

Think

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS

OJAI—CALIFORNIA

1949

(*Verbatim Report*)

Copyright 1950 by Krishnamurti Writings Inc.

Published by
KRISHNAMURTI WRITINGS INC.
OJAI, CALIFORNIA
MADRAS, INDIA
LONDON, ENGLAND

Translation and all rights reserved
Printed in India at the G. S. Press, Madras

I

I think it is very important that we should be most earnest. Those who come to these gatherings, those who go to various meetings of this kind, think they are very earnest and serious. But I would like to find out what we mean by being earnest, by being serious. Is it earnestness, does it show seriousness, if we go from one lecturer or talker to another, from one leader to another, from one teacher to another; if we go to different groups, or pass through different organizations, in search of something? So, before we begin to find out what it is to be earnest, surely we must find out what it is that we are seeking.

What is it that most of us are seeking? What is it that each one of us wants? Especially in this restless world, where everybody is trying to find some kind of peace, some kind of happiness, a refuge, surely it is important to find out, isn't it?, what it is that we are trying to seek, what it is that we are trying to discover. Probably most of us are seeking some kind of happiness, some kind of peace; in a world that is ridden with turmoil, wars, contention, strife, we want a refuge, where there can be some peace. I think that is what most of us want. And so we pursue, go from one leader to another, from one religious organization to another, from one teacher to another.

Now, is it that we are seeking happiness, or is it that we are seeking gratification of some kind, from which we hope to derive happiness? Surely, there is a difference between happiness and gratification. Can you *seek* happiness? Perhaps you can find gratification; but, surely, you cannot *find* happiness. Happiness is derivative, surely; it is a by-product of something else. So, before we give our minds and hearts to something which demands a great deal of earnestness, attention, thought, care, we must find out, must we not?,

what it is that we are seeking; whether it is happiness, or gratification. I am afraid most of us are seeking gratification. We want to be gratified, we want to find a sense of fullness at the end of our search.

Now, can you *seek* anything? Why do you come to these meetings? Why are you all sitting here and listening to me? It would be very interesting to find out why you are listening, why you take the trouble to come from long distances on a hot day, and listen. And, to what are you listening? Are you trying to find a solution for your troubles, and is that why you go from one lecturer to another, and through various religious organizations, and read books, and so on and on; or, are you trying to find out the cause of all the trouble, the misery, contention and strife? Surely, that does not demand that you should read a great deal, that you should attend innumerable meetings, or search out teachers? What it demands is clarity of intention, isn't it?

After all, if one is seeking peace, one can find it very easily. One can devote oneself blindly to some kind of a cause, to an idea, and take shelter there. Surely, that does not solve the problem. Mere isolation in an enclosing idea is not a release from conflict. So, we must find, must we not?, what it is, inwardly, as well as outwardly, that each one of us wants. If we are clear on that matter, then we don't have to go anywhere, to any teacher, to any church, to any organization. So, our difficulty is, is it not?, to be clear in ourselves regarding our intention. Can we be clear? And does that clarity come through searching, through trying to find out what others say, from the highest teacher to the ordinary preacher in a church round the corner? Have you got to go to somebody to find out? And yet, that is what we are doing, is it not? We read innumerable books, we attend many meetings and discuss, we join various organizations—trying thereby to find a remedy

to the conflict, to the miseries in our lives. Or, if we don't do all that, we think we have found; that is, we say that a particular organization, a particular teacher, a particular book satisfies us; we have found everything we want in that; and we remain in that, crystallized and enclosed.

So, we have to come to the point when we ask ourselves, really earnestly and profoundly, if peace, happiness, reality, God, or what you will, can be given to us by someone else. Can this incessant search, this longing, give us that extraordinary sense of reality, that creative being, which comes when we really understand ourselves? Does self-knowledge come through search, through following someone else, through belonging to any particular organization, through reading books, and so on? After all, that is the main issue, is it not?, that as long as I do not understand myself, I have no basis for thought, and all my search will be in vain. I can escape into illusions, I can run away from contention, strife, struggle; I can worship another; I can look for my salvation through somebody else. But as long as I am ignorant of myself, as long as I am unaware of the total process of myself, I have no basis for thought, for affection, for action.

But that is the last thing we want: to know ourselves. Surely, that is the only foundation on which we can build. But, before we can build, before we can transform, before we can condemn or destroy, we must know that which we are. So, to go out seeking, changing teachers, *gurus*, practising yoga, breathing, performing rituals, following Masters, and all the rest of it, is utterly useless, is it not? It has no meaning, even though the very people whom we follow may say: Study yourself. Because, what we are, the world is. If we are petty, jealous, vain, greedy—that is what we create about us, that is the society in which we live.

So, it seems to me, that before we set out on a journey to find reality, to find God, before we can act, before we can have any relationship with another, which is society, surely it is essential that we begin to understand ourselves first. And I consider the earnest person to be one who is completely concerned with this, *first*, and not with how to arrive at a particular goal. Because, if you and I do not understand ourselves, how can we, in action, bring about a transformation in society, in relationship, in anything that we do? And it does not mean, obviously, that self-knowledge is opposed to, or isolated from, relationship. It does not mean, obviously, emphasis on the individual, the me, as opposed to the mass, as opposed to another. I do not know if some of you have seriously undertaken to study yourselves, watching every word, and its responses; watching every movement of thought and feeling—just *watching* it, being conscious of your bodily responses, whether you act from your physical centers, or whether you act from an idea; how you respond to the world condition. I do not know if you have ever seriously gone into this question at all. Perhaps sporadically, as a last resort, when everything else has failed and you are bored, some of you have tried it.

Now, without knowing yourself, without knowing your own way of thinking, and why you think certain things, without knowing the background of your conditioning, and why you have certain beliefs about art and religion, about your country and your neighbor, and about yourself, how can you think truly about anything? Without knowing your background, without knowing the substance of your thought and whence it comes—surely, your search is utterly futile, your action has no meaning, has it? Whether you are an American, or a Hindu, or what your religion is, has no meaning either.

So, before we can find out what the

end-purpose of life is, what it all means—wars, national antagonisms, conflicts, the whole mess—surely, we must begin with ourselves, must we not? It sounds so simple, but it is *extremely* difficult. Because, to follow oneself, to see how one's thought operates, one has to be extraordinarily alert; so that, as one begins to be more and more alert to the intricacies of one's own thinking and responses and feelings, one begins to have a greater awareness, not only of oneself, but of another with whom one is in relationship. To know oneself, is to study oneself in action, which is relationship. But, the difficulty is that we are so impatient; we want to get on, we want to reach an end. And so we have neither the time nor the occasion, to give ourselves the opportunity, to study, to observe. Or, we have committed ourselves to various activities—to earning a livelihood, to rearing children—or have taken on certain responsibilities of various organizations; we have so committed ourselves in different ways, that we have hardly any time for self-reflection, to observe, to study. So, really, the responsibility of the reaction depends on oneself, not on another. And the pursuit, as in America and all the world over, of *gurus* and their systems, reading the latest books on this and that, and so on, seems to me so utterly empty, so utterly futile; for you may wander all over the earth, but you have to come back to yourself. And, as most of us are totally unaware of ourselves, it is extremely difficult to begin to see clearly the process of our thinking and feeling and acting. And that is the thing I am going to deal with during the weeks that are to follow in which I am to talk.

The more you know yourself, the more clarity there is. Self-knowledge has no end—you don't come to an achievement, you don't come to a conclusion. It is an endless river. And as one studies it, as one goes into it more and more, one finds peace. Only when the mind is

tranquil—through self-knowledge and not through imposed self-discipline—only then, in that tranquillity, in that silence, can reality come into being. It is only then that there can be bliss, that there can be creative action. And it seems to me that without this understanding, without this experience, merely to read books, to attend talks, to do propaganda, is so infantile—just an activity without much meaning. Whereas, if one is able to understand oneself, and thereby bring about that creative happiness, that experiencing of something that is not of the mind, then perhaps there can be a transformation in the immediate relationship about us, and so in the world in which we live.

Question: Do I have to be at any special level of consciousness to understand you?

KRISHNAMURTI: To understand anything—not only what I am saying, but to understand *anything*—what is required? To understand yourself, to understand your husband, your wife, to understand a picture, to understand the scenery, the trees, what is required? Right attention, isn't it? Because, to understand something, you must give your whole being to it, your undivided, full, deep attention, must you not? And how can there be deep, full attention, when you are distracted?—for example, when you are taking down notes as I am talking, you catch a good phrase, probably, and you say, "By Jove, I am going to take that down, I am going to use it in *my* talk." How can there be full attention when you are merely concerned with words? That is, you are concentrated on the verbal level, and so are incapable of going beyond that verbal level. Words are only a means of communication. But, if you are not capable of communicating, and merely stick to words, obviously there cannot be full attention; therefore, there is no right understanding.

So, listening is an art, is it not? To understand something, you must give full attention, and that is not possible when there is any kind of distraction: taking notes, or when you are sitting uncomfortably, or when you are struggling to understand by making an effort. Making an effort to understand is obviously a hindrance to understanding, because your whole attention has gone into making the effort. I do not know if you have ever noticed that when you are interested in something that another is saying, you are not making an effort, you are not building up a wall of resistance against distraction. There *are* no distractions when you are interested; you are giving your full attention eagerly, spontaneously, to something that is being said. When there is vital interest, there is spontaneous attention. But most of us find such attention very difficult; because, consciously, on the upper level of the mind, you may want to understand, but inwardly there is resistance; or, inwardly there may be a desire to understand, but outwardly, superficially, there is resistance.

So, to give full attention to something, there must be integration of your whole being. Because, at one level of consciousness you may want to find out, you may want to know; but at another level, that very knowing may mean destruction, because it may make you change your whole life. So, there is an inward contention, an inward struggle, of which you are perhaps unaware. Though you *think* you are paying attention, there is really a distraction going on inwardly or outwardly; and that is the difficulty.

So, to understand anything, one must give complete attention; and that is why I have been suggesting at various meetings that no notes should be taken, that you are not here to do propaganda, for me or for yourself; that you should listen only in order to understand. Our difficulty in understanding, is that our mind is

never quiet. We never look at anything quietly, in a receptive mood. A lot of rubbish is thrown at us by newspapers, magazines, politicians, tub-thumpers; every preacher around the corner tells us what to do and what not to do. All that is constantly pouring in; and, naturally, there is also an inward resistance to it all. There can be no understanding as long as the mind is disturbed. As long as the mind is not very quiet, silent, tranquil, receptive, sensitive, it is not possible to understand; and this sensitivity of the mind is not merely at the upper level of consciousness, in the superficial mind. There must be tranquillity right through, an integrated tranquillity. When you are in the presence of something very beautiful, if you begin to chatter you will not sense its meaning. But the moment you are quiet, the moment you are sensitive, its beauty comes to you. Similarly, if we would understand anything, not only must we be physically still, but our minds must be extremely alert, yet tranquil. That alert passivity of the mind does not come about through compulsion. You cannot *train* the mind to be silent; then it is merely like a trained monkey, outwardly quiet, but inwardly boiling. So, listening is an art; and you must give your time, your thought, your whole being, to that which you want to understand.

Question: Can I understand easier what you are saying by teaching it to others?

KRISHNAMURTI: You may learn, by telling it to others, a new way of putting things, a clever way of transmitting what you want to say; but, surely, that is not understanding. If you don't understand *yourself*, how in the name of names can you tell it to somebody else? Surely, that is merely propaganda, isn't it? You don't understand something, but you tell others about it; and you think a truth can be repeated. Do you think,

if you have an experience, you can tell it to others? You may be able to communicate verbally; but can you tell others of your experience—that is, can you convey the experiencing of a thing? You may describe the experience, but you cannot convey the state of experiencing. So, a truth that is repeated, ceases to be a truth. It is only the lie that can be repeated; but the moment you 'repeat' a truth, it loses its meaning. And most of us are concerned with repeating, but are not experiencing. A man who is experiencing something is not concerned with mere repetition, with trying to convert others, with propaganda. But unfortunately, most of us are concerned with propaganda; because, through propaganda, we try not only to convince others, but also gain a living by exploiting others; it gradually becomes a racket.

So, if you are not caught up in mere verbalization, but are really occupied with experiencing, then you and I are in communion. But, if you want to do propaganda—and I say truth cannot be propagandized—then there is no relationship between us. And I am afraid that is our difficulty at the present time. You want to tell others, without experiencing; and in telling, you hope to experience. That is mere sensation, mere gratification; it has no significance. It has no validity, no reality behind it. But, a reality experienced, if communicated, creates no bondage. So, experiencing is much more important, has greater significance, than communication on the verbal level.

Question: It seems to me that the movement of life is experienced in relationship with people and ideas. To detach oneself from such stimulation is to live in a depressing vacuum. I need distractions to feel alive.

KRISHNAMURTI: In this question is involved the whole problem of detachment and relationship. Now,

why do we want to be detached? What is this instinct in most of us that wants to push away, that wants to be detached? It may be, that for most of us this idea of detachment has come into being because so many religious teachers have talked about it: "You must be detached in order to find reality; you must renounce, you must give up, and then only will you find reality." And can we be detached in relationship? What do we mean by relationship? So, we will have to go into this question a little carefully.

Now, why have we this instinctive response, this constant looking to detachment? The various religious teachers have said, you must be detached. Why? First of all, the problem is, why are we attached? Not how to be detached, but why is it that you are attached? Surely, if you can find the answer to that, then there is no question of detachment, is there? Why are we attached to attractions, to sensations, to things of the mind or of the heart? If we can discover why we are attached, then perhaps we will find the right answer—not how to be detached.

Why are you attached? And what would happen if you were *not* attached? If you were not attached to your particular name, property, position—you know, the whole mass of things that makes up you: your furniture, your car, your characteristics, your idiosyncrasies, your virtues, your beliefs, your ideas—what would happen? If you were not attached, you would find yourself to be as nothing, would you not? If you were not attached to your comforts, to your position, to your vanity, you would be suddenly lost, would you not? So, the fear of emptiness, the fear of being nothing, makes you attached to something—whether it is to your family, to your husband, wife, to a chair, to a car, to your country—it doesn't matter what. The fear of being nothing makes one cling to something; and in the process of holding on, there is conflict,

there is pain. Because, what you hold onto soon disintegrates, dies; your car, your position, your property, your husband. So, in the process of holding, there is pain; and in order to avoid pain, we say we must be detached. You look into yourself and you will see that this is so. Fear of loneliness, fear of being nothing, fear of emptiness, makes us attach ourselves to something: to a country, to an idea, to a God, to some organization, to a Master, to a discipline, what you will. In the process of attachment, there is pain; and to avoid that pain, we try to cultivate detachment, and so we keep up this circle which is always painful, in which there is always a struggle.

Now, why can't we be as nothing, a non-entity? Not merely on the verbal level, but inwardly? Then there is no problem of attachment or detachment, is there? And, in that state, can there be relationship? Because, that is what this questioner wants to know. He says that without relationship to people and to ideas, one lives in a depressing vacuum. Is that so? Is relationship a process of attachment? When you are attached to somebody, are you related to that person? When I am attached to you, hold on to you, possess you, am I related to you? You become a necessity to me because, without you, I am lost, I am made uncomfortable, I feel miserable, I feel lonely. So, you become a necessity, a useful thing, a thing to fill my emptiness. *You* are not important; what is important is that you fill my need. And is there any relationship between us, when to me you are a need, a necessity, like a piece of furniture?

To put it differently, can one live without relationship? And is relationship merely a stimulation? Because, without that, which you call distraction, you feel lost, you do not feel alive. That is, you treat relationship as a distraction, which makes you feel alive. That is what the questioner says.

So, can one live in the world with-

out relationship? Obviously not. There is nothing that can live in isolation. Some of us, perhaps, would *like* to live in isolation; but one cannot do it. Therefore, relationship becomes merely a distraction, which makes you feel as though you were alive: quarrelling with each other, having struggles, contention, and so on, gives one a sense of aliveness. So, relationship becomes merely a distraction. And, as the questioner says, without distractions, you feel you are dead. Therefore, you use relationship merely as a means of distraction; and distraction, whether drink, going to cinemas, accumulating knowledge—any form of distraction—, obviously dulls the mind and heart, does it not? A dull mind, a dull heart—how can it have any relationship with another? It is only a sensitive mind, a heart that is awakened to affection, that *can* be related to something.

So, as long as you treat relationship as a distraction, you are obviously living in a vacuum, because you are frightened to go out of that state of distraction. Hence you are afraid of any kind of detachment, any kind of separation. Relationship then is a distraction which makes you feel alive. Whereas, true relationship, which is *not* a distraction, is really a state in which you are constantly in a process of understanding yourself in relation to something. That is, relationship is a process of self-revelation, not of distraction; and that self-revelation is very painful, because in relationship you soon find yourself out, if you are open to discover it. But as most of us do not want to discover ourselves, as most of us would rather hide ourselves in relationship, relationship becomes blindly painful, and we try to detach ourselves from it. Relationship is not a stimulation. Why do you want to be stimulated through relationship? And if you are, then relationship, like stimulation, becomes dull. I do not know if you have noticed that any kind of stimulation eventually

II

dulls the mind and the sensitivity of the heart.

So, the question of detachment should never arise; because only the man who possesses, thinks of renouncing; but he never questions *why* he possesses, what is the background that has made him possessive. When he understands the process of possessing, then there is naturally freedom from possession—not the cultivation of an opposite, as detachment. And relationship is merely a stimulation, a distraction, as long as we are using another as a means of self-gratification, or as a necessity, in order to escape from ourselves. You become very important to me, because in myself I am very poor; in myself I am nothing, therefore you are everything. Such a relationship is bound to be a conflict, a pain; and a thing that gives pain is no longer a distraction. Therefore, we want to escape from that relationship, which we call detachment.

So, as long as we use the mind in relationship, there can be no understanding of relationship. Because, after all, it is the mind that makes us be detached. When there is love, there is no question of attachment or detachment. The moment there is the cessation of that love, then the question of attachment and detachment begins. Love is not the product of thought: you cannot *think* about love. It is a state of being. And when the mind interferes, by its calculation, by its jealousies, by its various cunning deceptions, then the problem in relationship arises. Relationship has significance only when it is a process of revealing oneself to oneself; and if, in that process, one proceeds deeply, widely and extensively, then in relationship there is peace—not the contention, not the antagonism between two people. Only in that quietness, in that relationship in which there is the fruition of self-knowledge, is there peace.

July 16, 1949

As I was suggesting yesterday, we should be able to listen to what is being said without rejection, or acceptance. We should be able to listen so that, if something new is being said, we do not immediately reject it—which does not mean either, that we must accept everything that is being said. That would be really absurd; because then we would merely be building up authority, and where there is authority, there can be no thinking, feeling; there can be no discovery of the new. And, as most of us are inclined to accept something eagerly, without true understanding, there is a danger, is there not?, that we may accept without thought or investigation, without looking deeply into it. This morning I may perhaps say something new, or put something differently, which you may pass by, if you do not listen with that ease, with that quietness which brings understanding.

I want to discuss this morning a subject which may be rather difficult: the question of action, activity and relationship. Then I will answer questions. But before I do that, we have to understand first what we mean by activity, what we mean by action. Because, our whole life seems based on action, or rather, activity—I want to differentiate between activity and action. We seem to be so engrossed in doing things; we are so restless, so consumed with movement, doing something at any cost, getting on, achieving, trying for success. And what is the place of activity in relationship? Because, as we were discussing yesterday, life is a question of relationship. Nothing can exist in isolation; and if relationship is merely an activity, then relationship has not much significance. I do not know if you have noticed that the moment you cease to be active, there is immediately a feeling of nervous apprehension; you feel as though you are not alive, not alert,

so you must keep going. And there is the fear of being alone—of going out for a walk alone, of being by yourself, without a book, without a radio, without talking; the fear of sitting quietly without doing something all the time with your hands or with your mind or with your heart.

So, to understand activity, surely we must understand relationship, must we not? If we treat relationship as a distraction, as an escape from something else, relationship then is merely an activity. And is not most of our relationship merely a distraction, and therefore but a series of activities involved in relationship? As I said, relationship has true significance only when it is a process of self-revelation, when it is the revealing to oneself in the very action of relationship. But most of us do not want to be revealed in relationship. On the contrary, we use relationship as a means of covering up our own insufficiency, our own troubles, our own uncertainty. So, relationship becomes mere movement, mere activity. I do not know if you have noticed that relationship is very painful; and that as long as it is not a revealing process, in which you are discovering yourself, relationship is merely a means of escape from yourself.

I think it is important to understand this; because, as we were discussing yesterday, the question of self-knowledge lies in the unfolding of relationship, whether to things, to people, or to ideas. Can relationship be based on an idea? And, surely, any act based on an idea must be merely the continuation of that idea, which is activity. Action is not based on an idea. Action is immediate, spontaneous, direct, without the process of thought involved. But when we base action on an idea, then it becomes an activity; and if we base our relationship on an idea, then surely such a relationship is merely an activity, without comprehension. It is merely carrying out a formula,

a pattern, an idea. Because we want something out of relationship, such relationship is always restricting, limiting, confining.

Idea is, is it not?, the outcome of a want, of a desire, of a purpose. If I am related to you because I need you, physiologically or psychologically, then that relationship is obviously based on idea, is it not?; because I want something from you. And such a relationship, based on an idea, cannot be a self-revealing process. It is merely a momentum, an activity, a monotony, in which habit is established. Hence, such relationship is always a strain, a pain, a contention, a struggle, causing us agony.

Is it possible to be related without idea, without demand, without ownership, possession? Can we commune with each other—which is real relationship on all the different levels of consciousness—if we are related to each other through a desire, a physical or psychological need? And can there be relationship without these conditioning causes, arising from want? As I said, this is quite a difficult problem. One has to go very deeply and very quietly into it. It is not a question of accepting or rejecting.

We know what our relationship is at present—a contention, a struggle, a pain; or, mere habit. If we can understand fully, completely, relationship with the one, then perhaps there is a possibility of understanding relationship with the many, that is, with society. If I do not understand my relationship with the one, I certainly shall not understand my relationship with the whole, with society, with the many. And if my relationship with the one is based on a need, on gratification, then my relationship with society must be the same. Therefore, there must follow contention, with the one and with the many. And is it possible to live, with the one and with the many, without demand? Surely, that is the problem, is it not? Not only between you and me, but between me and society.

And to understand that problem, to inquire into it very deeply, you have to go into the question of self-knowledge; because, without knowing yourself as you are, without knowing exactly what is, obviously, you cannot have right relationship with another. Do what you will—escape, worship, read, go to cinemas, turn on radios—as long as there is no understanding of yourself, you cannot have right relationship. Hence the contention, battle, antagonism, confusion not only in you, but outside of you and about you. As long as we use relationship, merely as a means of gratification, of escape, as a distraction which is mere activity, there can be no self-knowledge. But self-knowledge is understood, is uncovered, its process is revealed, through relationship—that is, if you are willing to go into the question of relationship and expose yourself to it. Because, after all, you cannot live without relationship. But we want to use that relationship to be comfortable, to be gratified, to be something. That is, we use relationship based on an idea; which means, the mind plays the important part in relationship. And as mind is concerned always with protecting itself, with remaining always within the known, it reduces all relationship to the level of habit, or of security; and therefore, relationship becomes merely an activity.

So, you see that relationship, if we allow it, can be a process of self-revelation; but, since we do not allow it, relationship becomes merely a gratifying activity. As long as the mind merely uses relationship for its own security, that relationship is bound to create confusion and antagonism. And is it possible to live in relationship without the idea of demand, of want, of gratification? Which means, is it possible to love without the interference of the mind? We love with the mind, our hearts are filled with the things of the mind; but surely, the fabrications of the mind cannot be love. You cannot

think about love. You can think about the person whom you love; but that thought is not love, and so, gradually, thought takes the place of love. And, when the mind becomes supreme, the all-important, then obviously, there can be no affection. Surely, that is our problem, is it not? We have filled our hearts with the things of the mind. And the things of the mind are essentially ideas—what should be, and what should not be. Can relationship be based on an idea? And if it is, is it not a self-enclosing activity and therefore inevitable that there should be contention, strife, and misery? But if the mind does not interfere, then it is not erecting a barrier, it is not disciplining, suppressing or sublimating itself. This is extremely difficult, because it is not through determination, practice, or discipline, that the mind can cease to interfere; the mind will cease to interfere only when there is full comprehension of its own process. Then only is it possible to have right relationship with the one and with the many, free of contention and discord.

Question: I gather definitely from you that learning and knowledge are impediments. To what are they impediments?

KRISHNAMURTI: Obviously, knowledge and learning are an impediment to the understanding of the new, the timeless, the eternal. Surely, developing a perfect technique does not make you creative. You may know how to paint marvellously, you may have the technique; but you may not be a creative painter. You may know how to write poems, technically most perfect; but you may not be a poet. To be a poet implies, does it not?, being capable of receiving the new; to be sensitive enough to respond to something new, fresh. But, with most of us, knowledge, or learning has become an addiction, and we think that through *knowing* we

shall be creative. A mind that is crowded, encased in facts, in knowledge—is it capable of receiving something new, sudden, spontaneous? If your mind is crowded with the known, is there any space in it to receive something that is of the unknown? Surely, knowledge is always of the known; and with the known, we are trying to understand the unknown, something which is beyond measure.

Take, for example, a very ordinary thing that happens to most of us: those who are religious—whatever that word may mean for the moment—try to imagine what God is, or try to think about what God is. They have read innumerable books, they have read about the experiences of the various saints, the Masters, the Mahatmas, and all the rest, and they try to imagine, or try to feel, what the experience of another is. That is, with the known, you try to approach the unknown. Can you do it? Can you think of something that is not knowable? You can only think of something that you know. But there is this extraordinary perversion taking place in the world at the present time: we think we shall understand if we have more information, more books, more facts, more printed matter.

Surely, to be aware of something that is not the projection of the known, there must be the elimination through the understanding of the process of the known. Why is it that the mind clings always to the known? Is it not because the mind is constantly seeking certainty, security? Its very nature is fixed in the known, in time; and how can such a mind, whose very foundation is based on the past, on time, experience the timeless? It may conceive, formulate, picture the unknown, but that is all absurd. The unknown can come into being only when the known is understood, dissolved, put aside. And that is extremely difficult; because the moment you have an experience of anything, the mind translates it into

the terms of the known and reduces it to the past. I do not know if you have noticed that every experience is immediately translated into the known, given a name, tabulated, and recorded. So, the movement of the known, is knowledge. And, obviously, such knowledge, learning, is a hindrance.

Suppose you had never read a book, religious or psychological, and you had to find the meaning, the significance, of life. How would you set about it? Suppose there were no Masters, no religious organizations, no Buddha, no Christ, and you had to begin from the beginning. How would you set about it? First, you would have to understand your process of thinking, would you not?—and not project yourself, your thoughts, into the future and create a God which pleases you; that would be too childish. So, first you would have to understand the process of your thinking. Surely, that is the only way to discover anything new, is it not?

When we say that learning or knowledge is an impediment, is a hindrance, surely we are not including technical knowledge—how to drive a car, how to run machinery, or the efficiency which such knowledge brings. We have in mind quite a different thing: that sense of creative happiness which no amount of knowledge or learning will bring. And, to be creative in the truest sense of that word, is to be free of the past from moment to moment. Because, it is the past that is continually shadowing the present. Merely to cling to information, to the experiences of others, to what someone has said, however great, and try to approximate your action to that—all that is knowledge, is it not? But, to discover anything new, you must start on your own; you must start on a journey completely denuded, especially of knowledge. Because it is very easy, through knowledge and belief, to have experiences; but those experiences are merely the products of

self-projection, and therefore utterly unreal, false. And if you are to discover for yourself what is the new, it is no good carrying the burden of the old, especially knowledge—the knowledge of another, however great. Now, you use knowledge as a means of self-protection, security, and you want to be quite sure that you have the same experiences as the Buddha, or the Christ, or X. But a man who is protecting himself constantly through knowledge, is obviously not a truth-seeker.

For the discovery of truth, there is no path. You must enter the uncharted sea—which is not depressing, which is not being adventurous. Surely, when you want to find something new, when you are experimenting with anything, your mind has to be very quiet, has it not? But if your mind is crowded, filled with facts, knowledge, they act as an impediment to the new; and our difficulty is, for most of us, the mind has become so important, so predominantly significant, that it interferes constantly with anything that may be new, with anything that may exist simultaneously with the known. So, knowledge and learning are impediments for those who would seek, for those who would try to understand that which is timeless.

Question: I gather from your various talks that thought must cease before there can be understanding. What is that thinking which must come to an end? What do you mean by thinking and thought?

KRISHNAMURTI: I hope you are interested in all this. After all, you should be; because that is what you are doing. The only instrument we have is the mind, thought; and what do we mean by thinking? What do we mean by thought? How does it arise? What is its function? So, let us investigate it together. Though I may answer it, you too, please, think it out; let us think it out together.

What is thought? Surely, thought is the result of the past, isn't it? Thought is founded upon the reaction of the past, of yesterday, and of many, many, many yesterdays. You would not be capable of thinking if there were no yesterdays. So, thought is the result of the conditioned responses, established in the mind as the past. The mind is the result of the past. That is, thinking is the response of memory. If you had no memory, there would be no thinking. If you had no memory of the way to your house, you could not get there. So, thinking is the response of memory. Memory is a process, a residue of experiences—whether immediate, or of the past. Contact, sensation, desire, create experience. That is, through contact, sensation, desire, there is experience; that experience leaves a residue, which we call memory, whether pleasant or unpleasant, profitable or unprofitable. From that residue there is a response, which we call thinking, conditioned according to different environmental influences, and so on and so on. That is, the mind—not only the upper levels of consciousness, but the whole process—is the residue of the past. After all, you and I are the result of the past. Our whole conscious process of living, thinking, feeling, is based on the past; and, most of us live in the upper levels of consciousness, the superficial mind. There we are active, there we have our problems, innumerable contentions, every-day questions; and with that we are satisfied. But surely, what is on the surface, the little that shows, is not the whole content of consciousness. To understand the whole content of consciousness, the superficial mind must be quiet, if only for a few seconds, a few minutes. Then it is possible, is it not?, to receive what is the unknown.

Now, if thought is merely the response of the past, then the thought process must cease for something new, must it not? If thought is the result of time, which it is, then, to

have the intimation of the timeless, of something which you do not know, the thought process must come to an end, must it not? To receive something new, the old must cease. If you have a modern picture, and if you don't understand it, you cannot approach it with your classical training; at least for the time being, you must put it aside to understand the new. Similarly, if you are to understand that which is new, timeless, then the mind, which is the instrument of thought, which is the residue of the past, must come to an end; and the process of ending thought—though that may sound rather crazy—does not come through discipline, through so-called meditation. We will discuss presently, in the following weeks, what is right meditation, and so on. But we can see that any action on the part of the mind to make itself come to an end, is still a process of thought.

So, this problem is really quite arduous to go into and quite subtle. Because, there can be no happiness, there can be no joy, no bliss, unless there is creative renewal; and this creative renewal cannot take place if the mind is constantly projecting itself into the future, into the tomorrow, into the next second. And, as it does that all the time, we are uncreative. We may produce babies; but to be inwardly creative, to have that extraordinary sense of renewal in which there is constant newness, freshness, in which the mind is totally absent—that sense of creativeness cannot take place if the mind is constantly projecting itself into the future, into the tomorrow. That is why it is important to understand the whole thought process. Without understanding the thought process—all its subtleties, its varieties, its depth—you cannot come to the other. You may *talk* about it, but you have to stop thinking—though it sounds crazy. To have that renewal, that freshness, that extraordinary sense of otherness, the mind must understand itself. And that is why it is im-

portant that there should be deeper and wider awareness of self-knowledge.

Question: I agree with you that knowledge has not brought happiness. I have been trying to be receptive, to be intuitive and eager for hints from within. Am I on the right track?

KRISHNAMURTI: To understand this question, we must understand what we mean by consciousness; because, what you call intuition may be the projection of your own desire. There are so many people who say, "I believe in reincarnation. I feel it is so. My intuition tells me." It is obviously their desire to prolong, to continue themselves. Because they are so scared of death, they want to be assured that there is a next life, another opportunity, and so on, and so on. Therefore, 'intuitively' they feel it is correct. So, to understand this question, we must understand what you mean by within and without. Is it possible to receive intimations of that which is within when you are continually seeking an end—when you want to attain, when you want to cultivate, when you want to be happy? Surely, to receive intimations from within, the mind, the upper mind, must be completely free from all entanglements and prejudices, from all want, from all nationalism; otherwise, your 'intimations' will make you into the greatest nationalist, and a terror to the rest of the world.

So, our question is, how is it possible to receive the intimation of the unknown without warping it, without translating it into our conditioned thought-pattern? To understand that, we must go into the question of what is consciousness. What do we mean by being conscious? What is the process of consciousness? When do you say you are conscious? Surely, you say, "I am conscious," when you are experiencing, do you

not? When there is an experience—whether pleasurable or not pleasurable is irrelevant—then, there is an awareness of your being conscious of that experience. Then, from that experiencing, the next step is, you name it, you term it, do you not? You say it is pleasure, it is not pleasure; this I remember, that I do not remember. So you give it a name. Then you record it, do you not? By the very process of giving it a name, you are recording it. Are you following all this, or is it too Sunday-morningish? (Laughter).

So, there is consciousness only when there is experiencing, terming, and recording. Don't accept what I am saying—watch it yourself, and you will see this is how it operates. This is going on at all the levels, all the time, consciously or unconsciously. And, at the deeper levels of consciousness, the process is almost instantaneous, as on the upper level; but the difference is, is it not?, that on the upper level there is choice, there is choosing; at the wider, deeper level, there is instant recognition, without choice. And the upper mind or the superficial mind can receive the intimation only when this terming or naming or recording process comes to an end—which happens when the problem is much too great, or much too difficult. You try to solve a problem, and there is no answer. Then you let it go. The moment you let it go, there is a response, there is an intimation; because the mind, the conscious mind, is no longer struggling, trying to find an answer. It is quiet. The very exhaustion is a process of quietness; and therefore, the mind is capable of receiving the intimation. But the so-called intuition that the majority of people have, is really their own wish-fulfillment. That is why there are so many wars, organized beliefs, antagonisms, so much contention, because each one thinks his intuition is so true, that for it he is willing to die, or ill-treat others.

I am afraid the person who thinks

he is following intuition is obviously on the wrong track; because, to understand all this, one must transcend reason. To transcend reason, you must first know what the reasoning process is. You cannot go beyond something which you do not know; to go beyond it, you must know what it is; you must understand the whole meaning of reason, how to reason, how to go into it—you cannot jump beyond it. That does not mean that you must have a very clever brain, that you must be a great student, someone erudite. It needs honesty of thinking, clarity, the desire to be open, to invite what is, without fear of suffering. Then the barrier between the inner and the outer is non-existent. The inner then is the outer, and the outer is the inner. But to have that integration there must be a comprehension of the process of the mind.

Question: Please explain clearly what part memory has in our life. You seem to distinguish between two forms of memory. Actually, is there not only memory, which is our only means of consciousness, and that which makes us aware of time and space? Therefore, can we dispense with memory, as you seem to suggest?

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us investigate the question anew. Let us forget what has been said, and let us try to find out what we mean. We said this morning that thought is a result of the past, which is an obvious fact; whether you like it or not, it is so. Thought is founded on the past. There can be no thought without being conscious; and, as I said, consciousness is a process of experiencing, terming, which is recording. That is what you do all the time: if you see *that*, (pointing to a tree) you call it a tree and name it, and you think you have had an experience. This process of naming is part of memory, is it not? And it is a

very convenient way of experiencing. You think you have experienced a thing by naming it. You call me a Hindu, and you think you have understood all Hindus; I call you an American, and it is over. So we think we understand something by giving it a name. We give it a name in order to recognize it, as a species, or this or that; but that is not understanding, experiencing a thing. And we do it out of slackness—it is so much easier to dispense with people by giving them a name.

So, this process of experiencing, which is contact, sensation, desire, consciousness, identification, and experience—this process, with naming, is considered consciousness, isn't it? Part of that consciousness is awake, and the other part is dormant. The conscious mind, our every-day mind, the upper level of our mind, is awake. The rest is sleeping. Now, when we sleep, the conscious, upper mind, is silent; and therefore it is able to receive hints, intimations, translated as dreams, but which need further interpretation. Now, the questioner wants to know what we mean by memory, what is its function, and whether we can dispense with it. So, the question really is: What is the function of thought? Memory has no function apart from thinking. So, the question is, what is the function of thought? Can thought be divided at all? Is it to be dispensed with?

So, what is the function of thought? We say, thought is the response of memory, which it is; and memory is incomplete experience, termed and thought out for self-protection, and so on, and so on. Now, if thought is the result of memory, what function has thought in life? When do you use thought? I wonder if you have ever considered this? You use your thought when you want to go to your home, do you not? You think how to get to your place. This is one kind of thought. When does your thought function? When you are protecting yourself, isn't it? When you are seeking security: economic, social,

psychological. Isn't that so? When you want to safeguard yourself. That is, thought functions when there is the urge for self-protection. When you are kind to another, is that a thought process? When you love another, is that a thought process? When you love another and use that love as a means of self-enrichment, then obviously, it is a thought process; then, it is no longer love. So, thought process comes into being when there is fear, when there is the desire to possess, when there is conflict—in other words, thought process comes into being when the self, the me, becomes important. Surely? Because, after all, thought is concerned with me; when the I, the me, predominates, then the thought process as self-protection begins. Otherwise you don't think, you are unaware of your thought process, are you not? It is only when there is conflict that you are aware of the thought process—either to protect or to discard, to accept or to deny.

Now, the questioner wants to know what part memory plays in our life. If we understand that the thought process begins only when the me becomes important, and that the me is important only when there is the desire to safeguard itself, then we see that most of our life is spent in safeguarding ourselves. Therefore, thought has a very important part in our life; because most of us are concerned with ourselves. Most of us are concerned with how to protect ourselves, how to gain, how to arrive, how to achieve, how to become more perfect, how to have this virtue and that virtue, how to discard, how to deny, how to be detached, how to find happiness, how to be more beautiful, how to love, how to be loved—you know how we are concerned with ourselves.

So, we are consumed in the thought process. We *are* the thought process. We are not separate from the thought. And thought *is* memory; how to be more of something. That is, when there is the urge to be the more or

the less, the positive or the negative, then thought process comes into being. The thought process does not come into being when there is the recognition of what is. A fact does not demand a thought process; but if you want to avoid a fact, then the thought process begins. If I accept that I am what I am, then thought is not; but something else takes place when I accept what is. Quite a different process, which is not the process of thought, comes into being. So, as long as there is the desire for the more, or the less, there must be thought, there must be the process of memory. After all, if you want to be a very rich man, a powerful man, a popular man, or a man of God, if you want to become something, you must have memory. That is, you must think about it; the mind must constantly sharpen itself to become something.

Now, what part has that becoming in life? Surely, as long as we want to be something, there must be contention; as long as our desire, our urge, our pursuit, is to be the *more*, or to be the *less*—the positive or the negative—there must be strife, antagonism. But it is extremely arduous, extremely difficult, not to be the more or the less. Verbally you may throw it off and say, "I am nobody"; but that is merely living on the verbal level, without much significance—it is empty-headedness. That is why one has to understand the thought process, which is consciousness: which means, the whole problem of time, of yesterday, of to-morrow. And a man who is caught in yesterday, can never understand that which is timeless. And most of us are caught in the net of time. Our thought is basically entangled in the net of time—it is the net of time. Our thought is the net of time; and with that thought process—educated, cultivated, sharpened, made keen, subtle—we want to find something that is beyond.

We go to one teacher after another, one hero after another, one Master

after another. Our mind is sharpening itself on all these, and thereby hopes to find that which is beyond. But, thought can never find that which is beyond, because thought is the result of time, and that which is of the known, cannot receive the unknown. Therefore, the man who is entangled in the known is never creative; he may have moments of creativeness, as some painters do, some musicians, some writers; but they get entangled in the known—popularity, money, a hundred other things; and then they are lost. And that is why those who are trying to understand themselves—not to *find*, because that is a wrong process, you *cannot find*—, must cease to search. All that you can do is to understand yourself, understand the intricacies, the extraordinary subtlety of your thought and your being. And that can be understood only in relationship, which is action; and that action is denied when relationship is based on an idea; then relationship is mere activity, it is not action; and activity merely dulls the mind and the heart. It is only action that makes the mind alert and the heart subtle, so that it is capable of receiving, of being sensitive. That is why it is important that there be self-knowledge, before you seek. If you seek, you will find, but it will not be the truth. Therefore, this craze, this fear, this anxiety to arrive, to search out, to find, must end; then, with self-knowledge, ever wide and deep, there comes that sense of reality which cannot be invited. It comes into being, and only then is there creative happiness.

July 17, 1949.

III

Last Saturday and Sunday, we were discussing the importance of self-knowledge; because, as I explained, I do not see how we can have any foundation for right thinking without

self-knowledge; how any action, however inclusive, however collective or individualistic, can possibly be a harmonious and true action, without fully knowing oneself. Without knowing oneself, there is no possibility of really searching out what is true, what is significant, what are the right values in life. Without self-knowledge, we cannot go beyond the self-projected illusions of the mind. Self-knowledge, as we explained, implies not only the action of relationship between one individual and another, but also the action of relationship with society; and there can be no complete, harmonious society, without this knowledge. So, it is really very important and significant that one should know oneself as completely and fully as possible. And, is this knowledge possible? Can one know *integrally*, not partially, the total process of oneself? Because, as I said, without knowing oneself, one has no basis for thinking. One gets caught in illusions: political, religious, social illusions—they are limitless, endless. Is it possible to know oneself? And, how is it possible to know oneself—what are the means, what are the ways, what are the processes?

I think to find out what are the ways, one must find out first, must one not?, what are the impediments; and by studying what we consider important in life, those things which we have accepted—the values, the standards, the beliefs, the innumerable things that we hold—by examining them, perhaps we shall find out the ways of our own thinking, and thereby know ourselves. That is, by understanding the things that we accept, by questioning them, going into them—by that very process we shall know the ways of our own thinking, our responses, our reactions; and through them, we shall know ourselves as we are. Surely, that is the only way we can find out the manner of our thinking, our responses: by studying, by going fully into the values, the standards, the beliefs, that

we have accepted for generations. And, seeing behind these values, we shall know how we respond, what our reactions are to them; and thereby, perhaps, we shall be able to uncover the ways of our own thinking. In other words, to know oneself, surely, is to study the responses, the reactions that one has in relation to something. One cannot know oneself through isolation. That is an obvious fact. You may withdraw to a mountain, into a cave, or pursue some illusion on the banks of a river; but, if one isolates oneself, there can be no relationship, and isolation is death. It is only in relationship that one can know oneself as one is. So, by studying the things that we have accepted, by going into them fully, not superficially, perhaps we shall be able to understand ourselves.

Now, one of the things, it seems to me, that most of us eagerly accept and take for granted, is the question of beliefs. I am not attacking beliefs. What we are trying to do this evening is to find out why we accept beliefs; and if we can understand the motives, the causation of acceptance, then perhaps we may be able not only to understand why we do it, but also be free of it. Because, one can see how political and religious beliefs, national and various other types of beliefs, do separate people, do create conflict, confusion, and antagonism—which is an obvious fact; and yet we are unwilling to give them up. There is the Hindu belief, the Christian belief, the Buddhist—innumerable sectarian and national beliefs, various political ideologies, all contending with each other, trying to convert each other. One can see; obviously, that belief is separating people, creating intolerance; and is it possible to live without belief? One can find that out, only if one can study oneself in relationship to a belief. Is it possible to live in this world without a belief—not change beliefs, not substitute one belief for another, but be entirely free from all beliefs, so that one meets life anew

each minute? This, after all, is the truth: to have the capacity of meeting everything anew, from moment to moment, without the conditioning reaction of the past, so that there is not the cumulative effect which acts as a barrier between oneself and that which is.

Obviously, most of us accept or take on beliefs because, first of all, there is fear. We feel that, without a belief, we shall be lost. Then we use belief as a means of conduct, as a pattern, according to which we direct our lives. And also we think that, through belief, there can be collective action. So, in other words, we think that belief is necessary for action. And is that so? Is belief necessary for action? That is, belief being an idea, is ideation necessary for action? Which comes first: idea, or action? Surely, first there is action, which is either pleasurable or painful, and according to that we build up various theories. Action invariably comes first, does it not? And, when there is fear, when there is the desire to believe in order to act, then ideation comes in.

Now, if you consider, you will see that one of the reasons for the desire to accept a belief, is fear. Because, if we had no belief, what would happen to us? Wouldn't we be very frightened of what might happen? If we had no pattern of action, based on a belief—either in God, or in Communism, or in Socialism, or in Imperialism, or in some kind of religious formula, some dogma in which we are conditioned—we would feel utterly lost, wouldn't we? And is not this acceptance of a belief, the covering up of that fear—the fear of being really nothing, of being empty? After all, a cup is useful only when it is empty; and a mind that is filled with beliefs, with dogmas, with assertions, with quotations, is really an uncreative mind, it is merely a repetitive mind. And, to escape from that fear—that fear of emptiness, that fear of loneliness, that fear of stagnation, of not arriving, not succeeding, not

achieving, not being something, not becoming something—is surely one of the reasons, is it not?, why we accept beliefs so eagerly and greedily. And, through acceptance of belief, do we understand ourselves? On the contrary. A belief, religious or political, obviously hinders the understanding of ourselves. It acts as a screen through which we are looking at ourselves. And, can we look at ourselves without beliefs? If we remove those beliefs, the many beliefs that one has, is there anything left to look at? If we have no beliefs with which the mind has identified itself, then the mind, without identification, is capable of looking at itself as it is—and then, surely, there is the beginning of the understanding of oneself. If one is afraid, if there is fear which is covered over by a belief; and if, in understanding beliefs, one comes face to face with fear, without the screen of beliefs—is it not possible then to be free from that reaction of fear? That is, to know one is afraid, and to *stay* there, without any escape? To be with what is, is surely much more significant, much more worthwhile, than to escape from what is, through a belief.

So, one begins to see that there are various forms of escape from oneself, from one's own emptiness, from one's own poverty of being—escapes such as knowledge, such as amusement, various forms of addictions and distractions, both learned and stupid, clever or not worthwhile. We are surrounded by these, we are them; and if the mind can see the significance of the things to which it is held, then, perhaps, we shall be face to face with what we are, *whatever* it be; and I think the moment we are capable of doing that, then there is a real transformation. Because then, there is no question of fear; for fear exists only in relationship to something. When there is you and something else to which you are related, and when you dislike that thing to which you are related and try to avoid it—then there is fear. But

when you *are* that very thing, then there is no question of avoidance. A fact gives fear only when you bring an emotional reaction to it; but when a fact is faced as it is, there is no fear. And when what we call fear is no longer named, but only looked at, without it being given a term, then, surely, there takes place a revolution, there is no longer that sense either of avoidance or acceptance.

So, to understand belief, not superficially but profoundly, one must find out why the mind attaches itself to various forms of beliefs, why beliefs have become so significant in our lives: belief about death, about life, about what happens after death; beliefs asserting that there is God or there is no God; that there is reality or there is no reality; and various political beliefs. Are these beliefs not all indicative of our own sense of inward poverty, and, do they not reveal a process of escape, or act as a defence? And in studying our beliefs, do we not begin to know ourselves as we are, not only at the upper levels of our mind, of our consciousness, but deeper down? So, the more one studies oneself in relationship to something else, such as beliefs, the more the mind becomes quiet, without false regimentation, without compulsion. The more the mind knows itself, the more quiet it is, obviously. The more you know something, the more you are familiar with it, the more the mind becomes quiet. And the mind must be really quiet, not *made* quiet. Surely, there is a vast difference between a mind that is made quiet, and a mind that is quiet. You can compel a mind by circumstances, by various disciplines, tricks, and so on, to be quiet. But that is not quietude, that is not peace; that is death. But a mind that is quiet because it understands the various forms of fear, and because it understands itself—such a mind is creative, such a mind is renewing itself constantly. It is only the mind that is self-enclosed by its own fears and beliefs, that stagnates.

But a mind that understands its relationship to the values about it—not imposing a standard of values, but understanding what is—surely, such a mind becomes quiet, is quiet. It is not a question of becoming. It is only then, surely, that the mind is capable of perceiving what is real from moment to moment. Reality is, surely, not something at the end, an end-result of accumulative action. Reality is to be perceived only from moment to moment; and it can be perceived only when there is not the accumulative effect of the past on the moment, the now.

There are many questions, and I will answer some of them.

Question: Why do you talk?

KRISHNAMURTI: I think this question is quite interesting—for me to answer and also for *you* to answer. Not only why do I *talk*, but why do you *listen*? No; seriously, if I talked for self-expression, then I would be exploiting you. If my talking is a necessity for me in order to feel myself flattered, egotistic, self-aggressive, and all the rest of it, then I must use you; then you and I have no relationship, because you are a necessity for my egotism. I need you then to bolster myself up, to feel myself rich, free, applauded, having so many people listening to me. Then I am using you; then one uses another. Then, surely, there is no relationship between you and me, because you are useful to me. When I use you, what relationship have I with you? None. And, if I speak because I have various sets of ideas which I want to convey to you, then ideas become very important; and I do not believe that ideas ever bring about a fundamental, radical change, a revolution in life. Ideas can never be new; ideas can never bring about a transformation, a creative surge; because ideas are merely the response of a continued past, modified or altered,

but still of the past. If I talk because I want you to change, or I want you to accept my particular way of thinking, belong to my particular society, become my particular disciple—then you as an individual are a non-entity, because then I am only concerned with transforming you according to a particular view. Then *you* are not important; then the *pattern* is important.

So, why am I talking? If it is none of these things, why am I talking? We will answer that presently. Then the question is, why are you listening? Isn't that equally important? Perhaps more. If you are listening to get some new ideas, or a new way of looking at life, then you will be disappointed, because I am not going to give you new ideas. If you are listening to experience something you think I have experienced, then you are merely imitating, hoping to capture something which you think I have. Surely, the real things of life cannot be vicariously experienced. Or, because you are in trouble, sorrow, pain, have innumerable conflicts, you come here to find out how to get out of them. Again, I am afraid I cannot help you. All that I can do is to point out your own difficulty, and we can then talk it over with each other; but it is for you yourself to see. Therefore, it is very important to find out for yourself why you come here and listen. Because, if you have one purpose, one intention, and I another, we shall never meet. Then, there is no relationship between you and me, there is no communion between you and me. You want to go north, and I am going south. We will pass each other by. But, surely, that is not the intention of these gatherings. What we are trying to do is to undertake a journey together, and experience together as we go along—not that I am teaching you, or you are listening to me, but together we are exploring, if that is possible; so that you are not only the master but also the disciple in discovering and understanding. There

is not then this division of the high and the low, the one that is learned and the one that is ignorant, the one that has achieved and the one that is still on the way to achievement. Such divisions, surely, distort relationship; and, without understanding relationship, there can be no understanding of reality.

I have told you why I speak. Perhaps you will think then that I need you in order to discover. Surely not. I have something to say: you can take it or leave it. And, if you take it, it is not that you are taking it from me. I merely act as a mirror in which you see yourself. You might not like that mirror and so discard it; but, when you *do* look into the mirror, look at it very clearly, unemotionally, without the blur of sentimentality. And, surely, it is important, is it not?, to find out why you come and listen. If it is merely an afternoon's amusement, if instead of going to a cinema you come here, then it is utterly valueless. If it is merely for the sake of argumentation, or to catch new sets of ideas so that you can use them when you lecture, or write a book, or discuss—again, that is valueless. But if you come really to discover yourself in relationship, which might help in your relationship with others, then it has significance; then it is worthwhile; then it will not be like so many other meetings which you attend. Surely, these gatherings are intended, not for you to listen to me, but to see yourself reflected in the mirror which I am trying to describe. You don't have to accept what you see—that would be foolish. But if you look at the mirror dispassionately, as you would listen to music, as you would sit under a tree and watch the shadows of an evening, without condemnation, without any kind of justification—merely *look* at it—, that very awareness of what is, does a most extraordinary thing, if there is no resistance. Surely, that is what we are trying to do in all these talks. So, real freedom comes, but

not through effort; effort can never bring about freedom. Effort can only bring about substitution, suppression, or sublimation; but none of those things is freedom. Freedom comes only when there is no longer effort to be something. Then, the truth of what is, acts; and that is freedom.

Question: Is there a distinction between my intention in listening to you, and in going from one teacher to another?

KRISHNAMURTI: Surely, it is for you to find out, isn't it? Why do you go from one teacher to another, from one organization to another, from one belief to another? Or, why are you so closed in by one belief—Christian, or what you will? Why? Why do we do this? This is happening not in America only, but right through the world—this appalling restlessness, this desire to find. Why? Do you think by searching, you will find? But, before you can search, you must have the instrument for search, must you not? You must be capable of searching—not merely start out to search. To search, to have the capacity to search, you must understand yourself, surely. How can you search without first knowing yourself, without knowing what it is you are searching for, and what it is that is searching? The Hindus come over here and give their stuff—the yogis, the swamis, you know; and you go over there and preach, and convert. Why? It will be a happy world when there are neither teachers nor pupils.

What is it really that we are seeking? Is it that we are bored with life, bored with one set of ceremonies, one set of dogmas, church rituals, and so we go to another because it is something new, more exciting—Sanskrit words, men with beards, togas, and all the rest of it? Is that the reason? Or, do we want to find a refuge, an escape, in Buddhism, in Hinduism, or in some other organized religious

belief? Or, are we seeking gratification? It is very difficult to distinguish and be aware of what we are really seeking. Because, from period to period we vary; when we are bored, when we are tired, when we are miserable, we want something ultimate, lasting, final, absolute. It is only a very few who are consistent in their search—in their inquiry, rather. Most of us want distraction. If we are intellectual, we want intellectual distraction, and so on, and so on.

So, can one genuinely, authentically, for oneself, find out what it is that one wants? Not what one *should* have, or what one *thinks* one ought to have; but to find out for oneself, inwardly, what it is that one wants, what it is that one is searching after so ceaselessly. And, can one find, when one seeks? Surely, we will find that which we are seeking; but, when we get what we want, it soon fades away, it turns to ashes. So, before we start out searching, gathering what we want, surely it is important, isn't it?, to find out who the searcher is, and what he is seeking; because, if the seeker does not understand himself, then what he finds will be merely a self-projected illusion. And, you may live in that illusion happily for the rest of your life, but it will still be illusion.

So, before you seek, before you go from teacher to teacher, from organization to organization, from belief to belief, surely it is important to find out who is the person that is seeking, and what he is seeking—not just vaguely go from shop to shop, hoping to find the right dress. So, surely, the thing of primary importance is to know yourself, not to go out and search—which does not mean that you should become an introvert and avoid all action, which is impossible. You can know yourself only in relationship, not in isolation. So, what is the distinction between one's intention in coming here and listening, and in going to another teacher? Surely, there is no distinction if one merely

comes here to get something—to be pacified, to be comforted, to be given new ideas, to be persuaded to join or to leave some organization, or God knows what else. Surely, here there is no refuge, no organization. Here, you and I are trying to see exactly what *is*, if we can,—see ourselves as we are—, which is extremely difficult, because we are so cunning; you know the innumerable tricks that we play upon ourselves. Here, we are trying to strip ourselves naked and see ourselves; for, in that stripping, there comes wisdom; and it is that wisdom which gives happiness. But, if your intention is to find comfort, something which will hide you from yourself, something which will offer an escape, then, obviously, there are many ways of doing it—through religion, politics, amusement, knowledge—you know, the whole gamut of it. And, I do not see how any form of addiction, any form of distraction, any escape, however pleasant or however uncomfortable, to which one so eagerly adjusts oneself because it promises a reward at the end, can bring about that self-knowledge which is so essential, and which alone can give creative peace.

Question: Our mind knows only the known. What is it in us that drives us to find the unknown, reality, God?

KRISHNAMURTI: Does your mind urge towards the unknown? Is there an urge in us for the unknown, for reality, for God? Please think seriously about it. This is not a rhetorical question, but actually let us find out. Is there an inward urge in each one of us to find the unknown? Is there? How can you find the unknown? If you do not know it, how can you find it? Please, I am not being clever. Don't brush it off that way. So, is it an urge for reality? Or, is it merely a desire for the known, expanded? Do you understand what I mean? I have

known many things; they have not given me happiness, satisfaction, joy. So, now I want something *else* that will give me greater joy, greater happiness, greater hope, greater vitality—what you will. And, can the known, which is my mind—because, my mind is the known, the result of the known, the result of the past—, can that mind seek the unknown? If I do not know reality, the unknown, how can I search for it? Surely, it must come, I cannot go after it. If I go after it, I am going after something which is the known, projected from me.

So, our problem is not what it is in us that drives us to find the unknown—that is clear enough. It is our own desire to be more secure, more permanent, more established, more happy, to escape from turmoil, from pain, confusion. Surely, that is our obvious drive. And, when there is that drive, that urge, you will find a marvellous escape, a marvellous refuge—in the Buddha, in the Christ, or in political slogans, and all the rest of it. But, surely, that is not reality; that is not the unknowable, the unknown. Therefore, the urge for the unknown must come to an end, the search for the unknown must stop; which means, there must be the understanding of the cumulative known, which is the mind. The mind must understand itself as the known, because that is all it knows. You cannot think about something that you do not know. You can only think about something that you know.

Our difficulty is for the mind not to proceed *in* the known; and that can only happen when the mind understands itself and how all its movement is from the past, projecting itself through the present, to the future. It is one continuous movement of the known; and, can that movement come to an end? It can come to an end only when the mechanism of its own process is understood, only when the mind understands itself and its workings, its ways, its purposes, its pursuits, its demands—not only

the superficial demands, but the deep inward urges and motives. This is quite an arduous task; it isn't just in a meeting, or at a lecture, or by reading a book, that you are going to find out. On the contrary, it needs constant watchfulness, constant awareness of every movement of thought—not only when you are waking, but also when you are asleep. It must be a total process, not a sporadic, partial process.

And also, the *intention* must be right. That is, there must be a cessation of the superstition that inwardly we all want the unknown. It is an illusion to think that we are all seeking God—we are not. We don't have to *search* for light. There will be light when there is no darkness; and through darkness, we cannot find the light. All that we can do is to remove those barriers that create darkness; and the removal depends on the *intention*. If you are removing them *in order* to see light, then you are not removing anything, you are only substituting the word light for darkness. Even to look beyond the darkness, is an escape from darkness.

So, we have to consider, not what it is that is driving us, but why there is in us such confusion, such turmoil, such strife and antagonism—all the stupid things of our existence. When these are not, then there is light, we don't have to look for it. When stupidity is gone, there is intelligence. But the man who is stupid and tries to become intelligent, is still stupid. Surely, stupidity can never be made wisdom; only when stupidity ceases, is there wisdom, intelligence. But the man who is stupid and tries to become intelligent, wise, obviously can never be. To know what is stupidity, one must go into it, not superficially, but fully, completely, deeply, profoundly, one must go into all the different layers of stupidity; and when there is the cessation of that stupidity, there is wisdom.

So, it is important to find out, not if there is something more, something greater than the known, which is

urging us to the unknown; but to see what it is in us that is creating confusion, the wars, the class differences, the snobbishness, the pursuit of the famous, the accumulation of knowledge, the escape through music, through art, through so many ways. It is important, surely, to see them as they are, and to come back to ourselves as we are. And, from there we can proceed. Then the throwing off of the known is comparatively easy. When the mind is silent, when it is no longer projecting itself into the future, into the tomorrow, wishing for something; when the mind is really quiet, profoundly peaceful, the unknown comes into being. You don't have to search for it. You cannot invite it. That which you can invite is only that which you know. You cannot invite an unknown guest. You can only invite one whom you know. But you do not know the unknown, God, reality, or what you will. It must come. It can come only when the field is right, when the soil is tilled. But, if you till *in order* for it to come, then you will not have it.

So, our problem is not to seek the unknowable, but to understand the accumulative processes of the mind, which is ever with the known. And that is an arduous task: that demands attention, that demands a constant awareness in which there is no sense of distraction, of identification, of condemnation; it is *being* with what is. Then only can the mind be still. No amount of meditation, discipline, can make the mind still, in the real sense of that word. Only when the breezes stop does the lake become quiet. You cannot *make* the lake quiet. So, our job is not to pursue the unknowable, but to understand the confusion, the turmoil, the misery, in ourselves; and then that thing darkly comes into being, in which there is joy.

July 23, 1949

IV

I would like this morning to discuss what is simplicity, and perhaps from that arrive at the discovery of sensitivity. We seem to think that simplicity is merely an outward expression, a withdrawal: having few possessions, wearing a loin cloth, having no home, putting on few clothes, having a small bank account. Surely, that is not simplicity. That is merely an outward show. And it seems to me that simplicity is essential; but simplicity can come into being only when we begin to understand the significance of self-knowledge, which we have discussed previously, and which we will be discussing here till the end of August.

Simplicity is not merely adjustment to a pattern. It requires a great deal of intelligence to be simple and not merely conform to a particular pattern, however worthy outwardly. Unfortunately, most of us begin by being simple externally, in outward things. It is comparatively easy to have few things, and to be satisfied with few things; to be content with little, and perhaps to share that little with others. But, a mere outward expression of simplicity in things, in possessions, surely does not imply the simplicity of inward being. Because, as the world is at present, more and more things are being urged upon us, outwardly, externally. Life is becoming more and more complex. And, in order to escape from that, we try to renounce, or be detached from things—from cars, from houses, from organizations, from cinemas, and from the innumerable circumstances outwardly thrust upon us. We think we shall be simple by withdrawing. A great many saints, a great many teachers, have renounced the world; and it seems to me that such a renunciation on the part of any of us does not solve the problem. Simplicity which is fundamental, real, can only come into being inwardly; and from that there is

an outward expression. How to be simple, then, is the problem; because that simplicity makes one more and more sensitive. A sensitive mind, a sensitive heart, is essential, for then it is capable of quick perception, quick reception.

So, one can be inwardly simple, surely, only by understanding the innumerable impediments, attachments, fears, in which one is held. But most of us like to be held—by people, by possessions, or by ideas. We like to be prisoners. Inwardly, we are prisoners, though outwardly we seem very simple. Inwardly we are prisoners to our desires, to our wants, to our ideals, to the innumerable motivations. And simplicity cannot be found unless one is free inwardly. Therefore, it must begin first inwardly, not outwardly.

We were discussing yesterday afternoon the freedom from beliefs. Surely, there is an extraordinary freedom when one understands the whole process of belief, why the mind is attached to a belief. And, when there is freedom from beliefs, there is simplicity. But that simplicity requires intelligence; and, to be intelligent, one must be aware of one's own impediments. To be aware, one must be constantly on the watch, not established in any particular groove, in any particular pattern of thought or action. Because, after all, what one is inwardly, does affect the outer. Society, or any form of action, is the projection of ourselves; and, without transforming inwardly, mere legislation has very little significance outwardly; it may bring about certain reforms, certain adjustments; but, what one is inwardly, always overcomes the outer. If one is inwardly greedy, ambitious, pursuing certain ideals, that inward complexity does eventually upset, overthrow outward society, however carefully planned it may be.

So, surely, one must begin within—not exclusively, not rejecting the outer. You come to the inner, surely, by understanding the outer, by find-

ing out how the conflict, the struggle, the pain, exists outwardly; and as one investigates it more and more, naturally one comes into the psychological states which produce the outward conflicts and miseries. The outward expression is only an indication of our inward state; but to understand the inward state, one must approach through the outer. Most of us do that. And, in understanding the inner—not exclusively, not by rejecting the outer, but by understanding the outer and so coming upon the inner—, we will find that, as we proceed to investigate the inward complexities of our being, we become more and more sensitive, free. It is this inward simplicity that is so essential. Because, that simplicity creates sensitivity. A mind that is not sensitive, not alert, not aware, is incapable of any receptivity, any creative action. That is why I said that conformity as a means of making ourselves simple, really makes the mind and heart dull, insensitive. Any form of authoritarian compulsion, imposed by the government, by oneself, by the ideal of achievement, and so on—any form of conformity must make for insensitivity, for not being simple inwardly. Outwardly you may conform and give the appearance of simplicity, like so many religious people do. They practise various disciplines, join various organizations, meditate in a particular fashion, and so on—all giving an appearance of simplicity. But, such conformity does not make for simplicity. Compulsion of any kind can never lead to simplicity. On the contrary, the more you suppress, the more you substitute, the more you sublimate, the less there is simplicity; but the more you understand the process of sublimation, suppression, substitution, the greater the possibility of being simple.

Our problems—social, environmental, political, religious—are so complex that we can solve them only by being simple, not by becoming extraordinarily erudite and clever. Be-

cause, a simple person sees much more directly, has a more direct experience, than the complex person. And, our minds are so crowded with an infinite knowledge of facts, of what others have said, that we have become incapable of being simple and having direct experience ourselves. These problems demand a new approach; and they can be so approached only when we are simple, inwardly really simple. That simplicity comes only through self-knowledge, through understanding ourselves; the ways of our thinking and feeling, the movements of our thoughts, our responses; how we conform, through fear, to public opinion, to what others say, what the Buddha, the Christ, the great saints have said—all of which indicate our nature to conform, to be safe, to be secure. And, when one is seeking security, one is obviously in a state of fear, and therefore there is no simplicity.

Without being simple, one cannot be sensitive—to the trees, to the birds, to the mountains, to the wind, to all the things that are going on about us in the world. And, if one is not simple, one cannot be sensitive to the inward intimation of things. Most of us live so superficially, on the upper level of our consciousness; there we try to be thoughtful or intelligent, which is synonymous with being religious; there we try to make our minds simple, through compulsion, through discipline. But that is not simplicity. When we force the upper mind to be simple, such compulsion only hardens the mind, does not make the mind supple, clear, quick. To be simple, in the whole total process of our consciousness, is extremely arduous. Because, there must be no inward reservation, there must be an eagerness to find out, to inquire into the process of our being, which means, to be awake to every intimation, to every hint; to be aware of our fears, of our hopes, and to investigate and be free of them more and more. Only then, when the mind and the heart are really simple, not encrusted,

are we able to solve the many problems that confront us.

Knowledge is not going to solve our problems. You may know, for example, that there is reincarnation, that there is a continuity after death. You may know, I don't say you do; or you may be convinced of it. But that does not solve the problem. Death cannot be shelved by your theory, or by information, or by conviction. It is much more mysterious, much deeper, much more creative, than that.

So, one must have the capacity to investigate all these things anew; because, it is only through *direct experience* that our problems are solved; and to have direct experience, there must be simplicity, which means, there must be sensitivity. A mind is made dull by the weight of knowledge. A mind is made dull by the past, by the future. But, only a mind that is capable of adjusting itself to the present, continually, from moment to moment, can meet the powerful influences and pressures constantly put upon us by our environment.

So, a religious man is not really one who puts on a robe, or a loin cloth, or lives on one meal a day, or one who has taken innumerable vows to be this and not to be that; but, it is he who is inwardly simple, who is not *becoming* anything. Such a mind is capable of extraordinary receptivity, because there is no barrier, there is no fear, there is no going toward something; therefore, it is capable of receiving grace, God, truth, or what you will. But a mind that is *pursuing* reality, is not a simple mind. A mind that is seeking out, searching, groping, agitated, is not a simple mind. A mind that conforms to any pattern of authority, inward or outward, cannot be sensitive. And it is only when a mind is really sensitive, alert, aware of all its own happenings, responses, thoughts, when it is no longer becoming, is no longer shaping itself to be something — only then is it capable of receiving that which

is truth. It is only then that there can be happiness; for happiness is not an end, it is the result of reality. And, when the mind and the heart have become simple, and therefore sensitive—not through any form of compulsion, direction, or imposition—then we will see that our problem can be tackled very simply. However complex our problems, we shall be able to approach them anew and see them differently. And that is what is wanted, is it not?, at the present time: people who are capable of meeting this outward confusion, turmoil, antagonism, anew, creatively, simply; not with theories, not with formulas, whether of the left or of the right. And you *cannot* meet it anew, if you are not simple.

You know, a problem can be solved only when we approach it anew. But we cannot approach it anew if we are thinking in terms of certain patterns of thought, religious, political, or otherwise. So, we must be free of all these things, to be simple. That is why it is so important to be aware, to have the capacity to understand the process of our own thinking, to be cognizant of ourselves, totally; and, from that there comes a simplicity, there comes a humility which is not a virtue or a practice. Humility that is gained, ceases to be humility. A mind that makes itself humble, is no longer a humble mind. And it is only when one has humility, not a cultivated humility, that one is able to meet the things of life that are so pressing; because, then one is not important, one doesn't look through one's own pressures and sense of importance; one looks at the problem for itself, and then one is able to solve it.

Question: I have been a member of various religious organizations, but you have destroyed them all. I am utterly bored, and work because hunger forces me to it. It is difficult to get up in the morning, and I have no interest in life. I realize I am

merely existing from day to day, without any human sense of value; but I can feel no spark of enthusiasm for anything. I am afraid to commit suicide. What on earth am I to do? (Laughter)

KRISHNAMURTI: Though you laugh, are not most of us in that position? Though you may still belong to many organizations—religious, political and otherwise—or you may have given them all up, is there not in you the same inward despair? You may go to analysts, or to confession, and so feel pacified for the time being; but isn't there the same ache of loneliness, a sense of loss, a despair without end? Joining organizations, indulging in various forms of amusement, being addicted to knowledge, performing daily rituals, and all the rest of it, does offer an escape from ourselves; but, when those have ceased, when those have been pushed away intelligently and not replaced by other forms of escape, one comes to this, doesn't one? You may have read many books, you may be surrounded by your family, children, wealth—a new car every year, the latest literature, the newest phonograph, and all the rest of it. But, when you intelligently discard distraction, you are inevitably faced with this, aren't you?—the sense of inward frustration, the sense of hopeless despair without an end. Perhaps most of you are not aware of it; or, if you are, you run away from it. But it is there. So, what is one to do?

First of all, it seems to me, it is very difficult to come to that position; to be so aware that you are directly confronted with that thing. Very few of us are capable of facing that thing directly, as it is, because it is extremely painful; and when you do face it, you are so anxious to leave it, that you might do anything, even commit suicide—or run far away, into any illusion, any distraction. So, the first difficulty is to be fully aware that you are confronted with it. Surely, one must be in

despair to find something. When you have tried everything about you, every door through which you can possibly escape, and none of them offer an escape, you are bound to come to this point.

Now, if you *are* at this point, really, actually—not fancifully, not *wishing* to be there in order to do something else—, if you are actually faced with it, then we can proceed and discuss what to do. Then it is worthwhile to proceed. If you have ceased substituting one escape for another, leaving one organization and joining something else, pursuing one thing after another: if all that has stopped—and it must eventually stop for every intelligent man—, then what? Now, if you are in that position, what is the next response? When you are no longer escaping, when you are no longer seeking an outlet, a way to avoid it—then what happens? If you observe, what we do is this: because of a sense of fear with regard to it, or the desire to understand it, we give it a name. Don't we? We say, "I am lonely, I am in despair; I am this, I want to understand it." That is, we establish a relationship between ourselves and that thing which we call loneliness, emptiness, by giving it a name. I hope you understand what I am talking about. By verbalizing our relationship to it, we give it a neurological as well as a psychological significance. But, if we do not name it, but merely regard it, look at it, then we shall have a different relationship to it; then it is not away from us, it is us. We say, for example, "I am afraid of it." Fear exists only in relationship to something; that something comes into being when we curb it, when we give it a name, as being lonely. Therefore, there is the feeling that you and that loneliness are two separate things. But is that so? You, the observer, are observing the fact, which you term as being lonely. Is the observer different from the thing which he observes? It is different only as long as he gives

it a name; but if you do not give it a name, the observer is the observed. The name, the term, acts only to divide; and then you have to battle with that thing. But, if there is no division, if there is an integration between the observer and the observed, which exists only when there is no naming—you can try this out and you will see—, then the sense of fear is entirely gone. It is fear that is preventing you from looking at this when you say, you are empty, you are this, you are that, you are in despair. And fear exists only as memory, which comes when you term; but when you are capable of looking at it without terming, then, surely, that thing is yourself.

So, when you come to that point, when you are no longer naming the thing of which you are afraid, then you *are* that thing. When you *are* that thing, there is no problem, is there? It is only when you do not want to be that thing, or when you want to make that thing different from what it is, that the problem arises. But if you *are* that thing, then the observer is the observed, they are a joint phenomenon, not separate phenomena; then there is no problem, is there?

Please, experiment with this, and you will see how quickly that thing is resolved and transcended, and something else takes place. Our difficulty is to come to that point, when we can look at it without fear; and fear arises only when we begin to recognize it, when we begin to give it a name, when we want to do something about it. But, when the observer sees that he is not different from the thing which he calls emptiness, despair, then the word has no longer a meaning. The word has ceased to be, it is no longer despair. When the word is removed, with all its implications, then there is no sense of fear or despair. Then, if you proceed further, when there is no fear, no despair, when the word is no longer important, then, surely, there is a tremendous release, a freedom;

and in that freedom there is creative being, which gives a newness to life.

To put it differently: We approach this problem of despair through habitual channels. That is, we bring our past memories to translate that problem; and thought, which is the result of memory, which is founded upon the past, can never solve that problem, because it is a new problem. Every problem is a new problem; and when you approach it, burdened with the past, it cannot be solved. You cannot approach it through the screen of words, which is the thinking process; but when the verbalization stops—because you understand the whole process of it, you leave it—, then you are able to meet the problem anew; then the problem is not what you think it is.

So, you might say at the end of this question. "What am I to do? Here I am in despair, in confusion, in pain; you haven't given me a method to follow, to become free." But, surely, if you have understood what I have said, the key is there: a key which opens much more than you realize if you are *capable* of using it. You can see then how words play an extraordinarily important part in our lives, words like God, like nation, like political leader, like Communism, like Catholicism—words, words, words. What extraordinary significance they have in our life! And it is these words that are preventing our understanding the problems anew. To be really simple is to be uncluttered with all these impressions, words and their significance; and to approach the problem anew. And I assure you, you can do it; it is quite an amusement, if you will do it, for it reveals so much. And I feel this is the only way to tackle any fundamental problem. You must tackle a problem which is very deep, profoundly, not at the superficial level. And this problem of loneliness, of despair, with which most of us are somewhat, in our rare moments, acquainted, is not a thing to be dis-

solved by merely running off into some kind of distraction or worship. It is *always* there, until you are capable of dealing with it directly and experiencing it directly, without any verbalization, without any screen between yourself and it.

Question: What have you to say to a person who, in quiet moments, sees the truth of what you say, who has a longing to keep awake, but who finds himself repeatedly lost in a sea of impulse and small desires?

KRISHNAMURTI: This is what happens to most of us, isn't it? We are awake at moments, at other moments we are asleep. At moments we see everything clearly, with significance; at other moments all is confused, dark, misty. Sometimes there are extraordinary heights of joy, unrelated to any kind of action; at other moments, we struggle for that. Now, what is one to do? Should one memorize, keep awake to those things that we have caught a glimpse of, and hang on to them grimly? Or, should we deal with the little desires, impulses, the dark things of our life, as they arise from moment to moment? I know most of us prefer to cling to that joy; we make effort, discipline ourselves to resist, to overcome the petty little things, and try to keep our eyes fixed on the horizon. That is what most of us want, isn't it? Because that is so much easier—at least, we think so. We prefer to look to an experience that is over, that has given us a great delight, a joy, and hold on to it, like some old people who look to their youth; or, like some other people, who look to the future, to the next life, to some greatness which they are going to achieve next time, tomorrow, or a hundred years hence. That is, there are those who sacrifice the present to the past, enriching the past; and those who enrich the future. They are both the same. Different sets of words

are employed, but the same phenomenon is there.

Now, what is one to do? First of all, let us find out why we want to cling to a pleasurable experience, or avoid something which is not pleasurable. Why do we go through this process of holding on, clinging to something which has given us a great joy physically or psychologically? Why do we do this? Why has an experience that is over, so much more importance? Because, don't we feel that without that extraordinary experience, there is nothing in the present? The present is an awful bore, a trial; therefore, let us think of the past. The present is irksome, nagging, bothersome, therefore, let us at least be something in the future—a Buddha, a Christ, or God knows what.

So, the past and the future become useful, or pleasurable, only when we do not understand the present. And against the present, we discipline; the present, we resist. Because, take away the past, all your experiences, your knowledge, your accumulations, your enrichments—and what are you? With that past, you meet the present. Therefore, you are really never meeting the present: you are merely overshadowing the present by the past, or by the future. And, we discipline ourselves to understand the present. We say, "I must not think of the past, I must not think of the future; I am going to be concentrated in the present." You see the fallacy, the absurdity, the infantilism of thinking yourself as some marvellous entity tomorrow, or in the past, and you say, "Now I must understand it." Can you understand anything through discipline, through compulsion? You may force a boy to be quiet, outwardly, by disciplining him; but inwardly, he is seething, isn't he? Likewise, when we force ourselves to understand, is there any understanding? But, if we can see the real futility, see the significance of our attachment to the past, or to our becoming something in the

future—if we really understand it—, then that gives sensitivity to the mind, to meet the present.

So, our difficulty is not the understanding of the present. Our difficulty is our attachment to the past or to the future. So, we have to investigate why it is that we are attached. Why is the past so important to old people, as the future is to others? Why are we so attached to it? Because we think, do we not?, that the experiences have enriched us; so, the past has significance. When one was young, one caught a light on the sea, a glimmer; there was a freshness which has faded now. But, at least one can remember that glimmer, that extraordinary sense of *élan*, that feeling of otherness, of youth. So, one goes back and lives there. That is, one lives in a dead experience. It is over, it is dead, it is gone; yet, one gives it life by thinking about it, living in it. But it is a dead thing. So, when one does that, one is also dead in the present—like so many people are—or in the future. In other words, one is afraid to be nothing in the present, to be simple, to be sensitive to the present, so one wants to be enriched by one's experiences of yesterday. Is that enrichment? Are the experiences of yesterday enriching? Surely, you have the memory of them. Is memory enriching? Or, is it merely words, with very little content? Surely, you can see that for yourself, if you will experiment. When we look to the past for enrichment, we are living on words. We give life to the past; the past has no life in itself; it has life only in relationship to the present. And when the present is disagreeable, we give life to the past; and that, surely, is not enrichment. When you are aware that you are rich, you are surely poor. To be aware of yourself as being something, obviously denies that which you are. If you are aware that you are virtuous, surely, you are no longer virtuous; if you are aware that you are happy, where is happi-

ness? Happiness comes only when there is self-forgetfulness, when there is no sense of the me as important. But, the me becomes important, the self becomes important, when the past or the future is all-significant. So, mere disciplining of oneself to be something, can never bring about that state in which there is no self-consciousness as the me.

Question: I am not interested in anything, but most people are busy with many interests. I don't have to work, so I don't. Should I undertake some useful work?

KRISHNAMURTI: Become a social worker, or a political worker, or a religious worker—is that it? Because you have nothing else to do, therefore you become a reformer! (Laughter) Sir, if you have nothing to do, if you are bored, why not be bored? Why not be that? If you are in sorrow, be sorrowful. Don't try to find a way out of it. Because, your being bored has an immense significance, if you can understand it, live with it. But if you say, "I am bored, therefore I will do something else," you are merely trying to escape from boredom. And, as most of our activities are escapes, you do much more harm socially and in every other way. The mischief is much greater when you escape, than when you are what you are and remain with it. The difficulty is, how to remain with it, and not run away; and as most of our activities are a process of escape, it is immensely difficult for you to stop escaping, and face it. So, I am glad if you are really bored; and I say: full stop, let's stay there, let's look at it. Why should you do anything? How do you know that in that state, when you are escaping, you are not causing much more harm to people? Your escape into something is an illusion; and when you go into an illusion and propagate that illusion, you are doing much more harm, aren't you?, than by merely

remaining bored. Sir, if you are bored, and remain so, what can you do? This person says he has enough money to live, so he has not that problem for the time being.

If you are bored, why are you bored? What is the thing called boredom? Why is it that you are not interested in anything? There must be reasons and causes which have made you dull: suffering, escapes, beliefs, incessant activity, have made the mind dull, the heart unpliant. To find out what are the causes that have made you dull, is not to analyze. That is quite a different problem, which we will discuss another time. But, if you could find out why you are bored, why there is no interest, then surely you would solve the problem, wouldn't you? Then the awakened interest will function. But, if you are not interested in why you are bored, you cannot force yourself to be interested in an activity, merely to be doing something—like a squirrel going around in a cage. I know that this is the kind of activity most of us indulge in. But, we can find out inwardly, psychologically, why we are in this state of utter boredom; we can see why most of us are in this state: we have exhausted ourselves emotionally and mentally; we have tried so many things, so many sensations, so many amusements, so many experiments, that we have become dull, weary. We join one group, do everything wanted of us, and then leave it; we then go to something else, and try that. If we fail with one psychologist, we go to somebody else, or to the priest; if we fail there, we go to another teacher, and so on; we always keep going. This process of constantly stretching and letting go, is exhausting, isn't it? Like all sensations, it soon dulls the mind.

So, we have done that, we have gone from sensation to sensation, from excitement to excitement, till we come to a point when we are really exhausted. Now, realizing that, don't proceed any further: take a rest. Be quiet. Let the mind

gather strength by itself, don't force it. As the soil renews itself during the winter-time, so, when the mind is allowed to be quiet, it renews itself. But it is very difficult to allow the mind to be quiet, to let it lie fallow after all this, for the mind wants to be doing something all the time. And when you come to that point where you are really allowing yourself to be as you are—bored, ugly, hideous, or whatever it is—, then there is a possibility of dealing with it.

What happens when you accept something, when you accept what you are? When you accept that you are what you are, where is the problem? There is a problem only when we do not accept a thing as it is, and wish to transform it—which does not mean that I am advocating contentment; on the contrary. So, if we accept what we are, then we see that the thing which we dreaded, the thing which we called boredom, the thing which we called despair, the thing which we called fear, has undergone a complete change. There is a complete transformation of the thing of which we were afraid.

That is why it is important, as I said, to understand the process, the ways of our own thinking. Self-knowledge cannot be gathered through anybody, through any book, through any confession, psychology, or psycho-analyst. It has to be found by yourself, because it is *your* life; and without the widening and deepening of that knowledge of the self, do what you will, alter any outward or inward circumstances, influences—it will ever be a breeding ground of despair, pain, sorrow. To go beyond the self-enclosing activities of the mind, you must understand them; and to understand them is to be aware of action in relationship, relationship to things, to people, and to ideas. In that relationship, which is the mirror, we begin to see ourselves, without any justification or condemnation; and from that wider and deeper knowledge of the ways of our own mind, it is possible to proceed

further; then it is possible for the mind to be quiet, to receive that which is real.

July 24, 1949

V

During the last four talks or discussions we have been considering the question of self-knowledge. Because, as we said, without being aware of one's own process of thought and feeling, it is obviously not possible to act rightly or think rightly. So, the essential purpose of these gatherings or discussions or meetings, is really to see if one can, for oneself, directly experience the process of one's own thinking and be aware of it integrally. Most of us are aware of it superficially, on the upper or superficial level of the mind, but not as a total process. It is this total process that gives freedom, that gives comprehension, that gives understanding; and not the partial process. Some of us may know ourselves partially, at least we think we know ourselves a little; but that little is not sufficient, because, if one knows oneself slightly, it acts as a hindrance rather than a help. And it is only in knowing oneself as a total process—physiologically and psychologically: the hidden, unconscious, deeper layers as well as the superficial layers—it is only when we know the total process, that we are able to deal with the problems that inevitably arise, not partially but as a whole.

Now, this ability to deal with the total process is what I would like to discuss this evening; also whether it is a question of the cultivation of a particular capacity, which implies a certain kind of specialization. Does understanding, happiness, the realization of something beyond the mere physical sensations, come through any specialization? Because, capacity implies specialization. In a world of ever-increasing specializa-

tion, we depend on the specialists. If anything goes wrong with a car, we turn to the mechanic; if anything goes wrong physically, we go to a doctor. If there is a psychological maladjustment, we run, if we have the money and the means, to a psychologist, or to a priest, and so on. That is, we look to the specialist for help in our failures and miseries.

Now, does the understanding of ourselves demand specialization? The specialist knows only his specialty at whatever level. And does the knowledge of ourselves demand specialization? I do not think so; on the contrary. Specialization implies, does it not?, a narrowing-down of the whole, total process of our being to a particular point, and specializing on that point. Since we have to understand ourselves as a total process, we cannot specialize. Because specialization implies exclusion, obviously; whereas, to know ourselves does not demand any kind of exclusion. On the contrary, it demands a complete awareness of ourselves as an integral process, and for that, specialization is a hindrance.

After all, what is it that we have to do? Know ourselves, which means to know our relationship with the world, surely—not only with the world of ideas and people, but also with nature, with the things we possess. That is our life—life being relationship to the whole. And does the understanding of that relationship demand specialization?; obviously not. What it demands is awareness to meet life as a whole. How is one to be aware? That is our problem. How is one to have that awareness—if I may use this word without making it mean specialization? How is one to be capable of meeting life as a whole?—which means not only personal relationship with your neighbor, but also with nature, with the things that you possess, with ideas, and with the things that the mind manufactures as illusion, desire, and so on. How is one to be aware of this whole process

of relationship? Surely, that is our life, is it not? There is no life without relationship; and to understand this relationship does not mean isolation, as I have been insisting, constantly explaining. On the contrary, it demands a full recognition or awareness of the total process of relationship.

Now, how is one to be aware? How are we aware of anything? How are you aware of your relationship with a person? How are you aware of these trees, the calling of that cow? How are you aware of your reactions when you read a newspaper, if you read a newspaper? And, are we aware of the superficial responses of the mind, as well as the inner responses? How are we aware of anything? Surely, first we are aware, are we not?, of a response to a stimulus, which is an obvious fact; I see the trees, and there is a response, then sensation, contact, identification, and desire. That is the ordinary process, isn't it? We can observe what actually takes place, without studying any books.

So, through identification, you have pleasure and pain. And our 'capacity' is this concern with pleasure and the avoidance of pain, is it not? If you are interested in something, if it gives you pleasure, there is 'capacity' immediately; there is an awareness of that fact immediately; and if it is painful, the 'capacity' is developed to avoid it. So, as long as we are looking to 'capacity' to understand ourselves, I think we shall fail; because the understanding of ourselves does not depend on capacity. It is not a technique that you develop, cultivate and increase through time, through constantly sharpening. This awareness of oneself can be tested, surely, in the action of relationship, it can be tested in the way we talk, the way we behave. Watch yourself after the meeting is over, watch yourself at table—just observe, without any identification, without any comparison, without any condemnation; just watch, and you will

see an extraordinary thing taking place. You not only put an end to an activity which is unconscious—because most of our activities are unconscious—you not only bring that to end, but, further, you are aware of the motives of that action, without inquiry, without digging into it.

Now, when you are aware, you see the whole process of your thinking and action; but it can happen only when there is no condemnation. That is, when I condemn something, I do not understand it, and it is one way of avoiding any kind of understanding. I think most of us do that purposely; we condemn immediately, and we think we have understood. If we do not condemn, but regard it, are aware of it, then the content, the significance of that action begins to open up. Experiment with this and you will see for yourself. Just be aware—without any sense of justification—which may appear rather negative, but is not negative. On the contrary, it has the quality of passivity which is direct action; and you will discover this, if you experiment with it.

After all, if you want to understand something, you have to be in a passive mood, do you not? You cannot keep on thinking about it, speculating about it, or questioning it. You have to be sensitive enough to receive the content of it. It is like being a sensitive photographic plate. If I want to understand you, I have to be passively aware; then you begin to tell me all of your story. Surely, that is not a question of capacity or specialization. In that process, we begin to understand ourselves—not only the superficial layers of our consciousness, but the deeper, which is much more important; because *there* are all of our motives or intentions, our hidden, confused demands, anxieties, fears, appetites. Outwardly we may have them all under control, but inwardly they are boiling. Until those have been completely understood through awareness, obviously there cannot be freedom, there can-

not be happiness, there is no intelligence.

So, is intelligence a matter of specialization?—intelligence being the total awareness of our process. And is that intelligence to be cultivated through any form of specialization? Because, that is what is happening, is it not? You are listening to me, probably thinking that I am a specialist—I hope not. The priest, the doctor, the engineer, the industrialist, the business man, the professor—we have the mentality of all that specialization. And we think that to realize the highest form of intelligence—which is truth, which is God, which cannot be described—to realize that, we have to make ourselves specialists. We study, we grope, we search out; and with the mentality of the specialist, or looking to the specialist, we study ourselves, in order to develop a capacity which will help to unravel our conflicts, our miseries.

So, our problem is, if we are at all aware, whether the conflicts and the miseries and the sorrows of our daily existence can be solved by another; and if they cannot, how is it possible for us to tackle them? To understand a problem, obviously requires a certain intelligence; and that intelligence cannot be derived from, or cultivated through, specialization. It comes into being only when we are passively aware of the whole process of our consciousness, which is to be aware of ourselves without choice, without choosing what is right and what is wrong. Because, when you are passively aware, you will see that out of that passivity—which is not idleness, which is not sleep, but extreme alertness—the problem has quite a different significance; which means, there is no longer identification with the problem, and therefore there is no judgment, and hence the problem begins to reveal its content. If you are able to do that constantly, continuously, then every problem can be solved fundamentally, not superficially. And that is the diffi-

culty, because most of us are incapable of being passively aware, letting the problem tell the story without our interpreting it. We do not know how to look at a problem dispassionately—if you like to use that word. Unfortunately, we are not capable of doing that, because we want a result from the problem, we want an answer, we are looking to an end; or we try to translate the problem according to our pleasure or pain; or we have an answer already, how to deal with the problem. Therefore, we approach a problem, which is always new, with the old pattern. The challenge is always the new, but our response is always the old; and our difficulty is to meet the challenge adequately, that is, fully. The problem is always a problem of relationship, there is no other problem; and to meet the problem of relationship, with its constantly varying demands—to meet it rightly, to meet it adequately—one has to be aware, passively; and this passivity is not a question of determination, of will, of discipline; to be aware that we are *not* passive, is the beginning. To be aware that we want a particular answer to a particular problem—surely, that is the beginning: to know ourselves in relationship to the problem, and how we deal with the problem. Then, as we begin to know ourselves in relationship to the problem,—how we respond, what are our various prejudices, demands, pursuits, in meeting that problem—, this awareness will reveal the process of our own thinking, of our own inward nature; and in that there is a release.

So, life is a matter of relationship; and to understand that relationship, which is not static, there must be an awareness which is pliable, an awareness which is alertly passive, not aggressively active. And as I said, this passive awareness does not come through any form of discipline, through any practice. It is to be just aware, from moment to moment, of our thinking and feeling, not only

when we are awake ; for we will see, as we go into it deeper, that we begin to dream, that we begin to throw up all kinds of symbols which we translate as dreams. So, we open the door into the hidden, which becomes the known ; but to find the unknown, we must go beyond the door—surely, that is our difficulty. Reality is not a thing that is knowable by the mind, because the mind is the result of the known, of the past ; therefore, the mind must understand itself and its functioning, its truth, and only then is it possible for the unknown to be.

Question : All religions have insisted on some kind of self-discipline to moderate the instincts of the brute in man. Through self-discipline the saints and mystics have asserted that they have attained Godhood. Now, you seem to imply that such disciplines are a hindrance to the realization of God. I am confused. Who is right in this matter ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Surely, it is not a question of who is right in this matter. What is important is to find out the truth of the matter for ourselves—not according to a particular saint, or to a person who comes from India, or from some other place, the more exotic the better. So let us examine it together.

Now, you are caught between these two : someone says discipline, another says no discipline. Generally what happens is, you choose what is more convenient, what is more satisfying : you like the man, his looks, his personal idiosyncrasies, his personal favouritism, and all the rest of it. So, putting all that aside, let us examine this question directly and find out the truth of the matter for ourselves. Because, in this question a great deal is implied, and we have to approach it very cautiously and tentatively.

Most of us want someone in authority to tell us what to do. We look for a direction in conduct, because

our instinct is to be safe, not to suffer more. Someone is said to have realized happiness, bliss, or what you will, and we hope that he will tell us what to do to arrive there. That is what we want : we want that same happiness, that same inward quietness, joy ; and in this mad world of confusion, we want someone to tell us what to do. That is really the basic instinct with most of us ; and, according to that instinct, we pattern our action. Is God, is that highest thing, unnamable and not to be measured by words—is that come by through discipline, through following a particular pattern of action ? Please, we are thinking it out together,—don't bother about the rain for the time being. If you are interested, let us go into it. We want to arrive at a particular goal, particular end, and we think that by practice, by discipline, by suppressing or releasing, sublimating or substituting, we shall be able to find that which we are seeking.

What is implied in discipline ? Why do we discipline ourselves, if we do ? I doubt if we do—but why do we do it ? Now, seriously, why do we do it ? Can discipline and intelligence go together ? Let us enquire into it fully and see how far—if the rain allows us—we can go into this matter. Because, most people feel that we must, through some kind of discipline, subjugate, or control the brute, the ugly thing in us. And is that brute, that ugly thing, controllable through discipline ? What do we mean by discipline ? A course of action which promises a reward ; a course of action which, if pursued, will give us what we want—it may be positive or negative. A pattern of conduct which, if practised diligently, sedulously, very, very ardently, will give me in the end what I want. It may be painful, but I am willing to go through it to get that. That is, the self, which is aggressive, selfish, hypocritical, anxious, fearful—you know, all of it—that self, which is the cause of the brute in us, we want

to transform, subjugate, destroy. And how is this to be done? Is it to be done through discipline, or through an intelligent understanding of the past of the self, what the self is, how it comes into being, and so on? That is, shall we destroy the brute in man through compulsion, or through intelligence? And is intelligence a matter of discipline? Let us for the time being forget what the saints and all the rest of the people have said—and I do not know if they *have* said it; not that I am an expert on saints. But let us go into the matter for ourselves, as though we were for the first time looking at this problem; then we may have something creative at the end of it, not just quotations of what other people have said, which is all so vain and useless.

We first say that in us there is conflict, the black against the white, greed against non-greed, and so on. I am greedy, which creates pain; and to be rid of that greed, I must discipline myself. That is, I must resist any form of conflict which gives me pain, which in this case I call greed. I then say it is anti-social, it is unethical, it is not saintly, and so on, and so on—the various social-religious reasons we give for resisting it. Is greed destroyed or put away from us through compulsion? First, let us examine the process involved in suppression, in compulsion, in putting it away, resisting. What happens when you do that, when you resist greed? What is the thing that is resisting greed? That is the first question, isn't it? Why do you resist greed, and who is the entity that says, "I must be free of greed"? The entity that says, "I must be free" is also greed, is he not? Because, up to now, greed has paid him; but now it is painful, therefore he says, "I must get rid of it." The motive to get rid of it, is still a process of greed, because he is wanting to be something which he is not. Non-greed is now profitable, so I am pursuing non-greed; but the motive,

the intention, is still to be something, to be non-greedy—which is still greed, surely; which is again a negative form of the emphasis on the me.

So, we find that being greedy is painful, for various reasons which are obvious. As long as we enjoy it, as long as it pays us to be greedy, there is no problem. Society encourages us in different ways to be greedy; so do religions encourage us in different ways. As long as it is profitable, as long as it is not painful, we pursue it. But the moment it becomes painful, we want to resist it. That resistance is what we call discipline against greed; but are we free from greed through resistance, through sublimation, through suppression? Any act on the part of the me who wants to be free from greed, is still greed. Therefore, any action, any response on my part with regard to greed, is obviously not the solution.

First of all, there must be a quiet mind, an undisturbed mind, to understand anything, especially something which I do not know, something which my mind cannot fathom—which, this questioner says, is God. To understand anything, any intricate problem—of life or relationship, in fact any problem—, there must be a certain quiet depth to the mind. And is that quiet depth come by through any form of compulsion? The superficial mind may compel itself, make itself quiet; but surely, such quietness is the quietness of decay, death. It is not capable of adaptability, pliability, sensitivity. So, resistance is not the way.

Now, to see that, requires intelligence, doesn't it? To see that the mind is made dull by compulsion, is already the beginning of intelligence, isn't it?—to see that discipline is merely conformity to a pattern of action through fear. Because, that is what is implied in disciplining ourselves: we are afraid of not getting what we want. And what happens when you discipline the mind, when you discipline your being? Surely, it becomes very hard, doesn't it?;

unpliable, not quick, not adjustable. Don't you know people who have disciplined themselves—if there are such people? The result is obviously a process of decay. There is an inward conflict which is put away, hidden away; but it is there, burning.

So, we see that discipline, which is resistance, merely creates a habit, and habit obviously cannot be productive of intelligence: habit never is, practice never is. You may become very clever with your fingers by practising the piano all day, making something with your hands; but intelligence is demanded to direct the hands, and we are now inquiring into that intelligence.

You see somebody whom you consider happy or as having realized, and he does certain things; and you, wanting that happiness, imitate him. This imitation is called discipline, isn't it? We imitate in order to receive what another has; we copy in order to be happy, which you think he is. Is happiness found through discipline? And, by practising a certain rule, by practising a certain discipline, a mode of conduct, are you ever free? Surely, there must be freedom for discovery, must there not? If you would discover anything, you must be free inwardly, which is obvious. Are you free by shaping your mind in a particular way, which you call discipline? Obviously, you are not. You are merely a repetitive machine, resisting according to a certain conclusion, according to a certain mode of conduct. So, freedom cannot come through discipline. Freedom can only come into being with intelligence; and that intelligence is awakened, or you have that intelligence, the moment you see that any form of compulsion denies freedom, inwardly or outwardly.

So, the first requirement, not as a discipline, is obviously freedom; and only virtue gives that freedom. Greed is confusion; anger is confusion; bitterness is confusion. When you see that, obviously you are free

of them—not that you are going to resist them, but you see that only in freedom can you discover; and that any form of compulsion is not freedom, and therefore there is no discovery. Surely, what virtue does, is to give you freedom. The unvirtuous person is a confused person; and in confusion, how can you discover anything? How can you? So, virtue is not the end-product of a discipline, but virtue is freedom, and freedom cannot come through any action which is not virtuous, which is not true in itself. Our difficulty is that most of us have read so much, most of us have superficially followed so many disciplines—getting up every morning at a certain hour, sitting in a certain posture, trying to hold our minds in a certain way—you know, practise, practise, discipline. Because, you have been told that if you do these things you will get there; if you do these things for a number of years, you will have God at the end of it. I may put it crudely, but that is the basis of our thinking. Surely, God doesn't come so easily as all that. God is not a mere marketable thing: I do this, and you give me that.

Most of us are so conditioned by external influences, by religious doctrines, beliefs, and by our own inward demand to arrive at something, to gain something, that it is very difficult for us to think of this problem anew, without thinking in terms of discipline. So, first we must see very clearly the implications of discipline, how it narrows down the mind, limits the mind, compels the mind to a particular action, through our desire, through influence, and all the rest of it; and a conditioned mind, however 'virtuous' that conditioning, cannot possibly be free, and therefore cannot understand reality. And, God, reality, or what you will—the name doesn't matter—can come into being only when there is freedom; and there is no freedom where there is compulsion, positive or negative, through fear. There is no freedom if you are seeking an end, for

you are tied to that end. You may be free from the past, but the future holds you, and that is not freedom. And it is only in freedom that one can discover anything: a new idea, a new feeling, a new perception. And surely, any form of discipline which is based on compulsion denies that freedom, whether political or religious. And since discipline, which is conformity to an action with an end in view, is binding, the mind can never be free. It can function only within that groove, like a gramophone record.

So, through practice, through habit, through cultivation of a pattern, the mind only achieves what it has in view. Therefore, it is not free; therefore, it cannot realize that which is immeasurable. To be aware of that whole process—why you are constantly disciplining yourself to public opinion, to certain saints, you know, the whole business of conforming to opinion, whether of a saint or of the neighbor, it is all the same—to be aware of this whole conformity through practice, through subtle ways of submitting yourself, of denying, asserting, suppressing, sublimating, all implying conformity to a pattern: to be aware of that, is already the beginning of freedom, from which there is virtue. Virtue, surely, is not the cultivation of a particular idea. Non-greed, for instance, if pursued as an end is no longer virtue, is it? That is, if you are non-greedy that you are non-greedy, are you virtuous? And yet that is what we are doing through discipline.

So, discipline, conformity, practice, only gives emphasis to self-consciousness as *being* something. The mind practises non-greed, and therefore it is not free from its own consciousness as being non-greedy; therefore, it is not really non-greedy. It has merely taken on a new cloak which it calls non-greed. We can see the total process of all this: the motivation, the desire for an end, the conformity to a pattern, the desire to be secure in

pursuing a pattern—all this is merely the moving from the known to the known, always within the limits of the mind's own self-enclosing process. To see all this, to be aware of it, is the beginning of intelligence; and intelligence is neither virtuous nor non-virtuous, it cannot be fitted into a pattern as virtue or non-virtue. Intelligence brings freedom, which is not licentiousness, not disorder. Without this intelligence there can be no virtue; and virtue gives freedom, and in freedom there comes into being, reality. If you see the whole process totally, in its entirety, then you will find there is no conflict. It is because we are in conflict, and because we want to escape from that conflict, that we resort to various forms of disciplines, denials and adjustments. But, when we see what is the process of conflict, then there is no question of discipline, because then we understand from moment to moment the ways of conflict. That requires great alertness, watching yourself all the time; and the curious part of it is that, although you may not be watchful all the time, there is a recording process going on inwardly, once the intention is there—the sensitivity, the inner sensitivity, is taking the picture all the time, so that the inner will project that picture the moment you are quiet.

So, again, it is not a question of discipline. Sensitivity can never come into being through compulsion. You may compel a child to do something, put him in a corner, and he may be quiet; but inwardly he is probably seething, looking out of the window, doing something to get away. That is what we are still doing. So, the question of discipline, and who is right and who is wrong, can be solved only by yourself. Because, there is much more involved in this than what I have just said.

Also, you see, we are afraid to go wrong, because we want to be a success. Fear is at the bottom of the desire to be disciplined; but the unknown cannot be caught in the net

of discipline. On the contrary, the unknown must have freedom and not the pattern of your mind. That is why the tranquillity of the mind is essential. When the mind is conscious that it is tranquil, it is no longer tranquil; when the mind is conscious that it is non-greedy, free from greed, it recognizes itself in the new robe of non-greed, but that is not tranquillity. That is why one must also understand the problem in this question of the person who controls, and that which is controlled. Surely, they are not separate phenomena, but a joint phenomenon: the controller and the controlled are one. It is a deception to think that they are two different processes; but we will discuss this at another time.

Question: How on earth can we tame the tiger in us, and in our children, without a pattern of clear purpose and cause, sustained by vigorous practice?

KRISHNAMURTI: This implies that you know your purpose, and you know the cause too; doesn't it? Do you know the purpose? Do you know the purpose of life, the end of life, and the way to achieve it? Is that why you must have a vigorous course of action through discipline, through practice, to attain what you want? Isn't it very difficult to find out what you want, the purpose you have in view? Political parties may have a purpose, but even then they are finding it extremely difficult. But can you say, "I know the purpose"? And is there such a thing as a purpose? Please, one has to go into this very carefully—not that I am casting doubt on your purposes. We must understand it. At a certain period of our life we have a purpose: to be an engine driver, to be a street-car driver, to be a fireman, this or that; and later on we come to have a different purpose. As we grow much older again we have a different purpose. The purpose varies all the

time doesn't it?, according to our pains and pleasures. You may have a purpose to be a very rich man, a very powerful man; but surely, that is not what we are discussing here for the time being. The ambitious man may have a purpose, but he is anti-social; he can never find reality. An ambitious man is merely one who is projecting himself into the future and wanting to be something, spiritually or secularly. Such a man, obviously, is not capable of finding reality, because his mind is only concerned with success, with achieving, with becoming something. He is concerned about himself in relation to what he wants. But most of us, though we are somewhat ambitious—wanting a little more money, a little more friendship, a little more love, a little more beauty, a little more this and that, and so on, many things—, do we know what we want ultimately, not just through passing moods? Most religious people say yes, they do; they want reality, they want God, they want the highest. But to desire the highest, you must know what it is; it may be quite different from what you think, and probably it is. Therefore; you cannot want that. If you want it, it is another form of ambition, another form of security. Therefore, it is not reality that you want. So, when you ask, "How can we tame the tiger in us and in our children, without a pattern of clear purpose and cause, sustained by practice?", you mean, do you not?, how can we live in relationship with others and not be anti-social, selfish, bound by our own prejudices, and so on. To tame the tiger, we must first know what kind of an animal it is, not just give it a name and try to tame it. You must know what it is made up of. So, if you call it a tiger, it is already a tiger, because you have the image, the picture of what the tiger is, or what greed is; but if you do not name it, but look at it, then surely, it has quite a different significance. I don't know if you are following all this.

We will discuss the same problem at various times, because there is only one problem put in different ways.

So, without calling it a tiger, without saying, "I have a purpose, and to fulfill it there must be discipline", let us inquire into the whole process. Don't approach it with a conclusion; because, as I said, the problem is always new, and it requires a new mind to look at it, a mind that is not verbalizing, which is extremely difficult. Because we can only think in terms of words; our thought is word. Try to think without words, and see how difficult it is.

So, our point is, how to tame the tiger without discipline, whether in ourselves or in our children, if we are parents. To tame something, you must understand it, know it. The moment you do not know something, you are frightened of it. You say, "I feel there is a conflict in me, an opposing desire, which I call the tiger; and how is that to be tamed, to be calmed down?" Only by understanding it; and I can understand it only when I look at it. I cannot look at it if I condemn it, or give it a name, or justify it, or identify myself with it. I can understand it only when I am passively aware of what it is; and there is no passive awareness as long as I am condemning it. So, my problem is to understand it, not to call the thing by a name. I must understand why I condemn. Because it is so much easier, isn't it?, to condemn something first. It is one of the ways to get rid of it, push it away—call it a German, a Japanese, a Hindu, a Christian, a Communist, or God knows what else, and push it away. And we think we have understood it by giving it a name. So the name, the naming, prevents understanding. That is one fact.

Also, what prevents understanding, is judging; because we look at a thing already with a bias, with a prejudice, with a want, with a demand. We look at a thing because we want a result from it. We have a purpose,

we want to tame it, we want to control it in order that it may be something else. The moment you see that, surely, your mind is passively quiet, watching the thing. It is no longer naming the tiger as the tiger; it has no name, and therefore your relationship to it is direct, not through words. It is because we have no relationship to it directly, that there is fear. The moment you are related to something, experience something directly, immediately, fully, there is no fear, is there? So, you have removed the cause of fear, and therefore you are able to understand it, and hence you are able to resolve it. That which you have understood, is resolved; that which is not understood, continues to be a problem. This is a fact. And our difficulty is to see always what is, without interpretation; because the function of the mind is to communicate, to store up, to translate, according to its fancies and desires—not to understand. To understand, none of these things must take place. To understand, there must be quiet; and a mind that is occupied with judging, with condemning, with translating, is not a quiet mind.

Question: I cannot control my thoughts. Must I control them? Does this not imply choice, and how can I trust my judgment, unless I have a standard based on the teachings of the Great Ones?

KRISHNAMURTI: Now, to understand how to control your thoughts, you must first know what your thoughts are, must you not? That is the problem, isn't it? You say, "I cannot control my thoughts." To find out why you cannot control thoughts, you must be aware of what thinking is, must you not? What is thinking? And who is the thinker? Surely, that is the question, isn't it? Who is the thinker, and are the thoughts different from the thinker? Then the problem arises for the

thinker to control his thoughts. If the thinker and the thought are one, and not separate processes, then the question of the thinker controlling thought does not arise. So, you have to find out first, if the thinker is separate from his thought. Is there a thinker without thought? If you have no thought, is there a thinker? So, the thinker is non-existent apart from thought; we have only thought. The thoughts have created the thinker; and the thinker, to make himself permanent, secure, and all the rest of it, then says, "I am apart from the thoughts which must be controlled." So, until you solve this problem, until you have a direct experience of this problem—whether the thinker is separate from thought—the question of control will exist; but the moment you see, experience directly, that the thinker is the thought, then you have quite a different problem.

Then, the next question is: When you control thoughts, one set of thoughts as opposed to another, there is choice. You choose certain thoughts and wish to concentrate on those, and not on others; why? We are concerned with thinking, not with a particular set of thoughts. If you say, "I prefer this thought to that," then choice arises; but *why* do you prefer? And what is the thing that prefers? Sirs, this is not very complicated, this is not metaphysics or big words; just look at it, and you will see the difficulty. First, we must see the difficulty, before we can solve it. When you choose, who is it that chooses? And, if the chooser has a standard according to the teachings of the Great Ones, as stated in the question, then the chooser becomes very important, doesn't he? Because, if he chooses according to the standards of the Teachers, then he is cultivating, emphasizing the chooser, is he not?

Sir, let us put the problem a little more simply. My thoughts wander all over the place. I want to think quietly upon a particular subject, but

my thoughts go off in different directions. Now, why do they go off? Because my thoughts are also interested in other things, not only in that particular thing. That is a fact, isn't it?, otherwise they would not wander off. My mind isn't wandering off now, because I am interested in what I am talking about. There is no question of effort, there is no question of discipline, there is no question of controlling; nothing else interests me.

So, we must find out the significance of each interest, and not exclude other interests for the sake of one. If I can find out the significance of each interest, and its value, then my mind won't wander, will it? But it *will* wander if I resist the various interests and try to concentrate on the one. So, I say, "All right, let it wander." I look at all the interests that arise, one after the other, so that my mind is made pliable by the whole sweep of interest, and not narrowed down by one specific interest. Then what happens? I see that my mind is merely a bundle of interests, opposing other interests; it chooses to emphasize one interest, and exclude all other interests.

When the mind recognizes that it is a bundle of interests, then every interest has significance; therefore, there is no excluding; therefore, there is no question of choosing; therefore, the mind begins to understand the whole, total process of itself. But if you have a standard of choice in accordance with the Great Ones, by which you are trying to live—then what happens? You emphasize the thinker, the chooser, don't you? Obviously. Now, who is the chooser, apart from the choice? As I said, there is no thinker apart from the thought; and it is a trick of the mind to separate itself into the thinker and the thought. When we really understand it, see the real significance of it, experience it, —not verbally assert it, for then it has no meaning—, then we will see that there is complete transformation in us. Then, we

will never put this question. The standard of the Great Teachers, the teachings of the Great Ones, or whatever else—you are the result of all that, aren't you? You are the result of the whole, total process of man—not just of America but of the world. And you are not separate from the standard. You *are* the standard, and it is a trick of the mind ever to separate itself.

Because you see that everything is transient, impermanent, you want to feel that at least there is the permanency of the *me*. You say, "I am different." In that separate action of the mind, there is conflict; it creates for itself an isolation, and then says, "I am different from my thought. I must control my thought. How am I to control it?" Such a question is not a valid question. If you think it out, you will see that you are a bundle of interests, a bundle of thoughts; and to choose one thought and discard the others, to choose one interest and resist another, is still to play the trick of separating yourself from the thought. Whereas, if you recognize that the mind *is* interest, the mind is thought—that there is not a thinker *and* a thought—, then you will approach this problem entirely anew. Then you will see that there is no conflict between the thinker and the thought; then every interest has significance and is worked out, thought out, fully, completely. Then there is no question of a central interest from which there is distraction.

July 30, 1949

VI

This morning I would like to discuss what is true religion, but in order to find out what it is, we must first examine our life, and not superimpose on it something we think is spiritual, romantic, sentimental. So, let us examine our life to find out what we mean by religion, and

if there is a way of discovering what is true religion.

First of all, for most of us, life is full of conflict; we are in pain, we are in sorrow. Our life is boring, empty; and there is always death, and there are the innumerable explanations. Life is mostly a constant repetition of habit. Taken as a whole, it is painful and tiresome, wearisome and sorrowful, and that is the lot of most of us. To escape from that, we turn to beliefs, to rituals, to knowledge, to amusements, to politics, to activity: we welcome any form of escape from our daily, tiresome, boring routine. These escapes, whether political or religious, must, by their very nature, likewise become tiresome, routine, habitual. We move from sensation to sensation; and ultimately, all sensation must become boring, tiresome. As our life is mostly a response from our physical centers, and as it causes disturbance, pain, we try to escape into what we call religion, into spiritual realms.

Now, as long as we are seeking sensation in any form, it must eventually lead to boredom; because one is surfeited, one gets tired of it—which is, again, an obvious fact. The more sensations you have, the more tiresome they become at the end, the more boring, the more habitual. And is religion a matter of sensation?—religion being the search for reality, and the discovery, the understanding, or the experiencing of the highest. Is that a matter of sensation, a matter of sentiment, a matter of appeal? To most of us, religion is a set of beliefs, dogmas, rituals, a constant repetition of organized formulae, and so on. If you examine these things you will see that they also are the outcome of the desire for sensation. You go to churches, temples, or to mosques, and you repeat certain phrases, you indulge in certain ceremonies. They are all stimulations, they give you a certain kind of sensation; and you are satisfied with that sensation, giving it a high-

sounding name, but it is essentially sensation. You are caught in sensation, you like the impressions, the feeling of being good, the repetition of certain prayers, and so on. But, if one goes into it deeply and intelligently, one finds that basically they are only sensation; and although they may vary in expression and give you a feeling of newness, they are essentially sensation, and therefore ultimately boring, tiresome, habit-forming.

So, obviously, religion is not ceremony. Religion is not dogma. Religion is not the continuation of certain tenets or beliefs, inculcated from childhood. Whether you believe in God, or don't believe in God, does not make you a religious person. Belief does not make you a religious person, surely. The man who drops an atomic bomb and destroys in a few minutes thousands upon thousands of people, may believe in God; and the person who leads a dull life and also believes in God, or the person who does not believe in God,—surely, they are not religious. Belief or non-belief has nothing to do with the search for reality, or with the discovery and the experiencing of that reality, which is religion. It is the experiencing of reality that is religion; and it does not lie through any organized belief, through any church, through any knowledge, either eastern or western. Religion is the capacity of experiencing directly that which is immeasurable, that which cannot be put into words; but that cannot be experienced, so long as we are escaping from life, from life which we have made so dull, so empty, so much a matter of routine. Life, which is relationship, has become a matter of routine, because inwardly there is no creative intensity, because inwardly we are poor, and therefore outwardly we try to fill that emptiness with belief, with amusement, with knowledge, with various forms of excitement.

That emptiness, that inward poverty, can come to an end only when

we cease to escape; and we cease to escape when we are no longer seeking sensation. Then we are able to face that emptiness. That emptiness is not different from us: we *are* that emptiness. As we were discussing yesterday, thought is not different from the thinker. The emptiness is not different from the observer who feels that emptiness. The observer and the observed are a joint phenomenon; and when you experience that directly, then you will find that the thing which you have dreaded as emptiness—which makes you seek escape into various forms of sensation, including religion—ceases, and you are able to face it and *be* it. Because we have not understood the significance of escapes, how escapes have come into being; because we have not examined them, gone into them fully, these escapes have become much more significant, much more meaningful, than that which is. The *escapes* have conditioned us; and because we have escaped, we are not creative in ourselves. There is creativeness in us when we are experiencing reality constantly, but not continuously—because there is a difference between continuity, and experiencing from moment to moment. That which continues, decays. That which is being experienced from moment to moment, has no death, no decay. If we can experience something from moment to moment, it has a vitality, life; if we can meet life anew all the time, then in that there is creativeness. But to have an experience which you desire to continue—in that there is decay.

So many people have had some kind of pleasurable experience, and they want that experience to continue. So they go back to it, they revive it, they look to it, they long for it, they are miserable because it doesn't continue; and therefore there is a constant decaying process taking place. Whereas, if there is experiencing from moment to moment, there is a renewal. It is that renewal that is creative; and you cannot have

that renewal, that creative *élan*, if your mind is occupied with escapes and caught in those things that we have taken for granted. That is why we have to re-examine all of the values that we have gathered; and one of the main values in our life is religion, which is so organized. We belong to one or other of the various organized religions, groups, sects, or societies, because it gives us a certain sense of security. To be identified with the largest organization, or with the smallest, or the most exclusive, gives us satisfaction. It is only when we are capable of re-examining all these influences which are conditioning us, which help us to escape from our own boredom, from our own emptiness, from our own lack of creative responsibility and creative joy; it is only when we have examined them and come back, having put them aside and faced that which is—only then, surely, are we capable of really going into the whole problem of what is truth. Because, in doing that, there is a possibility of self-knowledge. The whole process is self-knowledge; and it is only when there is the knowledge of this process that there is a possibility of thinking, feeling, acting rightly. We cannot *practise* right thinking in order to be free from the process of thought; to be free, one must know oneself. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom; and without self-knowledge, there can be no wisdom. There can be knowledge, sensation; but sensation is wearisome, boring, whereas that wisdom which is eternal can never decay, can never come to an end.

Question: I find that, by effort, I can concentrate. I can suppress or put aside thoughts that come uninvited. I do not find that suppression is a hindrance to my well-being. Of course, I dream; but I can interpret the dreams and resolve the conflict. A friend tells me that I am

becoming smug, do you think he can be right? (Laughter).

KRISHNAMURTI: Now, let us first understand what we mean by effort, and what we mean by concentration. Do we understand anything through effort?—effort being exertion of will, action of will, which is desire. By the action of will to understand, that is, by deliberately making an effort, do we understand? Or is understanding something entirely different, which comes, not through effort, but through passive alertness?—which is not the action of will. When do you understand? Have you ever examined it? When do you understand? Not when you are battling with something, with some object which you *want* to understand. Surely, there is no understanding when you are constantly probing, questioning, tearing to pieces, analyzing—in that there is no understanding. It is only when the mind is passively aware and alert, that is, immediately in contact with or experiencing that thing, that there is a possibility of understanding it, surely. Please, to some of you what I am saying may be outrageous, or new; but experiment with it, don't reject it right off.

When we are in battle with each other, in conflict with each other, is there an understanding? It is only when you and I sit down quietly, discuss, try to find out, that there is a possibility of understanding. So, effort is obviously detrimental to understanding. That is, you may have a problem, you may go into it, worry over it, tear it to pieces, look at it from different sides. In that process, there is no understanding. It is only when the mind leaves the problem alone, lets it drop, only when the mind becomes quiet in relation to the problem, that there is understanding of it. But whether conflict, analysis, is a necessary step in understanding, is quite a different question, which we won't go into now.

Then there is concentration. What do you mean by concentration? Fixing the mind on a particular object to the exclusion of other interests, isn't it? That is what we mean by concentration: to fix the mind on an idea, an image, an interest, and exclude all other interests—which is a form of suppression. And the questioner says that it does not do him any harm; though he has dreams, he can easily interpret and put them aside.

Now, what does such concentration do? What does exclusion do? What is the result of exclusion? Obviously, conflict, isn't it? I may have the capacity to concentrate on one thing and exclude others; but the others are still there, wanting to come in. Therefore, there is a conflict going on—whether I am conscious of it or not, is not the point; but there is conflict. And, as long as that conflict continues, there is no understanding, surely. I may be able to concentrate; but as long as there is conflict within me between that which attracts my attention, and that which I am excluding—as long as there is conflict in me, it must have a wrong effect. Because, suppression of any kind must psychologically tear, making me either physically ill, or mentally unbalanced. What is suppressed must eventually come out, and one way is through dreams. The questioner says he can interpret his dreams and thereby get rid of them. Apparently he feels satisfied with this, and he wants to know if he is smug. As long as you are satisfied with the result, obviously you must be smug. Most of us hate to be in discontent; and being discontented inwardly, as most of us are, we find ways and means to cover up that discontent, that burning thing. And one of the escapes, one of the best ways of covering up this discontent, is to learn concentration, so that you can successfully conceal your discontent. Then you can fix your mind on an interest and go after it, and feel that you have at last conquered, canalized

your discontent. But, surely, discontent cannot be canalized by the mind, because the mind in its very nature is discontent. That is why mere concentration, which is exclusion, does not bring about freedom from discontent—which is to understand it. Concentration, which is a process of exclusion, does not bring understanding; but, as I was explaining yesterday, if you go after each interest as each interest arises, if you go into it, examine it, understand it—then there is a possibility of coming to a different kind of attention which is not exclusion. We will discuss this presently, in another question.

Question: How can we ever start anew, as you constantly suggest, if the cup of our experience is permanently sullied? How can we really forget that which we are? Will you please explain what is meant by self-forgetfulness. How can I throw away the cup, which I am?

KRISHNAMURTI: Renewal is possible only if there is no continuity. That which continues has no possibility of renewal; that which ends has a possibility of renewal. That which dies has a possibility of being reborn. And, when you say that you are sullied *permanently*, which is but a verbal assertion, then, surely, you are merely continuing. When you say you are permanently sullied, is that a fact? And, how is it possible to forget what we are? We cannot forget what we are; but we can examine what we are, we can be aware, without any justification or identification, of what we are. Be aware of it, and you will see there comes a transformation. But the difficulty is to be passively aware, without condemnation; only then is there an ending. But if you merely identify, condemn, then you give continuity to that particular character; and that which continues has no reality, has no renewal.

"Will you please explain what is meant by self-forgetfulness." Don't you know? Don't you know those moments when one is happy, when one is peaceful, when one is very quiet? Does not a state come into being in which no effort is involved, in which there is a cessation of the thought process as myself? As long as there is self-consciousness as the me, there can be no forgetfulness of the activities of the me. Any action of the will, of desire, obviously must cultivate and strengthen the self; and the self is the bundle of memories, characteristics, idiosyncrasies, which creates conflict. As long as there is conflict, there must be self-consciousness; and if there is conflict, there can never be peace, however deeply concealed, at whatever level that conflict may be.

"How can I throw away the cup, which I am?" Why do you want to throw away the cup? You cannot, surely, throw it away. All that you can do is to know it—all the intricacies, the subtleties, the extraordinary depth of oneself. When you know something, you are free of it; but merely to reject it, to suppress it, to sublimate it, to translate it into different verbal expressions, is surely not understanding; and only in understanding something, is there freedom from it. You cannot understand something if there is continued identity with it. So there is renewal only when there is no continuity. But most of our intentions, purposes, thoughts, are to continue. In name, in property, in virtue, in everything we are struggling to establish a permanency, and therefore a continuity; and in that there is no renewal, there is no creativeness. Surely, creativeness comes into being only from moment to moment.

personal idiosyncrasies of their proponents?

KRISHNAMURTI: This is really an important question, and if I may suggest, let us go into it together. Because, meditation has a great deal of significance. It may be the door to real self-knowledge, and it may open the door to reality; and in opening the door and experiencing directly, there is a possibility of understanding life, which is relationship. Meditation, the right kind of meditation, is essential. So, let us find out what is the right kind of meditation; and to find out what is right, we must approach it negatively. Merely to say this or that is right meditation will give you only a pattern, which you will adopt, practise; and that will not be right meditation. So, as I am talking about it, please follow me closely and experience it as we go along together. Because, there are different types of meditation. I do not know if any of you have practised them, or have indulged in them—gone away by yourself in a locked room, sat in a dark corner, and so on and so on. So, let us examine the whole process of what we call meditation.

First of all, let us take the meditation in which discipline is involved. Any form of discipline only strengthens the self; and, the self is a source of contention, conflict. That is, if we discipline ourselves to be something, as so many people do—"this month I am going to be kind, I am going to practise kindness, and so on,"—such discipline, such practice, is bound to strengthen the me. You may be outwardly kind; but, surely, a man who practises kindness and is conscious of his kindness, is not kind. So, that practice, which people also call meditation, is obviously not the right kind; because, (as we discussed yesterday,) if you practise something, in that the mind is caught, and so there is no freedom. But, most of

Question: Will you please carefully explain what is true meditation. There are so many systems of meditation. Are they really varied basically, or are the variations due to the

us desire a result—that is, we hope to be kind at the end of the month, or at the end of a certain period, because teachers have said that ultimately we must be kind in order to find God. Since our desire is to find God as the ultimate source of our security and happiness, we buy God through kindness—which is obviously the strengthening of the me and the mine, a self-enclosing process; and anything that encloses, any action that is binding, can never give freedom. Surely, that is obvious. Perhaps we can discuss it another time if it is not clear.

Then, there is this whole process of concentration, which is also called meditation. You sit crossed-legged, because that is the fashion from India, or in a chair, in a dark room, in front of a picture or an image, and you try to concentrate on a word, on a phrase, or a mental image, and exclude all other thoughts. I am sure many of you have done this. But the other thoughts keep pouring in, and you push them out; and you keep on with the struggle till you are able to concentrate on one thought to the exclusion of everything else. Then you feel gratified: at last you have learned to fix your mind on a point, which you think is essential. Again, through exclusion, do you find anything? Through exclusion, suppression, denial, can the mind be quiet? Because, as I said, there can be understanding only when the mind is really quiet, not suppressed, not so concentrated on one idea that it becomes exclusive—whether the idea is of a (Master), or of some virtue, or what you will. Through concentration, the mind can never be quiet. Superficially, at the higher levels of consciousness, you may enforce stillness, make your body perfectly still, your mind very quiet; but that, surely, is not the quietness of your whole being. So, again, that is not meditation; that is merely compulsion: when the engine wants to run at full speed, you hold it back, you put on the brake. Whereas, if you

are able to examine every interest, every thought that comes into your mind, go into it fully, completely, think every thought out—then there will be no wandering of the mind, because the mind has found the value of each thought, therefore it is no longer attracted, which means there is no distraction. A mind that is capable of being distracted, and which resists distraction, is not capable of meditation. Because, what is distraction? I hope you are experimenting with what I am saying, experiencing as I am talking, to find out the truth of this matter. It is the truth that liberates, not my words or your opinions.

We call distraction any movement away from that in which we think we should be interested. So you choose a particular interest, a so-called noble interest, and fix your mind on it; but any movement away from it, is a distraction, so you resist distraction. But why do you choose that one particular interest? Obviously, because it is gratifying, because it gives you a sense of security, a sense of fullness, a sense of otherness. So you say, 'I must fix my mind on that', and any movement away from it, is a distraction. You spend your life in battle against distractions, and fix your mind on something else. Whereas, if you examine every distraction, and not merely fix your mind on a particular attraction, then you will see that the mind is no longer capable of being distracted, because it has understood the distractions as well as the attractions, and therefore the mind is capable of extraordinary, extensive awareness without exclusion.

So, concentration is not meditation, and disciplining is not meditation.

Then, there are prayers, this whole problem of praying and receiving. That also is called meditation. What do we mean by praying? The gross form is supplication, and there are subtle forms at different levels of prayer. The gross form we all know. I am in trouble, I am in misery, physi-

cally or psychologically, and I want some help. So I beg, I supplicate; and, obviously, there is an answer. If there were no answer, people would not pray. Millions pray. You pray only when you are in trouble, not when you are happy, not when there is that extraordinary sense of otherness.

Now, what happens when you pray? You have a formula, haven't you? By repetition of a formula, the superficial mind becomes quiet, doesn't it? Try it, and you will see. By repeating certain phrases or words, gradually you will see your being becomes quiet. That is, your superficial consciousness is calm; and then, in that state, you are able to receive, aren't you?, the intimations of something else. So, through calming the mind by a repetitive word, by so-called prayers, you may receive hints and intimations not only from the sub-conscious, but from anything around you; but, surely, that is not meditation. Because, what you receive must be gratifying, otherwise you would reject it. So when you pray and thereby quiet the mind, your desire is to solve a particular problem, or a confusion, or something which gives you pain. Therefore, you are seeking an answer which will be gratifying. And when you see this, you say, 'I must not seek gratification, I will be open to something which is painful'. The mind is so capable of playing tricks upon itself, that one must be aware of the whole content of this question of prayer. One has learned a trick, how to quiet the mind so that it can receive certain answers, pleasurable or not pleasurable. But that is not meditation, is it?

Then, there is this question of devotion to somebody, pouring out your love to God, to an image, to some saint, to some (Master). Is that meditation? Why do you pour out your love to God, to that which you cannot possibly know? Why are we so attracted to the unknown, and give our lives, our being, to it? This

whole question of devotion, does it not indicate that, being miserable in our own lives, having no vital relationship with other human beings, we try to project ourselves into something, into the unknown, and worship the unknown? You know, people who are devoted to somebody, to some God, to some image, to some Master, are generally cruel, obstinate. They are intolerant of others, they are willing to destroy others, because they have so identified themselves with that image, with that Master, with that experience. So, again, the outpouring of devotion to an object, self-created or created by another, is surely not meditation. *their God*

So, what is meditation? If none of these things are meditation—discipline, concentration, prayer, devotion—, then what is meditation? Those are the forms we know, with which we are familiar. But, to find out that, with which we are *not* familiar, we have first to be free of those things with which we are familiar, haven't we? If they are not true, then they must be set aside. Then only, are you capable of finding out what is right meditation. If we have been accustomed to false values, those false values must cease, must they not?, to find out the new value—not because I say so, but because you think it out, feel it out for yourself. And when they have gone, what have you left? What is the residue of your examination of these things? Do they not reveal the process of your own thinking? If you have indulged in these things, and you see that they are false, you find out *why* you have indulged in them; and therefore, the very examination of all this reveals the way of your own thinking. So, the examination of these things is the beginning of self-knowledge, is it not?

So, meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge, you may sit in a corner, meditate on (the Masters), develop virtues *a Saint*—they are all illusions, and they have no meaning for the person who really

wants to discover what is right meditation. Because, without self-knowledge, you yourself project an image which you call the Master, and that becomes your object of devotion for which you are willing to sacrifice, to build, to destroy. Therefore, as I have explained, there is a possibility of self-knowledge, only as we examine our relationship to these things, which reveals the process of our own thinking; and therefore there is a clarity in our whole being; and this is the beginning of understanding, of self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge, there can be no meditation; and without meditation, there can be no self-knowledge. Shutting yourself up in a corner, sitting in front of a picture, developing virtues month by month—a different virtue each month, green, purple, white, and all the rest of it—going to churches, performing ceremonies: none of those things are meditation, or real spiritual life. Spiritual life arises in the understanding of relationship, which is the beginning of self-knowledge.

Now, when you have gone through that and have abandoned all those processes, which only reveal the self and its activity, then there is a possibility that the mind can be not only superficially quiet, but inwardly quiet; for then there is a cessation of all demands. There is no pursuit of sensation; there is no sense of becoming, myself becoming something, in the future, or tomorrow. (The Master,) the initiate, the pupil, the Buddha, you know, climbing the ladder of success, becoming something—all that has stopped, because all that implies the process of becoming. There is a cessation of becoming only when there is the understanding of what is; and the understanding of what is, comes through self-knowledge, which reveals exactly what one is. And when there is the cessation of all desire, which can only come through self-knowledge, the mind is quiet.

The cessation of desire cannot come through compulsion, through prayer, through devotion, through concentration. All these merely emphasize the conflict of desire in the opposites. But when there is the cessation of all these, then the mind is really still—not only superficially, on the higher levels, but inwardly, deeply. Then only, is it possible for it to receive that which is immeasurable. The understanding of all this is meditation, not just one part of it. Because, if we do not know how to meditate, we will not know how to act. Action, after all, is self-knowledge, in relationship; and merely to shut yourself in a sacred room with incense burning, reading about other people's meditations and their significance is utterly useless, it has no meaning. It is a marvellous escape. But to be aware of all this human activity, which is ourselves—the desire to attain, the desire to conquer, the desire to have certain virtues, all emphasizing the me as important in the now or in the future, this becoming of the me—, to be aware of all that, in its totality, is the beginning of self-knowledge and the beginning of meditation. Then you will see, if you are really aware, that there comes a marvelous transformation, which is not a verbal expression, which is not verbalization, mere repetition, sensation. But actually, really, vigorously, there takes place a thing which cannot be named, which cannot be termed. And that is not the gift of the few, it is not the gift of the Masters: self-knowledge is possible for everybody, if you are willing to experiment, try. You don't have to join any society, read any book, (or be at the feet of any Master) for self-knowledge liberates you from all that (absurdity, the stupidities of human invention. And then only, through self-knowledge and right meditation, there is freedom. In that freedom there comes reality; but you cannot have reality through mental processes. It must come to you; and it can only come

to you when there is freedom from desire.

July 31, 1949

VII

For the last three week-ends, we have been discussing, in different days, the problem of self-knowledge and how it is necessary to understand the process of our own thinking and feeling. Without understanding oneself clearly and definitely, it is not possible to think rightly. But, unfortunately, it seems to have left an impression among many, or at least among those who are committed to a particular form of prejudice which they call thinking, that this approach is individualistic and utterly selfish and self-centered, and does not lead to reality; that there are many paths to reality, and that this particular approach of self-knowledge must invariably lead to inaction, to self-centeredness and individual ruggedness.

Now, if you go into it very clearly and thoroughly, with intelligence, you see that to truth there can be no path; there is no path, as yours and mine: the path of service, the path of knowledge, the path of devotion, and the other innumerable paths that philosophers have invented, depending on their particular idiosyncrasies and neurological responses. Now, if one can think clearly about this matter, without prejudice—I mean by prejudice, being committed to a particular action of thought or belief, and being utterly unaware that one particular form of thinking, one particular approach, must inevitably limit, whether it is the path of knowledge, the path of devotion, or the path of action—, one will see that any particular path must invariably limit, and therefore cannot lead to reality. Because, a path of action, or a path of knowledge, or a

path of devotion, in itself, is not sufficient, surely. A man of learning, however erudite, however encyclopaedic his knowledge may be, if he has no love, surely his knowledge is worthless; it is merely book-learning. A man of belief, as we discussed, must inevitably shape his life according to the dogma, the tenet, that he holds, and therefore his experience must be limited; because, one experiences according to one's beliefs, and such experience can never be liberating. On the contrary, it is binding. And, as we said, only in freedom can we discover anything new, anything fundamental.

So, the difficulty with the majority of us is, it seems to me, that we are committed to so many beliefs, dogmas, that they prevent us from looking afresh at anything new; and therefore—as reality, God, or what you will, must be something unimaginable, something immeasurable—the mind cannot possibly understand. Do what it will, it *cannot* go beyond itself. It can create reality in its own image; but it will not be reality. It will be only its own self-projection. And, therefore, to understand reality, or for that immensity to come into being, one must understand the process of one's own thinking. That is, surely, the obvious approach. It is not my approach or your approach: it is the only intelligent approach. And intelligence is not yours or mine: it is quite beyond all countries and all paths, beyond all religious, social, or political activity. It does not belong to any particular society or group. Intelligence comes into being only with the understanding of oneself—which does not mean, surely, emphasis on the individual. On the contrary. It is the insistence on a path or a belief, on any ideology, that emphasizes the individual, though that individual may belong to a large group, be identified with a large group. Mere identification with the collective does not mean that one is free from the limited individuality.

So, it is important, surely, to understand, that reality or God or what you will, is not to be found through any particular path. The Hindus have very cleverly divided human beings into various types, and established paths for them. And, surely, any path—which is the emphasis of individuality, and not the freedom from individuality—cannot lead to reality, because it cultivates a particularity; it is not the freedom from selfishness, from prejudice, which is so essential to understanding. Therefore, we have been discussing, for the last three weeks, the importance of self-knowledge—which is not emphasis on individuality, on the personal, at all. If I do not know myself, I have no basis for thinking; whatever I think is merely an imposition, an external acceptance of various influences, circumstantial enforcement. Surely, that is not thinking. Because I have been brought up in a particular society, of the left or of the right, and have accepted a certain ideology from childhood, it does not mean that I am capable of thinking of life anew. I merely function in that particular pattern, and reject anything else that is given to me. Whereas, to think rightly, truly, profoundly, one has to begin by questioning the whole environmental process, and the influence of the environment from the outside, of which I am a part. Without understanding that process, in all its subtlety, surely I have no basis for thinking.

So, it is absolutely essential, is it not?, that the process of the mind be thoroughly understood—not only the conscious, the upper level, the superficial level of the mind, but the deeper levels of the mind. Because, it is comparatively easy to understand the superficial mind; to watch its reactions, its responses, to see how instinctively it acts and thinks. But that is only the beginning, is it not? It is much more difficult to go more profoundly, more deeply, into the whole process of our thinking; and,

without knowing the whole process, the total process, then what you believe, what you don't believe, what you think, whether you believe in Masters or don't believe in Masters, whether you believe in God or don't—all that is really irrelevant, is almost immature.

Now, it is comparatively easy, in listening to another, to see in that relationship a mirror in which we discover ourselves; but our problem is also to go into it much more profoundly, and that is where our difficulty lies. Perhaps a few of us can throw off our superficial prejudices, beliefs, give up a few societies and join new organizations—the many things that one does; but surely it is much more important; isn't it?, to go below, to the deeper layers of consciousness, and find out exactly what is taking place: what are our commitments of which we are so unconscious, our beliefs, our fears of which we are utterly unaware, but which actually guide and shape our action. Because, the inner always overcomes the outer. You may cunningly sift the outer, but the inner eventually breaks down the outer. In any Utopian society, you may build a social order very carefully and very cunningly; but without this psychological understanding of man's whole make-up, the outer is always smashed.

How is it possible, then, to go into the deeper layers of consciousness? Because, that is where most of our idiosyncrasies, most of our fears that create beliefs, most of our desires, ambitions, lie hidden. How is it possible to open them up, to expose and understand them? If we can have the capacity to delve into that and really experience these things, not merely verbally, then it is possible to be free of them, isn't it?

Take, for example, anger. Is it possible to experience anger and be aware of anger without giving it a name? I do not know if you have ever tried, if you have ever experienced a state which is not named.

If we have an experience, we give it a term, and we term it in order to explore it, or to communicate it, or to strengthen it. But we never experience a thing without naming it. That is extremely difficult, isn't it?, for most of us. Verbalization comes almost before experience. But if we do not name an experience, then perhaps it is possible to go into the deeper layers of consciousness. And that is why we must be aware, even at the superficial level, of our prejudices, fears, ambitions; of our fixations in a particular groove, whether we are young or old, whether of the left or of the right. Therefore, there *must* be a certain discontent—which is obviously often denied to the older, because they don't want to be discontented. They are fixed, they are going to disappear slowly; therefore they establish, crystallize in a particular groove, and deny everything new. But, surely, discontent is necessary—not the discontent that is easily canalized into a particular groove, a particular action, a particular belief, but discontent that is never satisfied. Because, most of our discontent arises from dissatisfaction. The moment we have found satisfaction, dissatisfaction ceases, discontent comes to an end. So most of our discontent is really a search for satisfaction. Whereas, discontent, surely, is a state in which there is no search for satisfaction. The moment I am easily satisfied, the problem is over. If I accept the left ideology, or the right, or some particular belief, my dissatisfaction is easily gratified. But discontent is of another quality, surely. Contentment is that state in which what is, is understood. To understand what is, there must be no prejudice. To see things as they are, requires enormous alertness of mind. But if we are easily satisfied, that alertness is dulled, made blunt.

So, our problem is, in all this—which is a question of relationship—to be aware of ourselves in action, in what we are thinking, in what we are saying; so that, in relationship,

we discover ourselves, we see ourselves as we are. But to superimpose our beliefs on what we are, surely does not help to bring about understanding of what we are. Therefore, it is necessary to be free of this imposition—political, sociological, or religious—, which can only be revealed in relationship. And as long as that relationship is not understood, there must be conflict, between two or between many. For the ending of that conflict, there must be self-knowledge; and when the mind is quiet—not *made* quiet—, then only is it possible to understand reality.

Many questions have been given to me, and naturally they cannot all be answered; but I will try to answer as many representative questions as possible, though sometimes the questions may be put in different words, with a change of terms. So, I hope you will not mind.

Question: If I am perfectly honest, I have to admit that I resent, and at times, hate almost everybody. It makes my life very unhappy and painful. I understand intellectually that I am this resentment, this hatred; but I cannot cope with it. Can you show me a way?

KRISHNAMURTI: Now, what do we mean by 'intellectually'? When we say that we understand something intellectually, what do we mean by that? Is there such a thing as intellectual understanding? Or is it that the mind merely understands the words, because that is our only way of communicating with each other? Do we understand anything verbally? That is the first thing we have to be clear about: whether so-called intellectual understanding is not an impediment to understanding. Surely, understanding is integral, not divided, not partial. Either I understand something, or I don't. To say to oneself, 'I understand something intellectually', is surely a barrier to

understanding. It is a partial process, and therefore, no understanding at all.

Now, the question is this : How am I, who am resentful, hateful, how am I, to be free of, or cope with that problem? How do we cope with a problem? What is a problem? Surely, a problem is something which is disturbing.

Please, may I suggest something? Just follow what I am saying. Don't try to *solve* your problem of resentment and hate—just follow it. Although it is difficult to go into this so that at the end you are free of it, let us see if we can do it now. It will be rather an interesting experiment to try together.

I am resentful, I am hateful; I hate people, and it causes pain. And I am aware of it. What am I to do? It is a very disturbing factor in my life. What am I to do, how am I to be really free of it—not just momentarily slough it off, but fundamentally be free of it? How am I to do it?

Now, it is a problem to me because it disturbs me. If it were not a disturbing thing, it would not be a problem to me, would it? Because it causes pain, disturbance, anxiety, because I think it is ugly, I want to get rid of it. Therefore, the thing that I am objecting to is the disturbance, isn't it? I give it different names at different times, in different moods; I call it one day this, and one day something else. But the desire is, basically, not to be disturbed. Isn't that it? Because pleasure is not disturbing, I accept it. I don't want to be free from pleasure, because there is no disturbance—at least, for the time being. But hate, resentment, are very disturbing factors in my life, and I want to get rid of them.

So, my concern is not to be disturbed, and I am trying to find a way in which I shall never be disturbed. And why should I *not* be disturbed? I *must* be disturbed, to find out, must I not? I must go through tremendous upheavals,

turmoil, anxiety, to find out, must I not? Because, if I am not disturbed, I shall go to sleep; and perhaps that is what most of us do want—to be pacified, to be put to sleep, to get away from any disturbance, to find isolation, seclusion, security. So, if I do not mind being disturbed—really, not just superficially; if I don't mind being disturbed, because I want to find out—, then my attitude toward hate, toward resentment, undergoes a change, doesn't it? If I do not mind being disturbed, then the name is not important, is it? The word 'hate' is not important, is it? Or 'resentment' against people is not important, is it? Because, then I am directly experiencing the state which I call resentment without verbalizing that experience. I do not know if I am explaining myself.

That is, anger is a very disturbing quality, as hate and resentment are; and very few of us experience anger directly, without verbalizing it. If we do not verbalize it, if we do not call it anger, surely there is a different experience, is there not? Because we term it, we reduce a new experience or fix it in the terms of the old. Whereas, if we do not name it, then there is an experience which is directly understood; and this understanding brings about a transformation in that experiencing. Am I making myself clear? Please, it is not simple.

Take, for example, meanness. Most of us, if we are mean, are unaware of it—mean about money matters, mean about forgiving people, you know, just being mean. I am sure we are familiar with that. Now, being aware of it, how are we going to be free from that quality?—not to become generous, that is not the important point. To be free from meanness implies generosity, you haven't got to *become* generous. So, obviously, one must be aware of it. You may be very generous in giving a large donation to your society, to your friends, but awfully mean about giving a bigger tip—you know what I mean

by 'mean'. One is unconscious of it. When one becomes aware of it, what happens? We exert our will to be generous; we try to overcome it; we discipline ourselves to be generous, and so on, and so on. But, after all, the exertion of will to be something is still part of meanness in a larger circle. So, if we do not do any of those things, but are merely aware of the implications of meanness, without giving it a term, then we will see that there takes place a radical transformation. Take anger: if you do not give it a term, but merely experience it—not through verbalization, because verbalization is a process of dulling the experience—but if you do not give it a term, then it is acute, it becomes very sharp, and it acts as a shock; and only then is it possible to be free.

Please experiment with this. First, one *must* be disturbed; and it is obvious that most of us do not like to be disturbed. We think we have found a pattern of life—the Master, the belief, whatever it is—and there we settle down. It is like having a good bureaucratic job, and functioning there for the rest of one's life. With that same mentality we approach various qualities of which we want to be rid. We do not see the importance of being disturbed, of being inwardly insecure, of not being dependent. Surely, it is only in insecurity that you discover, that you see, that you understand. We want to be like a man with plenty of money, at ease; but surely, he will not be disturbed; he doesn't *want* to be disturbed.

So, disturbance is essential for understanding; and any attempt to find security is a hindrance to understanding; and when we want to get rid of something which is disturbing, it is surely a hindrance. But if we can experience a feeling directly, without naming it, I think we will find a great deal in it; then there is no longer a battle with it, because the experiencer and the thing experienced are one; and that is essential. As

long as the experiencer verbalizes the feeling, the experience, he separates himself from it, and acts upon it; and such action is an artificial, illusory action. But if there is no verbalization, then the experiencer and the thing experienced are one. That integration is necessary and has to be radically faced. I hope this is clear. If not, we will discuss it at other meetings.

Question: I listened to you some years ago, and it did not mean much to me then; but listening to you now seems to mean a great deal. How is this?

KRISHNAMURTI: There are various explanations for this: that you have matured, that you have progressed, that life has knocked at your door, that you have suffered a great deal, and so on, and so on. That is, if what we are discussing means something to you. If you think it is all rot, then it is very simple. Now, people who believe in progress will give one kind of explanation: that you have slowly matured, that you must have time, not only a few years but another life, that time is essential for understanding; and that, though you have not understood at the beginning, you will understand later through gradual ripening of experience—you know, all the various theories one has. But, surely, there is a much simpler way of looking at it, isn't there? For some unknown reason your friend, perhaps, brings you here, and you listen casually and go away; it doesn't mean much, except there are nice trees, you have had a nice drive, you know, and all the rest of it. And you go away. But, unconsciously, surely, you have taken something in. Haven't you noticed, when you are driving, or walking, though your conscious mind may be attending to the driving, or seeing a particular thing attentively, the other part of your mind is absorbing unconsciously. Something has taken place, a seed

has been sown, of which you are unconscious; but later it comes out. It is there. So what at the beginning may not have meant much—because you have listened to something of which you have not been conscious—later reacts on you.

Surely, that is the whole purpose of propaganda, isn't it? Not that I am a propagandist—I have a horror of propaganda. But that is what is happening in the world, isn't it?, with the newspapers, magazines, cinemas, the radio, and all the rest of it. You go on, really interested in what you are doing, and the radio or the newspaper is giving you propaganda. Your mind is elsewhere, but you are absorbing unconsciously; and later on, when that absorption is called forth, it comes out—like the automatic response to war, to nationalism, to the acceptance of certain beliefs, whether of the right or of the left. How do you think children are impregnated with certain ideas? It is the constant impingement of those ideas on the unconscious. And they accept; when they grow up, they are the same, either of the left or of the right, of this religion or that religion, with innumerable beliefs and conditioned minds. The unconscious has been absorbing all the time. And, it can absorb the ugly as well as the beautiful, the true as well as the false. And our difficulty is, is it not?, to be free of all these imprints, and to look at life anew. Is it possible to be free from the influence of these constant impacts? That is, to be aware of these impacts, and not to be influenced by them? Because they are there. Can we be sensitive enough, alert enough, so that we know what is false, what is untrue; so that there is no resistance even? Because, the moment you resist, you strengthen what you are resisting; therefore you become part of it. But if you understand it, surely, then there is no longer its influence on the conscious or on the unconscious.

So, is it possible to be free from all the conditioning influences in

which we have been brought up? From nationalism, class differences, from the innumerable beliefs of religions and political ideologies? Surely, one must be free, otherwise one cannot find out what lies beyond freedom. But, to be free, one must examine all these things, must one not?, and not accept a thing—which is not the cultivation of doubt. Therefore, for that very process one must understand the content of one's own consciousness, of what one is.

Question: Would you talk to us about sin?

KRISHNAMURTI: Every organized religion has unfortunately cultivated, for purposes of civilization, the feeling of guilt. Most of us have it—the more sensitive we are, the more acute the feeling. The more you feel responsible, the more guilty you feel. You see this world mess, the impending wars, and all the chicanery that is going on, and—being sensitive, being alert, being sufficiently interested and intelligent—you feel that you are responsible. And, as one can do so little, one feels guilty. That is one part of it. Then, in order to hold man within civilized limits, this sense of doing wrong has been very carefully, sedulously cultivated, has it not? Otherwise you would go over the border. Because, if we had no standards, if we had no sanctions, if we had no moral code—not that there is much now—it would be worse. So, religion, organized belief, has carefully maintained, cultivated this sense that you must toe the line, that you must not sin, that you must not commit ugly things. It has held us within a pattern; and it is only the very few that can go beyond the pattern, because we want to remain in the pattern. We want to be respectable—fear of public opinion, and so many things hold us to the pattern. And, being afraid, not depending on our own understanding, most of us rely on another: the priest, the psycholo-

gist, the leader, the politician, you know, the innumerable dependencies that one cultivates. All those naturally strengthen our inherent anxiety to do the right thing. From all this, the sense of guilt arises.

And, there is the rigmarole in religion about sin. But, there are certain obvious things, are there not?—for example, that virtue is essential. But virtue which is cultivated, is no longer virtue; it is merely the strengthening of oneself with a different name. Virtue comes into being only when there is the freedom from desire to be something; when one is not afraid of being nothing. And, it is the *repetition* of a particular disturbance, of a particular action that has brought misfortune to others and to oneself, which may be called a sin. Surely, that is the first thing, is it not? To see something very clearly, which is discovered in relationship, and not to repeat it. The repetition, surely, is the mistake, not the first action; and to understand that, the repetitive quality of desire, one has to understand the whole structure of oneself.

So, there is this thing called sin, the feeling of guilt. One may have done something wrong, like worry, like gossip; but to keep on at it, surely, is the worst thing that one can do. If you see that you have done something wrong, observe it, go into it thoroughly, and be rid of it—don't keep on repeating it. Because, surely, this sense of worry about something that one has done in the past, or which one may do the next minute, this constant anxiety about it, this fear, only strengthens the restlessness of the mind, does it not? Gossip, worry, indicate the restlessness of the mind. When there is no restlessness, no distraction, but alertness, watchfulness, then the problem disappears, does it not? The feeling of guilt, with the majority of us, holds us in check. But that is only fear; and fear, surely, does not bring about clarity of understanding. In fear there is no communion. And it is that

fear that must be eradicated, not the feeling that one is sinning.

Question: There is no possibility of collective action without a co-ordinated plan, which involves the subservience of the individual will to the common purpose. If individuals were selfless, then control and authority would be needless. How can we achieve a common aim without curbing the erratic will of the individual, even if he is now and then well-intentioned?

KRISHNAMURTI: In order to have collective action, we resort to compulsion or authoritarianism; or to a form of fear, threat, or reward, with which we are all familiar. The State, or a group of individuals, establishes a certain aim, and then compels, coaxes, or persuades others to co-operate by giving them rewards or punishments—all the various ways to bring about co-ordinated action which we know. And the questioner wants to know if the emphasis on the individual, which is implied, does not prevent co-ordinated action. Which means, if there is a common purpose, with which we all agree, then must we not submit to that, and put aside our own will?

How is co-operation possible—that is really the crux of the matter, isn't it? Co-operation, co-ordination in action, lies either through fear, or through intelligence and love. When a particular nation is at war, then there is co-operation through fear; and apparently, fear, hatred, jealousy, brings people together more quickly than intelligence and love. Clever statesmen, politicians, are aware of this, and instigate it—with which, again, we are familiar. But is it possible to bring people together intelligently, through affection? That is really the problem, isn't it? Because, we see more and more people coming together through hatred, through fear, through compulsion—mass movements, the use of psychological

methods to persuade, propaganda, and all the rest of it. And if that is the way, then what we are discussing is futile. But if you do not co-operate, come together, through greed, is there any other way? And, if there is a way, must you not submit the individual will to a higher purpose?

Say, for example, we all agree that there must be peace in the world. And how is that peace possible? Peace is possible only when there is selflessness, surely; when the me is not important. Because I in myself am peaceful, therefore in my actions I will be peaceful; therefore I will not be anti-social. And anything that makes for antagonism, I will put away from myself. Therefore, I must pay the price for peace, must I not? But it must originate from me. And the more of us there are who are for that, surely, the greater the possibility of peace in the world—which does not mean the subservience of the individual will to the whole, to a purpose, to a plan, to an Utopia. Because, I see that there can be no peace until I am peaceful; which means, nationalism, no class, you know, all the things that are involved in being peaceful—which means being *completely* selfless. And when that is there, then we will co-operate. Then, there is bound to be co-operation. When there is compulsion from the outside to make me co-operate with the State, with a group, I may co-operate, but inwardly I will be fighting, inwardly there is no release. Or I may use the Utopia as a means of self-fulfillment, which is also expansion of oneself.

So, as long as there is the submitting of the individual will to a particular idea through greed, through identification, there must be conflict eventually between the individual and the many. So, the emphasis, surely, is not on the individual and the collective as opposed to each other, but on the freedom from the sense of the me and the mine. If that freedom exists, then there is no question of the individual as opposed

to the collective. But, as that seems almost impossible, we are persuaded to join the collective to produce a certain action, to sacrifice the individual for the whole; and the sacrifice is urged upon us by others, by the leaders. Whereas, we can look at this whole problem, not as concerning the individual and the collective, but intelligently, and realize that there can be no peace as long as you and I are not peaceful in ourselves; and that peace cannot be bought at any price. You and I have to be free from the causes that are producing conflict in ourselves. And the centre of conflict is the self, the me. But most of us do not want to be free from that me. That is the difficulty. Most of us like the pleasures and the pains that the me brings; and as long as we are controlled by the pleasure and the pains of the me, there will be conflict between the me and society, between the me and the collective; and the collective will dominate the me, and destroy the me, if it can. But the me is much stronger than the collective; so it always circumvents it, and tries to get a position in it, to expand, to fulfill.

Surely, the freedom from the self, and therefore the search of reality, the discovery and the coming into being of reality, is the true function of man. Religions play with it in their rituals and rigmarole—you know, the whole business of it. But, if one becomes aware of this whole process, which we have been discussing for so many years, then there is a possibility for the newly awakened intelligence to function. In that there is not self-release, not self-fulfillment, but creativeness. It is this creativeness of reality, which is not of time, that sets one free from all the business of the collective and the individual. Then one is really in a position to help create the new.

August 6, 1949.

VIII

I am sure many of you believe in immortality, in the soul, or the *atman*, and so on. And perhaps some of you have had a passing experience of these things. But, if I may, I would like this morning to approach it from a different point of view; let us go into it very seriously and earnestly, and discover the truth of it—not according to any particular pattern of belief or religious dogma, or your own personal experience, however vast, however beautiful and romantic it may be. So, please examine what we are going to discuss, intelligently and without any prejudice, with the intention of finding out, rather than rejecting or defending it. Because, it is quite a difficult problem to discuss. The implications are many, and if one can think of it anew, perhaps we shall have a different approach to action and to life.

We seem to think that ideas are very important. Our minds are filled with ideas. Our mind is idea—there is no mind without idea, without thought, without verbalization. And ideas play an extraordinarily important part in our life: what we think, what we feel, the beliefs and ideas in which we are conditioned. Ideas have an extraordinary significance with most of us: ideas which seem coherent, intelligent, logical, and also ideas that are romantic, stupid, without much significance. We are crowded with ideas, our whole structure is based on them. And these ideas come into being, obviously, through external influences and environmental conditioning, as well as through inward demands. We can see very well how ideas come into being. Ideas are sensations. There is no idea without sensation. As most of us feed on sensation, our whole structure is based on ideas. Being limited and seeking expansion through sensation, ideas become very important: ideas on God, ideas on morality, ideas on various forms of

social organization, and so on and so on.

So, ideas shape our experience, which is an obvious fact. That is, ideas condition our action. Not that action *creates* ideas, but ideas create action. First, we think it out, then we act; and the action is based on ideas. So, experience is the outcome of ideas; but experience is different from *experiencing*. In the state of *experiencing*, if you have noticed, there is no ideation at all. There is merely an *experiencing*, an *acting*. Later on comes the ideation of likes and dislikes, derived from that *experiencing*. We either want that experience to continue, or not to continue. If we like it, we go back to the experience in memory, which is a demand for the sensation of that experience—not *experiencing* anew. Surely, there is a difference between *experiencing* and experience, and that should be made fairly clear. In *experiencing* there is not the *experiencer* and the experience; there is only a state of *experiencing*. But *after* *experiencing*, the sensations of that *experiencing* are demanded, are longed for; and out of that desire, arises idea.

Say, for example, you have had a pleasurable experience. It is over, and you are longing for it. That is, you are longing for the sensation, not the state of *experiencing*; and sensation creates ideas, based on pleasure and pain, avoidance and acceptance, denial and continuance. Now, ideas are not basically important, because one sees that ideas have continuity. You may die, but the ideas that you have had, the bundle of ideas which you are, have a continuance, either partially or wholly, either fully manifested, or only a little; but they have a form of continuity, obviously.

So, if ideas are the result of sensation, which they are, and if the mind is filled with ideas, if the mind is idea, then there is a continuance of the mind as a bundle of ideas. But that, surely, is not immortality; because ideas are merely the result of

sensations, of pleasure and not-pleasure; and immortality must be something which is *beyond* ideas, upon which the mind cannot possibly speculate; because it can only speculate in terms of pleasure and pain, avoidance and acceptance. As the mind can only think in those terms, however extensively, however deeply, it is still based on idea; but thought, idea, has continuity, and that which continues is obviously not immortality. So, to know or to experience immortality, or for the experiencing of that state, there must be no ideation. One cannot think about immortality. If we can be free of ideation, that is, if we do not think in terms of ideas, then there is a state of experiencing only, a state in which ideation has stopped altogether. You can experiment with this yourself, and not accept what I am saying. Because, there is a great deal involved in this. The mind must be entirely quiet, without movement backward or forward, neither delving nor soaring. That is, ideation must entirely cease. And that is extremely difficult. That is why we cling to words like the soul, immortality, continuity, God—they all have neurological effects, which are sensations. And on these sensations the mind feeds; deprive the mind of these things, it is lost. So, it holds on with great strength to past experiences, which have now become sensations.

Is it possible for the mind to be so quiet—not partially, but in its totality—, as to have direct experience of that which is not thinkable, of that which cannot be put into words? That which continues is obviously within the limits of time; and through time, the timeless cannot come into being; therefore God, or what you will, cannot be thought of. If you think of it, there is merely an idea, a sensation; therefore it is no longer true. It is merely an idea which has a continuance, which is inherited or conditioned; and such an idea is not eternal, immortal, timeless. It is

essential to really *feel* this, see the truth of it as we discuss it—not say, 'This is so, that is not so', 'I believe in immortality, and you don't', 'You are agnostic, and I am godly'. All such expressions are immature, thoughtless, they have no significance. We are dealing with something which is not merely a matter of opinion, of like or dislike, of prejudice. We are trying to find out what is immortality—not as so-called religious people do who belong to some particular cult or other—but to experience that thing, to be aware of it; because, in that is creation. When once there is the experiencing of that, then the whole problem of life undergoes a significant, revolutionary change; and without that, all the squabbles and petty opinions have really no significance at all.

So, one has to be aware of this total process, of how ideas come into being, how action springs from ideas, and how ideas control action and therefore limit action, depending on sensation. It doesn't matter *whose* ideas they are, whether from the left or from the extreme right. As long as we cling to ideas, we are in a state in which there can be no experiencing at all. Then we are merely living in the field of time—in the past, which gives further sensation, or in the future, which is another form of sensation. It is only when the mind is free from idea that there can be experiencing. Just listen to this, don't reject or accept it. Listen to it, as you would listen to the wind in the trees. You don't object to the wind in the trees; it's pleasant. Or, if you dislike it, you go away. Do the same thing here. Don't reject, just find out. Because, so many people have expressed their opinion on this question of immortality; religious teachers speak of it, as does every preacher around the corner. So many saints, so many writers, either deny or assert; they say that there is immortality, or that man is merely the outcome of environmental influences, and so on and so on—so

many opinions. Opinions are not truth; and truth is something that must be experienced directly, from moment to moment, it is not an experience which you *want*—which is then merely sensation. And only when one can go beyond the bundle of ideas—which is the me, which is the mind, which has a partial or complete continuity—, only when one can go beyond that, when thought is completely silent, only then is there a state of experiencing. Then one shall know what truth is.

Question: How is one to know or feel unmistakably the reality, the exact and immutable significance of an experience which is truth? Whenever I have a realization and feel it to be truth, someone to whom I communicate it tells me I am merely self-deluded. Whenever I think I have understood, someone is there to tell me I am in illusion. Is there a way of knowing what is the truth about myself, without delusion, self-deception?

KRISHNAMURTI: Any form of identification must lead to illusion. There is the psychiatric illusion, and the psychological illusion. The psychiatric illusion we know what to do with. When one thinks one is Napoleon, or a great saint, you know what to do. But the psychological identification and illusion is quite different. The political, religious person, identifies himself with the country or with God. He is the country; and, if he has a talent, then he is a nightmare to the rest of the world, whether peacefully or violently. There are various forms of identification: identification with authority, with a country, with an idea; identification with a belief, which makes one do all kinds of things; with an ideology, for which you are willing to sacrifice everybody and everything, including yourself and your country, in order to achieve what you want; identification with

an Utopia, for which you force others into a particular pattern. Then, there is the identification of the actor, playing different roles. And most of us *are* in that position of acting, posing, whether consciously or unconsciously.

So, our difficulty is that we identify ourselves with a country, with a political party, with propaganda, with a belief, with an ideology, with a leader—all that is one kind of identification.

Then, there is the identification with our own experiences. I have had an experience, a thrilling thing; and the more I dwell on it, the more intense, the more romantic, the more sentimental, the more blurred it becomes; and to that I give the name God—you know the innumerable ways of self-deception. Surely, illusion arises when I cling to something. If I have had an experience which is over, finished, and I go back to it, I am in illusion. If I want something repeated, if I hold on to the repetition of an experience, it is bound to lead me to illusion. So, the basis of illusion is identification—identification with an image, with an idea of God, with a voice, or with experiences to which we ardently cling. It is not to the *experience* that we cling, but to the sensation of that experience which we had at the moment of experiencing. A man who has built around himself various methods of identification is living in illusion. A man who believes, because of a sensation, of an idea to which he clings, is bound to live in illusion, in self-deception. Therefore, any experience about yourself to which you go back, or which you reject, is bound to lead to illusion. Illusion ceases only when you understand an experience and do not hold on to it. This desire to possess is the basis of illusion, of self-deception. You desire to be something; and this desire to be something, must be understood, in order to understand the process of illusion, of self-deception. If I think I shall be a great teacher, a great Master, the

Buddha, X, Y, Z, in my next life, or if I think that I am that now and hold on to that, surely I must be in illusion; because I live on a sensation, which is an idea, and my mind feeds on ideas, whether false or true.

How is one to know if an experience at a given moment is truth? That is part of the question. Why do you *want* to know if it is truth? A fact is a fact, it is not true or false. It is only when I want to translate a fact according to my sensation, to my ideation, that I enter into delusion. When I am angry, it is a fact, there is no question of self-deception. When I am lustful, when I am greedy, when I am irritated, it is a fact; it is only when I begin to justify it, find explanations for it, translate it according to my prejudice in my favor, or avoid it—only then I have to ask, 'What is truth?' That is, the moment we approach a fact emotionally, sentimentally, with ideation, then we enter into the world of illusion and self-deceit. To look at a fact and be free of all this requires an extraordinary watchfulness. Therefore, it is most important to find out for oneself, not whether one is in illusion or self-deception, but whether one is free from the desire to identify, from the desire to have a sensation, which you call experience, from the desire to repeat, possess, or revert to an experience. After all, from moment to moment you can know yourself as you are, factually, not through the screen of ideation, which is sensation. To know yourself, there is no necessity to know the truth, or what is not the truth. To look at yourself in the mirror and see that you are ugly or beautiful, factually, not romantically, does not demand truth. But the difficulty with most of us is that when we see the image, the expression, we want to do something about it, we want to alter it, give it a different name; if it is pleasurable, we identify with it; if it is painful, we avoid it. In this process, surely, lies self-deception, with which you are somewhat familiar. The politicians

do that; the priests do it when they talk of God in the name of religion; and we ourselves do it when we are caught up in the sensation of ideas and hold on to them—that is true, this is false, the Masters exist or don't exist—which is all so absurd and immature and childish. But to find out what is factual, one needs an extraordinary alertness, an awareness in which there is neither condemnation nor justification.

So, one can say that one deceives oneself, and there is illusion, when there is identification with a country, with a belief, with an idea, with a person, and so on; or when there is the desire to repeat an experience, which is the *sensation* of the experience; or when one goes back to childhood, and wants the repetition of the experiences of childhood, the delight, the nearness, the sensitivity; or when one wants to be something. It is extremely difficult not to be deceived, either by oneself or by another; and deception ceases only when there is no desire to be something. Then the mind is capable of looking at things as they are, of seeing the significance of what is; then there is no battle between the false and the true; then there is no search for truth apart from the false. So, the important thing is to understand the process of the mind; and that understanding is factual, not theoretical, not sentimental, romantic, going into dark rooms and thinking it all out, having images, visions—all that has nothing to do with reality. And, as most of us are sentimental, romantic, seeking sensation, we are caught by ideas; and ideas are not what is. So, the mind that is free of ideas, which are sensations, such a mind is free from illusion.

Question: Experience shows that understanding arises only when argumentation and conflict cease, and a kind of tranquillity or intellectual sympathy is realized. This is true even in the understanding of mathe-

matical and technical problems. However, this tranquillity has been experienced only after every effort of analysis, examination, or experimentation has been made. Does this mean that this effort is a necessary, though not sufficient preliminary, to the tranquillity?

KRISHNAMURTI: I hope you have understood the question. The questioner, to put it briefly, asks: Is not effort, digging, analyzing, examining, necessary before there is tranquillity of the mind? Before the mind can understand, is not effort necessary? That is, is not technique necessary before creativeness? If I have a problem, must I not go into it, think it out fully, search it out, analyze it, dissect it, worry over it, and be free of it? Then, when the mind is quiet, the answer is found. This is the process we go through. We have a problem, we think about it, we question it, we talk it over; and then the mind, becoming weary of it, is quiet. Then, the answer is found, unknowingly. With that process we are familiar. And the questioner asks: Is that not necessary, first?

Why do I go through that process? Don't let us put this question wrongly, whether it is necessary or not, but why do I go through that process? I go through that process, obviously, in order to find an answer. My anxiety is to find an answer, isn't it? That fear of not finding an answer, makes me do all these things; and then, after going through this process, I am exhausted, and say, 'I can't answer it'. Then the mind becomes quiet, and then there is an answer, sometimes or always.

So, the question is not, is the preliminary process necessary, but *why* do I go through that process? Obviously, because I am seeking an answer. I am not interested in the problem, but in how to get away from the problem. I am not seeking the understanding of the problem, but the *answer* to the problem. Surely, there is a difference, isn't

there? Because, the answer is in the problem, not away from the problem. I go through the searching, analyzing, dissecting process, in order to escape from the problem. But, if I do not escape from the problem and try to look at the problem without any fear or anxiety, if I merely look at the problem, mathematical, political, religious, or any other, and not look to an answer, then the problem will begin to tell me. Surely, this is what happens. We go through this process, and eventually throw it aside because there is no way out of it. So, why can't we start right from the beginning, that is, not seek an answer to a problem?—which is extremely arduous, isn't it? Because, the more I understand the problem, the more significance there is in it. To understand it, I must approach it quietly, not impose on the problem my ideas, my feelings of like and dislike. Then the problem will reveal its significance.

Why is it not possible to have tranquillity of the mind right from the beginning? And there will be tranquillity, only when I am not seeking an answer, when I am not afraid of the problem. Our difficulty is the fear involved in the problem. So, if one puts the question whether it is necessary or not to make an effort, one receives a false answer.

Let us look at it differently. A problem demands attention, not distraction through fear; and there is no attention when we are seeking an answer away from the problem, an answer that will suit us, that will be preferable, that will give us satisfaction or avoidance. In other words, if we can approach the problem without any of these, then it is possible to understand the problem.

So, the question is not whether we should go through this process of analyzing, examining, dissecting, whether it is necessary in order to have tranquillity. Tranquillity comes into being when we are not afraid; and because we are afraid of the problem, of the issue of the problem, we

are caught in the desires of our own pursuits, the pursuits of our own desires.

Question : I no longer suppress my thoughts, and I am shocked by what sometimes arises. Can I be as bad as that? (Laughter).

KRISHNAMURTI : It is good to be shocked, isn't it? Shock implies sensitivity, doesn't it? But, if you are not shocked, if you merely say there is a certain thing in you which you do not like, and you are going to discipline it, change it, then you are shock-proof, are you not? (Laughter) No, please don't laugh it away. Because, most of us want to be shock-proof; we do not want to know what we are, and that is why we have learnt to suppress, to discipline, to destroy the neighbor and ourselves, for our country and for ourselves. We don't want to know ourselves as we are. So, to discover oneself as one is, is a shocking thing; and it *should* be. Because, we want it to be different; we like to think of ourselves, picture ourselves as being beautiful, noble, this or that—which is all a resistance. Our virtue has become merely resistance, and therefore it is no longer virtue. To be sensitive to what one is, requires a certain spontaneity; and in that spontaneity, one discovers. But, if you have suppressed, disciplined your thoughts and feelings so completely that there is no spontaneity, then there is no possibility of discovering anything; and I am not at all sure that is not what most of us want—to become inwardly dead. Because, it is much easier to live that way—to give ourselves to an idea, to a belief, to an organization, to service, to God knows what else—and function automatically. It is much easier. But to be sensitive, to be aware inwardly of all the possibilities, is much too dangerous, much too painful; and we use a respectable way of dulling ourselves, an approved form of discip-

line, suppression, sublimation, denial—you know, the various practices which make us dull, insensitive.

Now, when you discover what you are, which, as the questioner says, is bad, what will you do with it? Previously, you have suppressed, and therefore never discovered; now you no longer suppress, and you discover what you are. What is your next response? Surely, that is much more important—how you deal with it, how you approach it. Then what happens, when you discover that you are what you call bad? What do you do? The moment you discover, your mind is already at work on it, isn't it? Haven't you noticed it? I discover that I am mean. It is a shock to me. What do I do? The mind then says, 'I must not be mean', so it cultivates generosity. Generosity of the hand is one thing, and generosity of the heart is another. The cultivation of generosity is of the hand, and you *cannot* cultivate generosity of the heart. If you do cultivate the generosity of the heart, then you fill the heart with the things of the mind. So, what do we do when we discover certain things that are not generous? Watch yourselves, please, don't wait for my answer, my explanation—look at it, and experience it as we go along together. Not that this is a psychology class; but surely, in listening to something like this, we must experience and be free as we go along, not continue day after day in the same stupid way.

So, what do we do? The instinctive response is either to justify or to deny, which is to make ourselves insensitive. But to see it as it is, to see that I *am* mean, and then to stop there, without giving any explanations—merely to know that one is mean, is an extraordinary thing; which means there is no verbalization, no naming even of that feeling which one has. If one really stops there, then one will see there is an extraordinary transformation. Then one is aware extensively of the implications of that feeling; then one

doesn't have to do a thing with regard to that feeling. Because, when you don't name a thing, it withers away. Experiment with it and you will find out what an extraordinary quality of awareness comes into being when you are not naming or justifying, but merely looking, silently observing the fact that you are not generous, or that you are mean. I am using the words generous, mean, only for communication. The word is not the thing; so, don't be carried away by the word. But look at this thing. Surely, it is important to discover what one is; to be surprised and shocked to discover what one is, when one thought one was so marvellous. It is all romantic and idiotic and stupid to think one is this or that. So, when you put all that aside and merely look at what is—which needs an extraordinary alertness, not courage, not virtue—, when you no longer suppress it, justify it, condemn it, or give it a name—then you will see there is a transformation.

Question: What is it that determines the duration between the perception of one's thought-feeling, and the modification or permanent disappearance of the condition perceived? In other words, why is it that certain undesirable conditions in oneself do not vanish as soon as they are observed?

KRISHNAMURTI: Surely, that depends on right attention, doesn't it? When one perceives an undesirable quality—I am using these words merely to communicate; I am not giving any special significance to 'perceiving'—, there is an interval of time before there is transformation; and the questioner wants to know, why? Surely, the interval between perception and change depends on attention. Is there attention if I am merely resisting that, if I am condemning or justifying it? Surely, there is no attention. I am

merely avoiding it. If I am trying to overcome it, discipline it, change it, that is not attention, is it? There is attention only when I am fully interested in the thing itself—not how to transform it; for then I am merely avoiding, being distracted, running away. So, what is important is, not what takes place, but to have that capacity of right attention when one discovers an undesirable thing; and there is no right attention if there is any form of identification, any feeling of pleasure or displeasure. Surely, that is very clear: the moment I am distracted by my pleasure of wanting it, or not wanting it, there is no attention. If that is *very* clear, then the problem is simple. Then there is no interval. But we like the interval. We like to go through all this rigmarole of labyrinthine ways to avoid the thing which we *have* to tackle. And we have cultivated marvellously and sedulously the escapes; and the escapes have become more important than the thing itself. But if one sees the escapes, not verbally, but actually sees that one is escaping, then there is right attention; then one doesn't have to struggle against the escapes. When you see a poisonous thing, you don't have to escape; it is a poisonous thing, you leave it alone. Similarly, right attention is spontaneous when the problem is really great; when the shock is intense. Then there is immediate response. But when the shock, the problem is not great—and we take care not to make any problem too great—, then our minds are made dull and weary.

Question: Is the artist, the musician, engaged in a futile thing? I am not speaking of one who takes up art or music, but one who is inherently an artist. Would you go into this?

KRISHNAMURTI: It is a very complicated problem, so let us go into it slowly. As the questioner says, there

are two types of people, those who are inherently artists, and those who take up art or music. Those who take it up, obviously, do it either for sensation, for upliftment, for various forms of escape, or merely as an amusement, an addiction. You might take it up as another takes up drink, or an 'ism', or religious dogma; perhaps it is less harmful, because you are by yourself. Then, there is the other type, the artist—if there is such a person. Inherently, for itself, he paints, plays or composes music, and all the rest of it. Now, what happens to that person? You must know such people. What is happening to him as an individual, as a social entity? What is happening to such a person? The danger, for all those people who have a capacity, a gift, is that they think they are superior, first of all. They think they are the salt of the earth. They are people especially chosen from above; and, with that feeling of apartness, of being chosen, all the evils come: they are anti-social, they are individualistic, aggressive, extraordinarily self-centered—almost all gifted people are like that. So, gift, capacity, is a danger, is it not? Not that one can avoid the talent or the capacity; but one must be aware of the implications, the dangers of it. Such people may come together in a laboratory, or in a gathering of musicians and artists, but they have always this barrier between themselves and others, have they not? You are the layman, and I am the specialist; the man who knows more, and the man who knows less, and all the identification that goes with it.

I am not speaking slightly of anybody, because that would be too stupid; but one must be aware of all these things. To point them out is not to abuse or deride somebody. Few of us are inherently artists, first of all. We like to play with it, because it is profitable, or gives certain *éclat*, a certain show, certain verbal expressions which we have learnt. It gives us a place, a position. And

if we are artists, really, genuinely, surely there is the quality of sensitivity, not of isolation. Art does not belong to any particular country, or to any particular person; but the artist soon makes his gift into the personal—he paints, it is *his* work, *his* poem; it puffs him up, like the rest of us. And therefore, he becomes anti-social, he is more important. And, as most of us are not in that position, fortunately or unfortunately, we use music or art merely as sensation. We may have a quick experience when we hear something lovely; but the repetition of that thing over and over and over again soon dulls us. It is merely the sensation we indulge in. If we do not indulge in that, then beauty has quite a different significance. Then we approach it anew every time. And it is this fresh approach to something every time, whether ugly or beautiful, that is important, that makes for sensitivity; but you *cannot* be sensitive if you are captured by your own addiction or capacity, by your own delight, by your own sensation. Surely, the *really creative* person comes to things anew, he does not merely repeat what the radio announcer has told him, or what the critics say.

So, the difficulty in this is to keep that sensitivity all the time, to be alert, whether you are an artist, or merely playing with art. And that sensitivity is dulled when you give importance to yourself as the *artist*. You may have vision, and you may have the capacity to put that vision into paint, into marble, into words; but the moment you identify yourself with it, you are lost, it is finished. You lose that sensitivity. The world loves to praise you, to say what a marvellous artist you are; and you like that. And, for most of us, who are not great artists inherently, our difficulty is not to get lost in sensations, because sensations dull; through sensations you cannot experience. Experiencing comes only when there is direct relationship;

and there is no direct relationship when there is the screen of sensation, the desire to be, to alter, or to continue. So, our problem is to keep alert and sensitive; and that is denied when we are merely seeking sensation and the repetition of sensation.

August 7, 1949.

IX

I think I will only answer questions this evening and not give the usual preliminary talk; but before answering, I would like to point out one or two things concerning these questions and answers.

First of all, most of us are very inclined to believe. The mind is very clever in persuading us to think differently, to adopt a new point of view, or to believe in things that are not fundamentally true. Now, in answering these questions, I would like to say that I am not persuading you to think along my particular line. We are trying to find the right answer together. I am not answering for you just to accept or deny. We are going to find out together what is true, and that requires an open mind, an intelligent mind, an enquiring mind, an alert mind; not a mind that is so prejudiced that it merely denies, or so eager that it accepts. And, in answering these questions, one fundamental thing must be borne in mind. It is that they are merely a reflection of the ways of our own thinking, they reveal to us what we think. They should act as a mirror in which we perceive ourselves. After all, these discussions, these talks, have only one purpose, and that is the pursuit of self-knowledge. For, as I said, it is only in knowing ourselves first—deeply, profoundly, not superficially—that we can know truth. And it is extremely arduous to know ourselves deeply, not superficially. It is not a matter of time, but a question of intensity; it is direct perception and experience that are important. And

these discussions and talks are meant for that; so that each one of us may experience directly whatever is being discussed, and not merely understand it on the verbal level. It is important also to bear in mind that each of us must find the truth, each of us must be the Master and the pupil; and that requires a great deal of humility, not mere acceptance of assurance or denial from me.

So, when I answer these questions, please bear all this in mind. Because, all of us have innumerable problems. Life is not very pleasant or simple; it is very complicated; and we can understand it only when we understand the whole, total process; and the total process is in us, not outside of us. Therefore, it is important to understand ourselves. Then we can deal with the things that we face every day, the influences that are constantly impinging upon us.

Question: Gossip has value in self-revelation, especially in revealing others to me. Seriously, why not use gossip as a means of discovering what is? I do not shiver at the word 'gossip' just because it has been condemned for ages.

KRISHNAMURTI: I wonder why we gossip? Not because it reveals others to us. And why should others be revealed to us? Why do you want to know others? Why this extraordinary concern about others? First of all, Sir, why do we gossip? It is a form of restlessness, is it not? Like worry, it is an indication of a restless mind. And why this desire to interfere with others, to know what others are doing, saying? It is a very superficial mind that gossips, isn't it? An inquisitive mind which is wrongly directed. The questioner seems to think that others are revealed to him by his being concerned with them—with their doings, with their thoughts, with their opinions. But, do we know

others if we don't know ourselves? Can we judge others, if we do not know the way of our own thinking, the way we act, the way we behave? And why this extraordinary concern over others? Is it not an escape, really, this desire to find out what others are thinking and feeling, and gossiping about? Doesn't it offer an escape from ourselves? And, is there not in it also the desire to interfere with others' lives? Isn't our own life sufficiently difficult, sufficiently complex, sufficiently painful, without dealing with others, interfering with others? Is there time to think about others in that gossipy, cruel, ugly manner? Why do we do this? You know, everybody does it. Practically everybody gossips about somebody else. Why?

I think, first of all, we gossip about others because we are not sufficiently interested in the process of our own thinking and of our own action. We want to see what others are doing, and perhaps, to put it kindly, to imitate others. Generally when we gossip, it is to condemn others. But, stretching it charitably, it is perhaps to imitate others. Why do we want to imitate others? Doesn't it all indicate an extraordinary shallowness on our own part? It is an extraordinarily dull mind that wants excitement, and goes outside of itself to get it. In other words, gossip is a form of sensation, isn't it?, in which we indulge. It may be a different kind of sensation, but there is always this desire to find excitement, distraction. And so, if one really goes into this question deeply, one comes back to oneself, which shows that one is really extraordinarily shallow and seeking excitement from outside by talking about others. Catch yourself the next time you are gossiping about somebody; and if you are aware of it, it will indicate an awful lot to you about yourself. Don't cover it up by saying that you are merely inquisitive about others. It indicates restlessness, a sense of excitement, a shallowness, a lack of real, profound

interest in people which has nothing to do with gossip.

Now, the next problem is, how to stop gossip. That is the next question, isn't it? When you are aware that you are gossiping, how do you stop gossiping? If it has become a habit, an ugly thing that continues day after day, how do you stop it? Does that question arise? When you know you are gossiping, when you are aware that you are gossiping, aware of all its implications, do you then say to yourself, 'How am I to stop it?' Does it not stop of its own accord, the moment you are aware that you are gossiping? The 'how' does not arise at all. The 'how' arises only when you are unaware; and, surely, gossip indicates a lack of awareness. Experiment with this for yourself the next time you are gossiping, and see how quickly, how immediately you stop gossiping when you are aware of what you are talking about, aware that your tongue is running away with you. It does not demand the action of will to stop it. All that is necessary is to be aware, to be conscious of what you are saying, and to see the implications of it. You don't have to condemn or justify gossip. Be aware of it, and you will see how quickly you stop gossiping; because it reveals to oneself one's own ways of action, one's behaviour, thought pattern; and in that revelation, one discovers oneself, which is far more important than gossiping about others, about what they are doing, what they are thinking, how they behave.

Most of us, who read daily newspapers, are filled with gossip, global gossip. It is all an escape from ourselves, from our own pettiness, from our own ugliness. We think that through a superficial interest in world events we are becoming more and more wise, more capable of dealing with our own lives. All these, surely, are ways of escaping from ourselves, are they not? Because, in ourselves we are so empty, shallow; we are so frightened of

ourselves. We are so poor in ourselves that gossip acts as a form of rich entertainment, an escape from ourselves. We try to fill that emptiness in us with knowledge, with rituals, with gossip, with group meetings—with the innumerable ways of escape. So, the escapes become all-important, and not the understanding of what is. The understanding of what is, demands attention; to know that one is empty, that one is in pain, needs immense attention, and not escapes. But most of us like these escapes, because they are much more pleasurable, more pleasant. Also, when we know ourselves as we are, it is very difficult to deal with ourselves; and that is one of the problems with which we are faced. We don't know what to do. When I know that I am empty, that I am suffering, that I am in pain, I don't know what to do, how to deal with it. And so we resort to all kinds of escapes.

So, the question is, what to do? Of course, obviously, one cannot escape; for that is most absurd and childish. But when you are faced with yourself as you are, what are you to do? First, is it possible not to deny or justify it, but just to remain with it, as you are?—which is extremely arduous, because the mind seeks explanation, condemnation, identification. If it does not do any of those things but remains with it, then it is like accepting something. If I accept that I am brown, that is the end of it; but if I am desirous of changing to a lighter color, then the problem arises. So, to accept what is, is most difficult; and one can do that only when there is no escape; and condemnation or justification is a form of escape. So, when one understands the whole process of why one gossips, and, when one realizes the absurdity of it, the cruelty and all the things involved in it, then one is left with what one is; and we approach it always either to destroy it, or to change it into something else. But, if we don't do either of those

things, but approach it with the intention of understanding it, being with it *completely*, then we will find that it is no longer the thing that we dreaded. Then there is a possibility of transforming that which is.

Question: We have a collection of ideals, and the choice is wide. We try to realize them through various methods. This is a long and time-taking way. In listening to you, I feel that the distinction or space between ideal and practice is illusory. Is this so?

KRISHNAMURTI: First of all, are we aware, each one of us, that we have ideals; and that, having these ideals, we are trying to practise them, or live up to them, or approximate ourselves to them? Take the question of violence. We have the ideal of non-violence, and we try to practise that ideal in our daily lives. Or take any other ideal that you have. We are trying to live up to it all the time, to practise it, if we are serious and not merely living on the verbal level. And that takes time, a constant application, a series of failures, and so on.

Why do we have ideals? Any collection of them, why do we have them? Do they better our lives? And is virtue to be gained through constant disciplining? Is virtue a result? Or is it something quite different? Take humility. Can you practise humility? Or does humility come into being when the self is not important? Then the me and the mine do not predominate. But if we make *that* into an ideal, that the self should not predominate, then arises the question, how to come to that state? So, this whole process is very complicated and unreal, is it not? There must be a different approach to this problem, surely? Is not a collection of ideals, an escape? Because, it gives us time to play with it. We say, 'I am practising it, I am disciplining myself; one day I will

be that; it is necessary to go slowly, to evolve towards it'—you know all the various explanations that we give.

Now, is there a different approach? Because, we can see that the constant disciplining towards an ideal, approximating oneself to an ideal, does not really bring about the solution of the problem. We are no more kindly. We are not less violent. We may be, superficially—but not fundamentally. So, how is one, then, to be non-greedy without having the ideal of non-greed? Suppose, for example, I am greedy, or I am mean, or angry—any of these things. The ordinary process is to have an ideal, and try to approximate myself to that ideal all the time through practice, discipline, and so on. Does that free me from greed, from anger, from violence? What will free me from violence is to be free from my desire to *be* something, from my desire to *gain* something, to *protect* something, to achieve a result, and so on. So, our difficulty is, is it not?, that, having these ideals, there is this constant desire to be something, to become something; and that is really the crux of the matter. After all, greed or anger is one of the expressions of the me, the self, the I; and as long as that I remains, anger will continue. Merely to discipline it to function in a certain way does not free it from anger. This process only emphasizes the self, the me, does it not?

Now, if I realize that I am angry or greedy, need I go through all the disciplinary process in order to be free from it? Is there not a different approach to it, a different way of tackling it? I can tackle it differently only when I no longer take pleasure in sensation. Anger gives me a sensation of pleasure, doesn't it?; though I may dislike it afterwards, at the time there is an excitement involved in it. It is a release. So, the first thing, it seems to me, is to be aware of this process, to see that the ideal does not eradicate anything. It is merely a form of postponement. That

is, to understand something, I must give it full attention; and an ideal is merely a distraction which prevents my giving that feeling or that quality full attention at a given time. If I am *fully* aware, if I give my *full* attention to the quality I call greed, without the distraction of an ideal, then am I not in a position to understand greed and so dissolve it? You see, we are so accustomed to postponement, and ideals help us to postpone; but if we can put away all ideals because we understand the escapes, the postponing quality of an ideal, and face the thing as it is, directly, immediately, give our *full* attention to it—then, surely, there is a possibility of transforming it.

If I realize that I am violent, if I am aware of it without trying to transform it or become non-violent—if I am merely aware of it, then, because my attention is fully given to it, it opens up the various implications of violence, and therefore, surely, there is an inward transformation. But if I practise non-violence, or non-greed, or what you will, then I am merely postponing, am I not?, because I am not giving my attention to what is, which is greed or violence. You see, most of us have ideals either as a means of postponing, or to be something, to achieve a result. In the very desire to become the ideal, surely there is violence involved. In the very becoming of something, moving myself towards a goal, surely violence is involved, is it not? You see, we all want to be something. We want to be happy, we want to be more beautiful, we want to be more virtuous, we want to be more and more and more. Surely, in the very desire for something *more* there is violence involved, there is greed involved. But, if we realize that the more we want to be something, the more conflict there is, then we can see that the ideal merely helps us to increase our conflict—which doesn't mean that I am satisfied with what I am. On the contrary. As long as I want to be something *more*, there

must be conflict, there must be pain, there must be anger, violence. If I really feel that, if I am profoundly affected by it, see it, am aware of it, then I am able to deal with the problem immediately, without having a collection of ideals to encourage me to be this or that. Then my action is immediate, my relationship with it is direct.

But there also arises in this another problem, which is that of the experiencer and the experience. With most of us, the experiencer and the experience are two different processes. The ideal and myself are two different states. I want to become that. Therefore, the I, the experiencer, the thinker, is different from the thought. Is that so? Is the thinker different from the thought? Or is there only thought, which creates the thinker? So, as long as I am separate from the thought, I can manipulate thought, I can change it, transform it. But is the I, who is operating on a thought, different from the thought? Surely, they are a joint phenomenon, are they not? The thinker and the thought are one, not separate. When one is angry, one is *angry*: there is an integrated feeling which we term anger. Then I say, 'I am angry'; therefore, I separate myself from that anger, and then I can operate on it, do something about it. But if I realize that I *am* anger, that I am that quality itself, that the quality is not separable from me, surely, when I experience that, then there is quite a different action, quite a different approach. Now, we separate ourselves from the thought, from the feeling, from the quality. Therefore, the I is a separate entity from the quality, and therefore the I can operate on the quality. But the quality is not different from the I, from the thinker; and when there is that integrated experience in which the thinker and the thought are one, not separate, then, surely, there is quite a different approach, a different response. Again, experiment with this and you will see. Because, at the moment of ex-

periencing there is neither the experiencer nor the experience. It is only as the experiencing fades that there is the experiencer and the experience. Then, the experiencer says, 'I like that', or, 'I don't like it'; 'I want more of it', or, 'I want less of it'. Then, he wants to cultivate the ideal, to become the ideal. But if the thinker is the thought, and there are not two separate processes, then his whole attitude is transformed, is it not? Then there is quite a different response with regard to thought; then there is no longer approximating thought to an ideal, or getting rid of thought; then there is no maker of effort. And I think it is really very important to discover this for oneself, to experience this directly, not because I say so or someone else says so. It is important to come to this experience: that the thinker is the thought. Don't let that become a new jargon, a new set of words which we use. Through verbalization we don't experience. We merely have sensations, and sensations are not experience. And if one can be aware of this joint phenomenon, of this process in which the thinker and the thought are one, then I think the problem will be understood much more profoundly than when we merely have ideals or have none, which is really beside the point.

If I am my thoughts, and my thoughts are not different from me, then there is no maker of effort, is there? Then I do not become *that*; then I am no longer cultivating virtue. Not that I am already virtuous. The moment I am conscious that I am virtuous, I am *not* virtuous. The moment I am conscious that I am humble, surely humility ceases. So, if I can understand the maker of effort—the me becoming its own self-projected demands, desires, which are the same as myself—then, surely, there is a radical transformation in my whole outlook. That is why it is important to have right meditation, to know what right meditation means. It is not the approximation to an ideal,

it is not trying to reach out and get something, it is not to attain, to concentrate, to develop certain qualities, and so on, which we discussed previously. Right meditation is the understanding of this whole process of the me, of the self. Because, as I said, right meditation is self-knowledge; and without meditation, one cannot find out what the process of the self is. If there is no meditator to meditate upon something, then meditation is the experiencing of that which is, the total process of the thinker as the thought. Then only is there a possibility that the mind can be really quiet. Then it is possible to discover if there is something beyond the mind—which is not a mere verbal assertion that there is or that there is not, that there is *atman*, the soul, or what you will; we are not discussing those things. It is going beyond all verbal expression. Then the mind is quiet—not merely on the higher level, the upper level of the mind, but the whole content of the mind, the whole consciousness, is quiet. But there is no quietness if there is a maker of effort; and there will be the maker, the will of action, as long as he thinks he is separate from the thought. And this requires a great deal of going into, of thinking out, not just experiencing it superficially and sensationally. And when one has that direct experience, then becoming the ideal is illusory, it has no meaning at all. Then it is altogether a wrong approach. Then one sees that this whole process of becoming the more, the greater, has nothing to do with reality. Reality comes into being only when the mind is completely quiet, when there is no effort. Virtue is that state of freedom in which there is no maker of effort. Therefore, virtue is a state in which effort has completely ceased; but if you make an effort to become virtuous, surely it is no longer virtue, is it?

So, as long as we do not understand, do not experience that the thinker and the thought are one, all these problems will exist. But the moment we

experience that, the maker of effort comes to an end. To experience that, one must be completely aware of the process of one's own thinking and feeling, of one's desire to become. And that is why it is important, if one is really seeking reality, or God, or what you will, to see that this whole mentality of climbing, evolving, growing, achieving, must come to an end. We are much too worldly. With the mentality of the clerk becoming the boss, the foreman becoming the executive—with that mentality we approach reality. We think we will do the same thing, climb the ladder of success. I am afraid it cannot be done that way. If you do, you will live in a world of illusion, and therefore of conflict, pain, misery and strife. But if one discards all such mentality, such thoughts, such points of view, then one becomes really humble. One is, not becomes. Then there is a possibility of having a direct experience of reality, which alone will dissolve all our problems—not our cunning efforts, not our great intellect, not our deep and wide knowledge.

Question: I am free from ambition. Is there something wrong with me? (Laughter).

KRISHNAMURTI: If you are conscious that you are free from ambition, then there is something wrong. (Laughter) Then one becomes smug, respectable, unimaginative, thoughtless. Why should you be free from ambition? And how do you know you are free from ambition? Surely, to have the desire to be free from something is the beginning of illusion, is it not?, of ignorance. You see, we find ambition painful; we want to be something, and we have failed. And so now we say, 'It is too painful, I will get rid of it'. If you succeeded in your ambition, if you fulfilled yourself in the thing which you want to be, then this problem wouldn't arise. But, not succeeding, and seeing there is no fulfillment there, you discard it

and condemn ambition. Obviously, ambition is unworthy. A man who is ambitious, surely, cannot find reality. He may become the president of some club or some society or some country. But surely, he is not seeking reality. But the difficulty is, with most of us, if we don't succeed in what we want, we either become bitter, cynical, or we try to become spiritual. So we say, 'That is a wrong thing to do', and we discard it. But our mentality is the same. We may not succeed in the world and be a great person there, but 'spiritually' we still want to succeed—in a little group, as a leader. Ambition is the same, whether it is in the world, or turned towards God. To know consciously that you are free from ambition is surely an illusion, is it not? And if you are really free of it, can there be any question that you are or are not? Surely one knows within oneself when one is ambitious, does one not? And we can see very well all the effects of ambition in the world—the ruthlessness of it, the cruelty of it, the desire for power, position, prestige. But when one is consciously free of something, is there not the danger of becoming very respectable, of being smug, satisfied with oneself?

I assure you, it is a very difficult thing to be alert, to be aware, to walk delicately, sensitively, not to be caught in the opposites. It requires a great deal of alertness and intelligence and watchfulness. And then, even if you *are* free from ambition, where are you? Are you any more kindly, any more intelligent, any more sensitive to the outward and inward events? Surely, there is a danger in all this, is there not?, of becoming stultified, of becoming static, becoming dull, weary; and the more one is sensitive, alert, watchful, the more there is a possibility of really being free—not free from this or that. Freedom requires intelligence, and intelligence is not a thing that you sedulously cultivate. Intelligence is something which can be

experienced directly in relationship, not through the screen of what you think the relationship should be. After all, our life is a process of relationship. Life is relationship. And that requires an extraordinary watchfulness, alertness, not speculating whether you are free or not free from ambition. But ambition perverts that relationship. The ambitious man is an isolated man, therefore he cannot have relationship, either with his wife or with society. Life is relationship, whether with the one or with the many, and that relationship is perverted, is destroyed, is corrupted through ambition; and when one is aware of that corruption, surely, there is no question of being free from it.

So, in all this, our difficulty is to be watchful, to be watchful of what we are thinking, feeling, saying—not in order to transform it into something else, but just to be aware of it. And if we *are* so aware—in which there is no condemnation, no justification, but mere attention, full cognizance of what is—, that awareness in itself has an extraordinary effect. But if we are merely trying to become less, or more, then there is dullness, weariness, a smug respectability; and a man who is respectable, surely, can never find reality. Awareness demands a great deal of inward discontent which is not easily canalized through any satisfaction or gratification.

Now, if we see all this, all that we have discussed this evening, not merely on the verbal level, but really experience it, not at odd moments, not when we are pushed into a corner as perhaps some of you are now, but every day, from moment to moment; if we are aware, silently observing, then we become extremely sensitive—not sentimental, which only blurs, distorts. To be sensitive inwardly needs great simplicity—not wearing a loin cloth, or having few clothes, or no car; but the simplicity in which the me and the mine are not important, in which there is no sense of

possession; a simplicity in which there is no longer the maker of effort. Then there is a possibility of experiencing that reality, or of that reality coming into being. After all, this is the only thing that can bring about real, lasting happiness. Happiness is not an end in itself. It is a by-product, and it comes into being only with reality. Not that you *go after* reality—you cannot. It must come to you. And it can come to you only when there is *complete* freedom, silence. Not that you *become* silent. That is a wrong process of meditation. There is a vast difference between being silent and becoming silent. When there is real silence, not put together, then there is something inexplicable, then creation comes into being.

August 13, 1949.

X

For the last five weeks we have been discussing the importance of self-knowledge; for without knowing oneself, not partially, but fully, integrally, it is not possible to think rightly, and therefore act rightly. Without self-knowledge there cannot be complete, integrated action. There can only be partial action if there is no self-knowledge; and as partial action invariably leads to conflict and to misery, it is important for those who would really understand the problems of life completely, to understand the problem of relationship—not only with one or two, but with the whole, which is society. To understand this problem of relationship, we must understand ourselves; and to understand ourselves is action, it is not a withdrawal from action. There is action only when we understand relationship—relationship not only with people and ideas, but with things, with nature. So, action is relationship with regard to things, to property, to nature, to people, and to ideas. Without the comprehension of

all this process, which we call life, life must be contradictory, painful and a constant conflict. So, to understand this process of life, which is ourselves, we have to understand the whole significance of our own thoughts and feelings; and that is why we have been discussing the importance of self-knowledge. Perhaps some of us have read a few books on psychology, have some smattering of psycho-analytical phrases; but I am afraid mere superficial knowledge is not sufficient. Verbal expression of an understanding which comes through mere knowledge, mere study, is not sufficient. What is important is to understand ourselves in relationship; and that relationship is not static, it is constantly in motion. Therefore, to follow that relationship there must be no fixation on an idea. Most of us are slaves to ideas. We *are* ideas. We are a bundle of ideas. Our actions are shaped by ideas, and our whole outlook is conditioned by ideas. Therefore, ideas shape our relationship. That shaping of relationship by an idea prevents the understanding of relationship. To us, idea is very important, extraordinarily significant. You have your ideas, and I have my ideas, and we are in constant conflict over ideas; whether political, religious, or otherwise, each is in opposition to others. Ideas invariably create opposition, because ideas are the outcome of sensation; and as long as our relationship is conditioned by sensation, by idea, there is no understanding of that relationship. Hence ideas prevent action. Ideas do not further action—they limit action, which we see in everyday life.

So, is it possible for action to be without idea? Can we act without ideation first? Because, we see how ideas divide people—ideas which are beliefs, prejudices, sensations, political and religious opinions. These are dividing people and tearing the world to pieces at the present time. The cultivation of the intellect has become the predominant factor, and our

intellect guides, shapes our action. So, is it possible to act without idea? We *do* act without idea when the problem is really intense, very profound, demanding all our attention. We may try to conform the act to an idea; but if we go into the problem, if we really try to understand the problem itself, we will begin to discard the idea, the prejudice, the particular point of view, and approach the problem afresh. This is what we do when we have a problem, surely. We try to solve the problem according to a particular idea, or depending on a particular result, and so on. When the problem cannot be solved that way, then we push aside all ideas; then we give up our ideas, and therefore approach the problem afresh, with a quiet mind. We do this unconsciously. Surely, this is what happens, isn't it? When you have a problem, you worry over it. You want a particular result from that problem, or you translate that problem according to certain ideas. You go through all that process, and yet the problem is not solved. So, the mind, becoming weary, stops thinking about the problem. Then it is quiet, it is relaxed, it is not worried over the problem. And presently, as often happens, the solution of the problem is immediately perceived, there is a hint with regard to that problem.

So, action, surely, does not lie in conforming to a particular idea. Then it is merely a continuation of thought, it is not action. And, can we not live without conforming action to an idea? Because, ideas continue; and if we conform action to an idea, then we give continuity to action, and therefore, there is an identification with action as the me and the mine. Therefore, the strengthening, through ideation, of the me, which is the source of all conflict and misery.

Surely, immortality is not an idea. It is something beyond ideation, beyond thought, beyond the bundle of memories, which are all the me. And there is the experiencing of that state

only when ideation stops, when the thinking process stops. The experiencing of that which we call the immortal, the timeless state, is not the product of thought; because thought is merely the continuance of memory, the response to memory; and the experiencing of that extraordinary state can only come into being with the understanding of the self—not through trying to reach it, because that is merely trying to experience something which is self-projected, therefore unreal. For this reason it is important to understand the whole, total process of our consciousness, which we call the me and the mine, which can be understood only in relationship, not in isolation.

That is why it is imperative for those who would really understand truth, or reality, or God, or what you will, to fully grasp the significance of relationship; because that is the only action. If relationship is based on idea, then action is not. If I try to circumscribe my relationship, conform or limit it to an idea, which most of us do, then it is not action, there is no understanding in relationship. But if we see that that is a false process leading to illusion, to limitation, to conflict, to separateness—ideas always separate—, then we will begin to understand relationship *directly*, and not impose upon relationship a prejudice, a condition. Then we will see that love is not a thought process. You cannot think about love. But most of us do, and so it is merely sensation. And, if we limit relationship to an idea based on sensation, then we discard love, then we fill our hearts with the things of the mind. Though we may feel the sensation and call it love, it is not love. Surely, love is something beyond the thought process, but it can be discovered only through understanding the thought process in relationship; not through denying the thought process, but through being aware of the whole significance of the ways of our mind and of our action in relationship. If we can proceed more deeply,

then we will see that action is not related to idea. Then action is from moment to moment; and in that experience, which is right meditation, there is immortality.

Question : What place has criticism in relationship? What is the difference between destructive and constructive criticism?

KRISHNAMURTI: First of all, why do we criticize? Is it in order to understand? Or is it merely a nagging process? If I criticize you, do I understand you? Does understanding come through judgment? If I want to comprehend, if I want to understand, not superficially but deeply, the whole significance of my relationship to you, do I begin to criticize you? Or, am I aware of this relationship between you and me, silently observing it—not projecting my opinions, criticisms, judgments, identifications, or condemnations, but silently observing what is happening? And, if I do not criticize, what happens? One is apt to go to sleep, is one not? Which does not man that we do not go to sleep if we are nagging. Perhaps that becomes a habit; and we put ourselves to sleep through habit. Is there a deeper, wider understanding of relationship, through criticism? It doesn't matter whether criticism is constructive or destructive—that is irrelevant, surely. Therefore, the question is: What is the necessary state of mind and heart that will understand relationship? What is the process of understanding? How do we understand something? How do you understand your child, if you are interested in your child? You observe, don't you? You watch him at play, you study him in his different moods; you don't project your opinion onto him. You don't say he should be this or that. You are alertly watchful, aren't you?, actively aware. Then, perhaps, you begin to understand the child. But if

you are constantly criticizing, constantly injecting your own particular personality, your idiosyncrasies, your opinions, deciding the way he should or should not be, and all the rest of it, obviously you create a barrier in that relationship. But, unfortunately, most of us criticize in order to shape, in order to interfere; and it gives us a certain amount of pleasure, a certain gratification, to shape something—your relationship with your husband, child, or whoever it be. You feel a sense of power in it, you are the boss; and in that there is a tremendous gratification. Surely, through all that process there is no understanding of relationship. There is mere imposition, the desire to mould another to the particular pattern of your idiosyncrasy, your desire, your wish. All these prevent, do they not?, the understanding of relationship.

Then, there is self-criticism. To be critical of oneself, to criticize, condemn, or justify oneself—does that bring understanding of oneself? When I begin to criticize myself, do I not limit the process of understanding, of exploring? Does introspection, a form of self-criticism, unfold the self? What makes the unfolding of the self possible? To be constantly analytical, fearful, critical—surely, that does not help to unfold. What brings about the unfolding of the self so that you begin to understand it, is the constant awareness of it without any condemnation, without any identification. There must be a certain spontaneity; you cannot be constantly analyzing it, disciplining it, shaping it. This spontaneity is essential to understanding. If I merely limit, control, condemn, then I put a stop to the movement of thought and feeling, do I not? It is in the movement of thought and feeling that I discover—not in mere control. And, when one discovers, then it is important to find out how to act about it. Now, if I act according to an idea, according to a standard, according to an ideal,

then I force the self into a particular pattern. In that there is no understanding, there is no transcending. But if I can watch the self without any condemnation, without any identification, then it is possible to go beyond it. That is why this whole process of approximating oneself to an ideal is so utterly wrong. Ideals are home-made gods; and to conform to a self-projected image, is surely not a release.

So, there can be understanding only when the mind is silently aware, observing—which is arduous, because we take delight in being active, in being restless, critical, in condemning, justifying. That is our whole structure of being; and through the screen of ideas, prejudices, points of view, experiences, memories, we try to understand. Is it possible to be free of all these screens, and so understand directly? Surely, we do that when the problem is very intense; we do not go through all these methods—we approach it directly. So, the understanding of relationship comes only when this process of self-criticism is understood, and the mind is quiet. If you are listening to me and are trying to follow, with not too great an effort, what I wish to convey, then there is a possibility of our understanding each other. But if you are all the time criticizing, throwing up your opinions, what you have learned from books, what somebody else has told you, and so on and so on, then you and I are not related, because this screen is between us. But if we are both trying to find out the issues of the problem, which lie in the problem itself, if both of us are eager to go to the bottom of it, find the truth of it, discover what it is—then we are related. Then your mind is both alert and passive, watching to see what is true in this. So, your mind must be extraordinarily swift, not anchored to any idea or ideal, to any judgment, to any opinion that you have consolidated through your particular experiences. Understanding comes, surely, when there is the

swift pliability of a mind which is passively aware. Then it is capable of reception, then it is sensitive. A mind is not sensitive when it is crowded with ideas, prejudices, opinions, either for or against.

So, to understand relationship, there must be a passive awareness—which does not destroy relationship. On the contrary, it makes relationship much more vital, much more significant. Then there is in that relationship a possibility of real affection; there is a warmth, a sense of nearness, which is not mere sentiment or sensation. And if we can so approach or be in that relationship to everything, then our problems will be easily solved—the problems of property, the problems of possession. Because, we are that which we possess. The man who possesses money, is the money. The man who identifies himself with property, is the property, or the house, or the furniture. Similarly with ideas, or with people; and when there is possessiveness, there is no relationship. But most of us possess because we have nothing else, if we do not possess. We are empty shells if we do not possess, if we do not fill our life with furniture, with music, with knowledge, with this or that. And that shell makes a lot of noise, and that noise we call living; and with that we are satisfied. And when there is a disruption, a breaking away of that, then there is sorrow; because then you suddenly discover yourself as you are—an empty shell, without much meaning. So, to be aware of the whole content of relationship, is action; and from that action there is a possibility of true relationship, a possibility of discovering its great depth, its great significance, and of knowing what love is.

Question: When you speak of timelessness, it seems you must mean something besides a sequence of events. Time, to me, is necessary for action, and I cannot imagine

existence without a sequence of events. Do you perhaps mean that, by knowing what part of you is eternal, time no longer becomes a means to an end, or a means to progress?

KRISHNAMURTI: First of all, we cannot discuss what the timeless is. A mind that is the product of time cannot think of something which is timeless. Because, after all, my mind, your mind, is a result of the past; it is founded upon the past, its thought is the outcome of the past, which is time. And with that instrument, we try to think of something which is not of time; and that is not possible, surely. We can speculate upon it, we can write books about it, we can imagine it, do all kinds of tricks with it; but it will not be the real. So, do not let us speculate about it. Let us not even talk about it. To speculate what the timeless state is, is utterly useless, it has no meaning. But we can do something else, which is to find out how to make the mind free from its own past, from its own self-projection; we can find out what gives it continuity, a sequence of events as a means of progress, as a means of understanding, what you will. We can see that a thing which continues, must decay. That which has continuance, cannot renew itself. Only that which comes to an end, can renew. A mind that is merely caught in a habit, or in a particular opinion, or held in the net of ideals, beliefs, dogmas—for such a mind there can be no renewal, surely. It cannot look at life anew. It is only when those things are put aside, and it is free, that the mind can look at life anew. There is a renewal, a creative urge, only when the past has come to an end, which means, when there is no longer identification giving continuity as the me and the mine—my property, my home, my wife, my child, my ideal, my gods, my political opinions. It is this constant identification that gives continuity to the sequence of events as the me becoming wider, bigger,

nobler, more worthy, cleverer, and so on and so on.

Is life, existence, a matter of the sequence of events? What do we mean by sequence of events? Do I know that I am alive because I remember yesterday? Do I know that I am alive because I know the way to my house? Or do I know that I am alive because I am going to be somebody? How do I know that I am alive? It is only in the present, surely, that I know I am conscious. Is consciousness merely the result of the sequence of events? With most of us, it is. I know I am alive, I am conscious, because of my past, of my identification with something. Is it possible to know that one is conscious, without this process of identification? And, why does one identify? Why do I identify myself as my property, my name, my ambition, my progress? Why? And what would happen if we did not identify? Would it deny all existence? Perhaps, if we did not identify, there might be a wider field for action, a greater depth to feeling and to thought. We identify because it gives us the feeling of being alive as an entity, as a separate entity. So, the feeling that one is separate has become important because through separateness we enjoy the more; and if we deny separateness, we are afraid that we shall not be capable of enjoying, having pleasures. Surely, that is the basis of the desire for continuity, is it not? But there is also a collective process at work. Since separateness involves a great deal of destruction and so on, there is in opposition to that, collectivism, discarding the individual separateness. But the individual becomes the collective through another form of identification, and so retains his separateness—as we can see.

As long as there is continuity through identification, there can be no renewal. Only with the cessation of identification is there a possibility of renewal. And most of us are frightened of coming to an end. Most

of us are frightened of death. Innumerable books have been written about what is after death. We are more interested in death than in living. Because, with death, there seems to be an end, an end to identification. That which continues, surely, has no rebirth, no renewal. Only in dying is there renewal; and therefore it is important to die every minute—not wait to die of old age and disease. That means dying to all one's accumulations and identifications, one's gathered experiences; and that is real simplicity, not the accumulated continuance of identification.

So, when this process of identification—which revives memory and gives continuance to memory in the present—when that ceases, then there is a possibility of rebirth, renewal, creativeness; and in that renewal there is no continuity. That which renews cannot continue. It is from moment to moment.

The questioner asks also: "Do you perhaps mean that, by knowing what part of you is eternal, time no longer becomes a means to an end?" Is there a part of you that is eternal? That which you can think about is still the product of thought, and therefore not the eternal. Because, thought is the result of the past, of time. And if you posit a something eternal in you, you have already thought about it. I am not cleverly arguing this matter. You can see very well that the eternal is not what you can think about. You cannot progress to the eternal, you cannot evolve to it; if you do, it is merely a projection of thought, and therefore still within the net of time. That way leads to illusion, misery, to all the ugliness of deception—which we like; because the mind can function only within the known, from safety to safety, from security to security. The eternal is not, if it is within the bondage of time; and the moment the mind thinks about it, it is in the bondage of time, and therefore it is not real.

So, when you perceive this whole process of identification, when you see how thought gives continuity to things in order to be secure, how the thinker separates himself from the thought and thereby makes himself secure—when you see all this process of time and understand it, not merely verbally, but deeply feel it, inwardly experience it, then you will find that you no longer think of the timeless. Then the mind is quiet, not only superficially, but profoundly; then it becomes tranquil—is tranquil. Then there is a direct experience of that which is measureless. But merely to speculate upon what is the timeless, is a waste of time. You might just as well play poker. All speculation is brushed aside the moment you have a direct experience. And that is what we are discussing—how to have this direct experience, without the intervention of the mind. But when once there is this direct experiencing, the mind clings to the *sensations* of it, and then wants a repetition of that experience; which means, really, that the mind is interested in sensation, not in experiencing. Therefore, mind can never experience, it can only know sensations. The experiencing comes only when the mind is not the experiencer. So, the timeless cannot be known, or imagined, or experienced through the mind. And as that is the only instrument which we have cultivated, at the expense of everything else, we are lost when we look at the process of the mind. We *must* be lost. We must come to an end—which is not despair, not fear. Know the process of the mind, see what it is; and when you see what it is, it comes to an end, without any enforcement. Only then is there a possibility of that renewal which is eternal.

Question: Is there a gulf, an interval of any duration, between my perceiving something, and being or realizing it? Does not this interval imply an ideal at one end, and its

realization at the other, through practice and technique? It is this 'how' or the method that we want from you.

KRISHNAMURTI: Is there an interval between perception and action? Most of us would say yes. We say there is an interval: I see, and later on I will act. I understand intellectually, but how am I to put it into practice? I see what you mean, but I don't know how to carry it out. This gap, this gulf, this interval, is it necessary? Or, are we only deceiving ourselves? When I say, 'I see', I really *don't* see. If I do see, then there is no problem. If I see something, action follows. If I see a poisonous snake, I don't say, 'I see, and how am I to act?' I act. But we *don't* see; and we don't see, because we don't *want* to see; because it is too imminent, too dangerous, too vital. To see would upset our whole process of thinking, living. Therefore, we say, 'I see, and please tell me how to act'. Therefore you are interested in the method, the 'how' to do it, the practice. So we say, 'I see the idea, I comprehend, but how am I to act?' Then we try to bridge, to connect the action with the idea, and we get lost. Then we search for methods. You go to various teachers, psychologists, *gurus*, or what you will, and you join societies that will help you to bridge the action with the idea. That is a very convenient way of living, a happy escape, a very respectable way of avoiding action. And, in that process, we are all caught. I realize I must be virtuous, I must not be angry, mean—but please tell me how to do it. And this process of 'how to do it' becomes a religious investment, an exploitation, and all the rest of it follows—vast properties, you know, the whole game of it. In other words, we *don't* see, and we don't *want* to see. But we don't say that honestly. The moment we admit that, we have to act. Then we know we are deceiving ourselves, and it is very un-

pleasant. So we say, 'Please, I am gradually learning, I am still weak, I am not strong enough, it is a matter of progress, evolution, growth; eventually I will get there'. So, we should never say that we see, or perceive, or understand; because mere verbalization has no significance. There is no gap between seeing and acting. The moment you see, you act. You do that when you are driving a car. If you did not, there would be danger. But we have invented so many ways of avoiding. We have become so clever, so cunning, as not to change radically. But there is no gap between perception and action. When you see a poisonous snake, how quickly you respond; the action is instantaneous. When there is a gap, it indicates sluggishness of the mind, laziness, avoidance. And that avoidance, that laziness, becomes very respectable, because all of us are doing it. So, you look for a method to bridge the idea with the action, and so you live in illusion. And perhaps you may like it. But for a man who actually perceives, there is no problem; there is action. We do not perceive because of our innumerable prejudices, our disinclination, our laziness, our hopes that something will alter it.

So, to think in terms of idea separate from action is obviously ignorant. To say, 'I will be something'—the Buddha, the Master, what you will—is obviously a wrong process. What is important is to understand what you are now; and that cannot be understood if you are postponing, if you have an interval between the ideal and yourself. And as most of us indulge in that particular form of excitement, obviously you will pay scant attention to all this. Ideas can *never* free action. On the contrary, ideas limit action; and there is action only when I understand as I go along, from moment to moment, not tethered to particular beliefs, or to a particular ideal which I am going to realize. That is to die from moment to moment, in which there is rene-

wal. And that renewal will answer the next problem. That renewal gives a new light, a new significance to everything. And there can be renewal only when there is freedom from the gap, from the gulf, from the interval, between idea and action.

Question: You often speak of living, experiencing, and yet being as nothing. What is this state of consciously being as nothing? Has this anything to do with humility, being open to the grace of God?

KRISHNAMURTI: To be consciously anything, is not to be free. If I am conscious that I am non-greedy, beyond anger, surely I am not free from greed, anger. Humility is something of which you cannot be conscious. To cultivate humility, is to cultivate self-expansion negatively. Therefore, any virtue that is deliberately cultivated, practised, lived, is obviously not virtue. It is a form of resistance; it is a form of self-expansion, which has its own gratification. But it is no longer virtue. Virtue is merely a freedom in which you discover the real. Without virtue, there can be no freedom. Virtue is not an end in itself. Now, it is not possible, by deliberate, conscious effort, to be as nothing, because then, it is another achievement. Innocence is not the result of careful cultivation. To be as nothing, is essential. As a cup is useful only when it is empty, so only when one is as nothing, is it possible to receive the grace of God, or truth, or what you will. Is it possible to be nothing in the sense of *arriving* at it? Can you achieve it? As you have built a house, or gathered money, can you get this also? To sit down and meditate about nothingness, consciously throwing out everything, making yourself receptive, surely, is a form of resistance, isn't it? That is a deliberate action of the will, and will is desire; and when you desire to be nothing, you are something already. Please, see the

importance of this: When you desire positive things, you know what it implies—struggle, pain; and so you reject them, and you say to yourself, 'Now I will be nothing'. The desire is still the same, it is the same process in another direction. The will to be nothing, is as the will to be something. So, the problem is not to be nothing, or to be something, but to understand the whole process of desire: craving to be, or not to be. In that process the entity that desires is different from desire. You don't say, 'Desire is me', but, 'I am desirous of something'. Therefore, there is a separation between the experiencer, the thinker, and the experience, the thought. Don't, please, make this metaphysical and difficult. You can look at it very simply—simply, in the sense that one can feel one's way into it.

So, as long as there is the desire to be nothing, you are something. And that desire to be something divides you as the experiencer and the experience; and in that condition, there is no possibility of experiencing. Because, in the state of experiencing, there is neither the experiencer nor the experience. When you are experiencing something, you aren't thinking that *you* are experiencing. When you are really happy, you don't say, 'I am happy'. The moment you say it, it is gone. So, our problem is not how to be nothing, which is really quite childish, or how to learn a new jargon and try to become that jargon, but how to understand the whole process of desire, craving. And it is so subtle, so complex, that you must approach it very simply—not with all the conflicts of condemnation, justification, what it should be, what it should not be, how it must be destroyed, how it must be sublimated—all of which you have learned from books, from religious organizations. If we can discard all that, and merely silently observe the process of desire, which is oneself—which is not, *you* experience desire, but *experiencing* desire—, then we will see that there

is a freedom from this burning, constant urge to be or not to be, to become, to gain, to be the Master, to have virtue, and all the idiocy of desire and its pursuits. Then there can be a direct experiencing, that is, experiencing without the observer. Then only is there a possibility of being completely open, of being as nothing; and then there is the reception of the real.

August 14, 1949.

XI

We have been discussing, for the past several weeks, the problem of understanding oneself. Because, the more one thinks about the many conflicting and ever-increasing problems of life, private and social, the more one sees that, unless there is a fundamental, radical transformation within oneself, obviously it is not possible to deal with those problems that confront each one of us. So, it is essential, is it not?, if one is to resolve any of these problems of our life, to tackle them oneself directly, to be in relationship with them, and not merely rely on specialists, experts, religious leaders, or political givers of panaceas. And, as our life, our culture and civilization, are getting more and more complicated, it is becoming correspondingly difficult to deal with the ever-increasing problems directly.

Now, it seems to me that one of the problems, amongst others, which most of us have not very deeply and fundamentally faced, is the question of domination and submission. And, if I may, I would like to discuss this double-sided nature of domination rather briefly and succinctly before I answer the questions. Why is it that we dominate, consciously or unconsciously—the man and the woman, the woman and the man, and so on? There is domination in different ways, not only in private life, but the whole tendency of governments

is also to dominate. Why is this spirit of domination going on constantly, from period to period? Only very few seem to escape it. Can we think of it in a different sense? That is, can we understand it without going to the opposite? Because, the moment we recognize it, the moment we are aware of this problem of domination, we at once begin to submit, or we think of it in terms of the opposite, submission. Can we not think without the opposite, and look at the problem directly? Perhaps we shall then be able to understand this whole complex problem of domination, seeking power over another, or submitting oneself to another. After all, submission is another form of domination. To submit oneself to another, whether it be to a man or to a woman, is the negative form of domination. By the very denial of domination, one becomes submissive; and I do not think we shall be able to solve this problem by thinking in terms of the opposite. So, let us go into it, and see why it exists.

First of all, one must be aware, must one not?, of the obvious, crude form of domination. Most of us are aware of it, if we are at all alert. But there is the unconscious domination, of which most of us are unaware. That is, this unconscious desire to dominate takes the guise or the cloak of service, of love, of being kind, and so on. The unconscious desire to dominate exists under different forms; and I think it is much more important to understand this fact, than merely to try to regulate the superficial domination of one by another.

Now, why is it that we unconsciously want to dominate? Probably most of us are unaware that we dominate at different levels—not only in the family, but at the verbal level as well; and also there is this inward desire to seek power, to seek success, which are all indications of domination. Why? Why do we want to dominate another? Or, be subservient to another? If one delibera-

tely, consciously, put that question to oneself, what would be the response? Most of us wouldn't know why we want to dominate. First of all, there is in it the sensation, the unconscious pleasure of dominating somebody. Is that the only motive which makes us want to dominate? Surely, that is part of it; but there is much more to it, a much deeper significance. I wonder if you have ever watched yourself dominating in relationship, either as the man or as the woman? And if you have been conscious of it, what has been your response, your reaction? And why shouldn't we dominate? In relationship, which is life, do we understand through domination? In relationship, if I dominate you or you dominate me, do we understand each other? After all, that is life, isn't it? Relationship is life, relationship is action; and if I merely live in the self-enclosing action of domination, is there any relationship? Is not domination a process of isolation, which denies relationship? Is not domination a process of separation which destroys relationship? And is this really what I am seeking? And can there be relationship between two people, if there is any sense of domination or submission? Life is relationship—one cannot live in isolation. But, is not our purpose unconsciously to isolate ourselves within the cloak, within that feeling of aggressive assertiveness which is domination?

So, is not the process of domineering a process of isolation, and isn't this what most of us want? Most of us sedulously cultivate it. Because, to be open in relationship is very painful, it needs extraordinary intelligence and adaptability, quickness, understanding; and when that is not, we try to isolate ourselves. And is not the process of domination, a process of isolation? Obviously, it is. It is a process of self-enclosure. And when I am enclosed, encased in my own opinion, my own desires, my own ambitions, my urge to dominate, am I related? And if there is no

relationship, how is any real existence possible? Is there not constant friction, and therefore sorrow? So, our unconscious desire in relationship is not to be hurt, to seek security, refuge; and when that is thwarted, there is no fulfilment. Then I begin to isolate myself. And one of the processes of isolation is domination. And that fear which leads to isolation takes another form also, does it not? There is not only the desire to assert, to dominate, or be submissive, but there is also in this process of isolation the consciousness of being alone, of being lonely. After all, most of us are lonely—I won't use the word 'alone', for that has a different sense. Most of us are isolated, we live in our own world, though we may be related; though we may be married and have children, we live in a world of our own. And that is a very lonely world. It is a sorrowful world, with an occasional opening of joy and amusement, happiness, and so on; but it is a solitary world. And, to escape from that, we try to be something, we try to assert, we try to dominate. And hence, in order to escape from what we are, domination becomes a means through which we can take flight from ourselves.

So, does not this whole process of domination take place not only when there is the desire to avoid facing that which we are, but also when there is a desire to be isolated? If we can look at this process in ourselves, not in any condemnatory spirit, which is merely taking the opposite side, but to understand why we have this extraordinary desire to dominate, or to become very subservient; if we can be aware of it without any sense of taking the opposite side, I think we will really experience that state of isolation from which we are trying to run away; and then we shall be able to solve it. That is, if we understand something, we are free of it. It is only when we do not understand, that there is fear.

So, can we look at this problem

without condemnation? Can we merely observe, silently watch this process at work within ourselves? It can be observed very easily in all our relationships. Just silently watch the whole phenomenon unfold itself. You will find that when there is no condemnation, no justification for your domination, it begins to unfold, there is no hindrance; then you will begin to see all the implications, not only of personal domination, but also of public domination, the domination of one group by another, of one country by another, of one ideology by another, and so on. Self-knowledge is essential for any kind of understanding. And as our relationship is life—without relationship there can be no existence—, if you approach it rightly you begin to see this process of domination expressing itself in so many ways; and when you understand this whole process, conscious as well as unconscious, there is a freedom from it. Surely, there *must* be freedom; and only then is there a possibility of going beyond. Because, a mind that is merely dominating, asserting, tethered to a particular form of belief, to a particular opinion, cannot go further, cannot take a long journey, cannot soar. And so, is it not essential, in understanding oneself, to understand this most difficult and complex problem of domination? It takes such subtle forms; and when it takes a righteous form, it becomes very obstinate. The desire to serve, with the unconscious desire to dominate, is much more difficult to deal with. Can there be love when there is domination? Can you be in relationship to someone whom you say you love, and yet dominate? Then, surely, you are merely using; and when there is using, there is no relationship, is there?

So, to understand this problem, one has to be sensitive to the whole question of domination. Not that you should not dominate, or be submissive; but there should be aware-

ness of this whole problem. To be aware, one must approach it without any condemnation, not taking sides; and it is a very difficult thing to do, because most of us are swayed to condemn. And we condemn because we think we understand. We don't. The moment we condemn, we stop understanding. That is one of the easiest ways of brushing things aside—to condemn somebody. But to understand this whole process requires great alertness of mind; and a mind is not alert when it is condemning, or justifying, or merely identifying itself with what it feels.

So, self-knowledge is a constant discovery from moment to moment; but that discovery is denied if the past throws up an opinion, a barrier; the cumulative action of the mind prevents immediate understanding.

I have several questions; but, before I answer them, may I say that those of you who are taking notes, should not do so. I will explain why: I am talking to an individual, to you, not to a group. You and I together are experiencing something. You are not taking notes of what I am saying, you are experiencing. We are going together on a journey; and if you are merely concerned with taking notes, you are not really listening. You take it down in order to think it over, you will say, or in order to tell some of your friends who are not here. But, surely, that is not important, is it? What is important is that you and I understand; and to understand, you must give your full attention. And how can you give your full attention when you are taking notes? Please, see the importance of this, and then you will naturally abstain from taking notes. You don't have to be compelled, you don't have to be told. Because, what is important in these meetings is not so much the words, but the content behind, the psychological implications; and you cannot understand those unless you give your *full* attention, your *conscious* attention.

Question: Is not the experience of the past a help towards freedom and right action in the present? Cannot knowledge be a liberating factor, and not a hindrance?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do we understand the present through the past? Do we understand something through the accumulation of experiences? What do we mean by knowledge? What do we mean by the accumulation of experiences which you say gives you understanding? What do we mean by all that? And what do we mean by past experience? Let's go into it a little bit, because it is very important to find out whether the past which is the accumulation of your memories of incidents, of experiences, will give you understanding of an experience in the present.

Now, what happens when there is an experience? What is the process of it? What is an experience? A challenge and a response, is it not? That is what we call experience. Now, the challenge must always be new, otherwise it is not a challenge; and do I meet it adequately, fully, completely, if I respond according to my past conditioning? Do I understand it? After all, life is a process of challenge and response. That is the constant process. And there is friction between challenge and response when the response is inadequate—there is sorrow, pain. When the response is equal to the challenge, then there is harmony; then there is integration between challenge and response. Now, can my response to a challenge, if it is based on the various experiences of the past, can such a response be adequate? Can it meet the challenge on the same level? And what is the response? The response is the outcome of the accumulation of various experiences—the memory, the sensation of various experiences; not the experience itself, but the memory and the sensation of the experience. Therefore, it is sensation which meets the challenge, it is memory which meets the challenge.

That is what we call accumulated knowledge, isn't it? Therefore, knowledge is always the known; the past, the conditioned; the conditioned meets the unconditioned, the challenge, and therefore there is no relationship between the two; then you translate the challenge according to the conditioned mind, conditioned responses. And is that not a hindrance?

So, how to meet the challenge adequately is the question. If I meet it with my past experiences, I can see very well that it is not adequate. And my mind is the past; my thought is the result of the past. So, can thought meet the challenge—thought, the outcome of knowledge, the result of various experiences, and so on? Can thought meet the challenge? As thought is conditioned, how can it meet it? It can meet it partially, therefore inadequately—and therefore there is friction, pain, and all the rest of it. So, there is a different way of meeting the challenge, is there not? And what is that way, that process? That is what is implied in this question.

First of all, one must see that the challenge is always new; it *must* be new, otherwise it is not a challenge. A problem is always a new problem, because it is varying from moment to moment; and if it does not, it is not a problem. It is static. So, if the challenge is new, the mind must be new; it must come to it afresh, and not burdened by the past. But the mind is the past; therefore, the mind must be silent. We do this instinctively, almost without thought, when the problem is very great; when the problem is really new, the mind is silent. It is no longer chattering, no longer burdened by accumulated knowledge. Then, with that newness it responds, and therefore there is a comprehension of the challenge. Surely, that is how all creativeness takes place. Creation, or that sense of creativeness, is from moment to moment, it has no accumulation. You may have the technique for the ex-

pression of that creativeness; but that sense of creativeness comes into being only when the mind is absolutely quiet, no longer burdened by the past, by the innumerable experiences, the sensations it has gathered.

So, the adequacy of the response to the challenge depends, not on knowledge, not on previous memories, but on its newness, freshness; and that freshness is denied, that quality of renewal is denied, when there is a continuity of accumulated experience. Therefore, there must be an ending to each minute, a death to each minute.

Please, perhaps some of you may feel that it is all very well to talk like this; but if you really experiment with it, you will see how extraordinarily, how quickly one understands the challenge, how profoundly one is related to the challenge, and not merely responding to it. Surely, one understands only when the mind is capable of renewing itself, being new, fresh—not 'open'. Then it is like a sieve. And as the problem is always new—sorrow is always new, if it is real sorrow, not merely the memory of something else—, you must understand it, approach it afresh, you must have a fresh mind. And therefore, knowledge as the accumulation of experiences, individual or collective, such knowledge is an impediment to understanding.

Question: Is my believing in the now well-authenticated fact of survival after death a hindrance to liberation through self-knowledge? Is it not essential to distinguish between belief based on objective evidence, and belief arising from inner psychological states?

KRISHNAMURTI: Surely, what is important is, not whether there is or is not continuity after death, but *why* we believe. What is the psychological state that demands belief in something? Please let us be very

clear. We are not disputing now whether there is or is not life after death. That is another question, and we shall deal with it afterwards, another time. But the question is, what is the compulsion in me, the psychological necessity, to believe? A fact does not demand a belief on your part, surely. The sun sets, the sun rises—that does not demand a belief. Belief arises only when you want to translate the fact according to your desires, to your psychological states, to suit your particular prejudices, vanities, idiosyncrasies. So, what is important is, how you approach the fact—whether it is the fact of life after death, or any other fact. So, the question is, not whether there is survival of the individual after death, after his body dies, but why you believe; what is the psychological urge to believe? Surely, that is clear, is it not? So, let us investigate whether that psychological belief is not a hindrance to understanding.

If one is confronted with a fact, there is nothing more to be said about it. It is a fact, the sun sets. But, the problem is why there is this incessant urge in me to believe in something—to believe in God, to believe in an ideology, to believe in a future Utopia, to believe in something or other. Why? Why do we believe? Why is there this psychological urge to believe? What would happen if we did not believe, if we merely looked at facts? Can we? It becomes almost impossible, does it not?, because we want to translate facts according to our sensations. So, beliefs become sensations, which intervene between the fact and myself. So, belief becomes a hindrance. Are we different from our beliefs? You believe that you are an American, or that you are a Hindu, you believe in this and that, in reincarnation—in dozens of things. You are that, are you not? You *are* what you believe. And why do you believe? Which doesn't mean that I am being atheistic, or denying God, and all that stupidity—we are not discussing

that. Reality has nothing to do with belief.

So, the problem is, why do you believe? Why the psychological necessity, the investment in belief? Is it not because, without belief you are nothing? Without the passport of belief, what are you? Without labelling yourself *as* something, what are you? If you do not believe in reincarnation, if you do not call yourself this or that, if you have no labels, what are you? Therefore, belief acts as a label, an identifying card; and remove the card, where are you? Is it not that basic fear, that sense of being lost, which necessitates belief? Please, think it over, don't reject it. Let us experience together the things that we are talking about, not merely listen, then go away and carry on with our usual beliefs and non-beliefs. We are discussing the whole problem of belief.

So, belief, the word, has become important. The label has become important. If I did not call myself a Hindu, with all its implications, I would be lost, I would have no identity. But to identify myself with India, as a Hindu, gives me tremendous prestige; it places me, it fixes me, it gives me value. So, belief becomes a necessity when I am psychologically aware, whether consciously or unconsciously, that without the label, I am lost. Then the label becomes important—not what I am, but the label: Christian, Buddhist, Hindu. And we try then to live according to those beliefs, which are self-projected, therefore unreal. Surely, the man who believes in God, his God is a self-projected God, a home-made God; but the man who does not believe in God is still the same. To understand what that is, that supreme something, one must come to it afresh, anew, not tethered to a belief. And I think that is our difficulty—socially, economically, politically, and in our individual relationships—, that is, we approach all these problems with a prejudice; and as the problems are vital, living, they

can be met adequately only when the mind is new, not tethered to some self-projected, home-made belief.

So, belief becomes a hindrance, obviously, when the desire for belief is not understood; and when it is understood, there is no question of belief. Then you are able to face facts as they are. But even if there is continuity after death, does it solve the problem of living in the present? If I know that I am going to live after this thing dies, have I understood life?—which is *now*, not tomorrow. And to understand the present, do I have to believe? Surely, to understand the present, which is living, which is not merely a period of time, I must have a mind that is capable of meeting that present completely, giving it full attention. But if my attention is distracted by a belief, surely there is no meeting of the present completely, fully.

So, belief becomes a hindrance to the understanding of reality. As reality is the unknown, and belief is the known, how can the known meet the unknown? But our difficulty is, we want the unknown with the known. We don't want to let go the known, because it is too frightening, there is great insecurity, uncertainty; and that is why, to safeguard ourselves, we hedge ourselves about with beliefs. It is only in the state of uncertainty, insecurity, in which there is no sense of refuge, that you discover. That is why you must be lost in order to find. But we don't want to be lost. And to prevent ourselves from getting lost, we have home-made beliefs and gods to protect us. And when the moment of real crisis comes, these gods and beliefs have no value; and hence beliefs are an impediment to him who really wants to discover what is.

Question: Why is it that, in spite of all you have said against authority, certain individuals identify themselves with you or with your state of being, and thereby gain authority

for themselves? How can the inexperienced prevent themselves from being caught in the net of these individuals? (Laughter).

KRISHNAMURTI: Sir, this is quite an important question, because it brings up the matter of our desire to identify ourselves with something. First of all, why do you want to identify yourself with me, or with my state of being, or whatever it is? How do you know it? Because I happen to talk, or happen to have a name? Surely, you are identifying yourself with something which you have projected. You are not identifying yourself with something that is alive. You are identifying yourself with something which is self-created, and you give it a label; and that label happens to be well-known, or known to a few; and this identification gives you prestige. And then you can exploit people. You know, by calling yourself a friend of somebody, or a disciple of somebody, you gain a reflected glory. You go all the way to India to find your god, or your Master, and then identify yourself with that particular cult or that particular idea, and it gives you a certain boost. And then you can exploit the people around you. It is such a stupid process. It gives you a sense of authority, of power, to think that you are the one person that understands; everybody else doesn't understand; you are the nearest disciple—you know, the various forms which we use in order to exploit the blind.

So, the first thing to understand is the desire to exploit people, which means the desire to have for yourself power, position, prestige. And as everybody wants that, the inexperienced as well as the experienced, everybody is caught mutually in the net. We all want to exploit somebody. We don't put it so brutally, but cover it up with soft words. As all of us depend on others, not only for our physical necessities, but also for our psychological necessities, we

all use others. If I used you in order to express myself at these meetings, you would like it much more; and I would feel gratified and we would be mutually exploiting each other, surely. But such a process denies a search for truth, the search for reality. You cannot prevent the inexperienced from being caught in the net of these individuals who claim they understand, who are the 'nearest'. Sir, perhaps you yourself may be caught in it; because we do not want to be free from all identification. Surely, truth has nothing to do with any individual; it does not depend on the interpretation of any individual. You have to experience it directly, not through somebody; and it is not a matter of sensation, not a matter of belief. But if we are caught in sensation and belief, then we will use others. So, if one is really seeking truth, honestly, directly, then there is no question of exploiting anybody. But that requires a great deal of honesty; that entails an aloneness, which can be understood only when one has been through loneliness, and has gone into it fully, completely. And as most of us do not want to go through the pain, the sorrow, of facing the complications of our psychological states, we are distracted by these exploiters; and we like to be exploited. It requires a great deal of patient awareness, of freedom from identification with anything, to understand, to grasp the whole significance of reality.

August 20, 1949.

XII

I do not know with what attitude one listens to these talks. I am afraid one is apt to listen to them with the intention of developing a method, a technique, a way; and I think it is very important to understand that tendency; because, if we are caught in a technique, in a way, in a method,

we shall lose entirely the creative release. That is, through the cultivation of a technique, of a method, we shall lose creativeness. And I would like to discuss this morning, what are the implications in the cultivation of a technique, a method, a way, and how it dulls the mind, not only at the verbal level, but at the deeper psychological levels. Because, most of us are uncreative. We may paint a little, write a poem or two occasionally, or on rare occasions enjoy beautiful scenery; but for the most part our minds are so caught in the way, in habit, which is a form of technique, that we do not seem to be able to go beyond. The problems of life do not demand a method, because they are so vital, they are so alive, that if we approach any one of them with a fixed pattern, a method, a way, we shall totally misunderstand, we shall not adequately meet that problem. And, most of us want a technique, a method; because the problem, the movement of life, is so alive, so vital, so swift, that our minds are incapable of meeting it rapidly, swiftly, with clarity; and we think that we shall be able to meet it, if we know *how* to meet it. So, we try to learn from another the *how*, the method, the technique, the way, the means.

I am not at all sure that most of us here are not concerned with the means. Don't deny it, because it is extremely difficult to be free from the desire for a technique in order to achieve. Because, when we have a means, we emphasize the end, the result. We are more concerned with the result than with the understanding of the problem itself, whatever the outcome may be. Why is it that most of us seek a method for happiness, for the right way of thinking, for peace of mind or peace of soul, or whatever it is?

First of all, we carry over the mentality of industrial technology to meet life. That is, we want to meet life efficiently; and to meet it efficiently, we think we need a method;

and most religious societies, most teachers, offer a method: how to be peaceful, how to be happy, how to have a tranquil mind, how to concentrate, and so on, and so on. Now, where there is efficiency, there is ruthlessness; and the more you are efficient, the more intolerant, the more enclosed, the more resistant you are. This gradually develops the sense of pride; and pride, obviously, is isolating, it is destructive to understanding. We admire efficient people; and governments throughout the world are concerned with the cultivation of efficiency and the organization of efficiency: efficiency to produce, to kill, to carry out the ideology of a party, of a church, or of a particular religion. We all want to be efficient, and thereby we cultivate the psychological demand for a pattern to which we will conform in order to achieve efficiency. Efficiency, which means the cultivation of a technique, of a method, implies the constant practice of a habit, psychologically. We know about the industrial habits, but very little about the psychological habit of resistance. And I am not at all sure that that is not what most of us are seeking: the cultivation of a habit which will make us efficient to meet life, which is so swift. So, if we can understand, not only at the verbal level, but at the deeper, psychological levels, this whole process of the cultivation of technique, method, means, then we shall be able to understand, I think, what it is to be creative. Because, when there is the creative urge, it will find its own technique or its own means of expression. But if we are consumed, taken up, with the cultivation of a technique, obviously we shall never find the other. And why is it that we want technique, the psychological pattern of action which gives us certainty, efficiency, a continuity, a sustained effort? After all, if you must read religious books, most of them, I am pretty sure—not that I have read any of them—, contain the way. The *way* becomes important,

because the way points the goal ; therefore, the goal is separate from the way. Is that so ? Is the means different from the end ? If, psychologically, you cultivate a habit, a method, a means, a way, a technique, is not the end already projected, already crystallized ? Therefore, the means and the end are not separate. That is, you cannot have peace in the world through violent methods, at whatever level. The means and the end are inseparable ; and a mind that cultivates a habit will create the end which is already foreseen, already cultivated, already existent, projected by the mind. And that is what most of us want. The technique is only the cultivation of the known, of security, of certainty ; and with the known the mind wants to perceive the unknown ; therefore, it can never understand it. So, the *means* matters, not the end ; because the end and the means are one. So, the mind which cultivates habit, way, technique, prevents creativeness, that extraordinary sense of spontaneous discovery.

Our problem, then, is not to cultivate a new technique, a new habit, or to discover a new way, but to be altogether free of the psychological search for a technique. If you have something to say, you will say it, the right words will come out. But if you have nothing to say, and you cultivate a marvellous eloquence, you know, go to schools to learn how to speak, then what you project, what you say, will have very little meaning.

So, why is it that most of us are seeking a method, a technique ? Obviously, we want to be sure, to be certain not to go wrong ; we do not want to experiment, to discover. The practice of a technique prevents discovery from moment to moment ; because truth, or what you will, is from moment to moment, it is not a continuous, increasing, growing arc. So, can we be free from the psychological urge to be sure, to cultivate a habit, a practice ? These are all

resistances, defences ; and with this defensive mechanism, we want to understand something which is vital, swift. Now, if we can see that, see the implications in the cultivation or the search for a means, if we can see its psychological significance—not merely the superficial or industrial significance, which is obvious ; if we can understand it fully, as I am explaining it and as you and I are experimenting with it, then perhaps we can discover what it means to be free of it. And, is it possible to be free from the desire to be secure psychologically ? Technique, a means, offers security. You run in a groove, and then there is no going right or wrong ; you are merely functioning automatically. Is it possible for a mind which has been trained for centuries to cultivate habit, a means—is it possible for such a mind to be free ? It is possible only when we realize the whole significance of habit, the total process of its momentum. That is, as I am talking about it, silently observe your own process, be aware of the cumulative effect of all your desires to succeed, to gain, to achieve, which denies understanding. Because, the understanding of life, of this total process, does not come through desire—there must be a spontaneous meeting with it. If one can see this whole psychological process, as well as its outward expression—how all the governments, all society, all the various communities demand efficiency with all its ruthlessness—, then perhaps the mind will begin to break away from its accustomed habits. Then it will really be free, no longer seeking a means. Then, when the mind is quiet, there comes that creative something, which is creation itself. It will find its own expression, you don't have to choose an expression for it. If you are a painter, you will paint. It is that creative understanding that is vital, that gives grace, that gives happiness—not the technical expression of something which you have learnt.

So, reality, or God, or what you

will, is something that cannot come through a technique, through a means, through long, determined practice and discipline. It is not a course laid out, with a known end. One must enter the uncharted sea. There must be an aloneness. Aloneness implies no means. You are not alone when you have a means. There must be complete nakedness, emptiness of all these accumulated practices, hopes, pleasures, desires for security—which are all consistently maintaining a means, a method, a technique. Then only is there the other, and then the problem is solved. A man who is dying from moment to moment, and therefore renewing, is able to meet life. It is not that he is separate from life; he is life.

Question: How can one be aware of an emotion without naming or labelling it? If I am aware of a feeling, I seem to know what that feeling is, almost immediately after it arises. Or, do you mean something different when you say, 'do not name'?

KRISHNAMURTI: This is a very difficult problem, and it requires a great deal of thinking, being aware of the whole content of it; and as I explain it, I hope you will follow, not merely verbally, but through experiencing it. I feel, if we can understand this question fully, deeply, we shall have understood a great deal. I shall try to approach it from different directions, if I can in the given time, because it is a very intricate and subtle problem. It requires all your attention, because you are experiencing what we are discussing, not merely listening and trying to experience it afterwards. There is no afterwards: either you experience now, always now, or never.

Now, why do we name anything? Why do we give a label to a flower, to a person, to a feeling? Either to

communicate one's feeling, to describe the flower, and so on, and so on; or, to identify oneself with that feeling. Isn't it? I name something, a feeling, to communicate it. 'I am angry'. Or, I identify myself with that feeling in order to strengthen it, to dissolve it, or to do something about it. That is, we give a name to something, to a rose, to communicate it to others; or, by giving it a name, we think we have understood it. We say, 'That is a rose', rapidly look at it, and go on. By giving it a name, we think we have understood it; we have classified it, and think that thereby we have understood the whole content and the beauty of that flower.

Now, when not merely to communicate, what happens when we give a name to a flower, to anything? Please follow it, think it out with me. Though I may talk aloud, you also are participating in the talking. By giving a name to something, we have merely put it into a category, and we think we have understood it; we don't look at it more closely. But, if we do not give it a name, we are forced to look at it. That is, we approach the flower, or whatever it is, with a newness, with a new quality of examination; we look at it as though we had never looked at it before. Naming is a very convenient way of disposing of people—by saying they are Germans, they are Japanese, they are Americans, they are Hindus, you know; give them a label and destroy the label. But if you do not give a label to people, you are forced to look at them, and then it is much more difficult to kill somebody. You can destroy the label with a bomb, and feel righteous. But if you do not give a label, and must therefore look at the individual thing—whether it is a man, or a flower, or an incident, or an emotion—then you are forced to consider your relationship with it, and the action following. So, naming, or giving a label, is a very convenient way of disposing of anything, of denying, condemning, or justify-

ing it. That is one side of the question.

Then, what is the core from which you name, what is the center which is always naming, choosing, labeling? We all feel there is a center, a core, do we not?, from which we are acting, from which we are judging, from which we are naming. What is that center, that core? Some would like to think it is a spiritual essence, God, or what you will. So, let us find out what is that core, that center, which is naming, terming, judging. Surely, that core is memory, isn't it? A series of sensations, identified and enclosed—the past, given life through the present. That core, that center, feeds on the present through naming, labelling, remembering. I hope you are following this. We will see presently, as we unfold it, that as long as this center, this *core* exists, there can be no understanding. It is only with the dissipation of this core that there is understanding. Because, after all, that core is memory; memory of various experiences, which have been given names, labels, identifications. With those named and labelled experiences, from that center, there is acceptance and rejection, determination to be or not to be, according to the sensations, pleasures, and pains of the memory of experience. So, that center is the word. If you do not name that center, is there a center? That is, if you do not think in terms of words, if you do not use words, can you think? Thinking comes into being through verbalization; or, verbalization begins to respond to thinking. So, the center, the core is the memory of innumerable experiences of pleasure and pain, verbalized. Watch it in yourself, please, and you will see that words have become much more important, labels have become much more important, than the substance; and we live on words. Please, don't deny it, don't say it is right or wrong. We are exploring. If you merely explore one side of a thing, or stay put in

one place, you won't understand the whole content of it. Therefore, let us approach it from different angles.

For us, words like truth, God, have become very important—or the feeling which those words represent. When we say the word 'American', 'Christian', 'Hindu', or the word 'anger'—we *are* the word representing the feeling. But we don't know what that feeling is, because the *word* has become important. When you call yourself a Buddhist, a Christian, what does the word mean, what is the meaning behind that word which you have never examined? Our center, the core is the word, the label. If the label does not matter, if what matters is that which is *behind* the label, then you are able to inquire; but if you are identified with the label and stuck with it, you cannot proceed. And we *are* identified with the label: the house, the form, the name, the furniture, the bank account, our opinions, our stimulants, and so on, and so on. We are all those things—those things being represented by a name. The *things* have become important, the names, the labels; and therefore the center, the core is the word.

Now, if there is no word, no label, there is no center, is there? There is a dissolution, there is an emptiness—not the emptiness of fear, which is quite a different thing. There is a sense of being as nothing; and because you have removed all the labels, or rather, because you have understood why you give labels to feelings and ideas, you are completely new, are you not? There is no center from which you are acting. The center, which is the word, has been dissolved. The label has been taken away; and where are you as the center? You are there, but there has been a transformation. And that transformation is a little bit frightening; therefore, you do not proceed with what is still involved in it; you are already beginning to judge it, to decide whether you like

or don't like it. You don't proceed with the understanding of what is coming, but you are already judging; which means that you have a center from which you are acting. Therefore, you stay fixed the moment you judge; the words 'like' and 'dislike' become important. But what happens when you do not name? You look at emotion, at sensation, more directly, and therefore have quite a different relationship to it, just as you have to a flower when you do not name it. You are forced to look at it anew. When you do not name a group of people, you are compelled to look at each individual face, and not treat them all as the mass. Therefore, you are much more alert, much more observing, more understanding, you have a deeper sense of pity, love; but if you treat them all as the mass, it is over.

If you do not label, you have to regard every feeling as it arises. Now, when you label, is the feeling different from the label? Or, does the label awaken the feeling? Please, think it over. When we label, most of us intensify the feeling. The feeling and the naming are instantaneous. If there were a gap between naming and feeling, then you could find out if the feeling is different from the naming; and then you would be able to deal with the feeling without naming it. Is this all becoming rather too difficult? I'm glad. I'm afraid it *should* be difficult. (Laughter)

The problem is this, is it not?, how to be free from a feeling which we term, such as anger? Not subjugate it, not sublimate it, not suppress it, which are all idiotic and immature; but how to be really free from it? And to be really free from it, we have to discover whether the word is more important than the feeling. The word 'anger' has more significance than the feeling itself. And, to find that out, there must be a gap between the feeling and the naming. That is one part.

Then, if I do not name a feeling, that is, if thought is not functioning merely because of words, or if I do not think in terms of words, images, or symbols, which most of us do—then what happens? Surely, the mind, then, is not merely the observer. That is, when the mind is not thinking in terms of words, symbols, images, there is no thinker separate from the thought, which is the word. Then the mind is quiet, is it not?—not *made* quiet, it *is* quiet. And, when the mind is really quiet, then the feelings that arise can be dealt with immediately. It is only when we give names to feelings and thereby strengthen them that the feelings have continuity; they are stored up in the center, from which we give further labels, either to strengthen or to communicate them.

So, when the mind is no longer the center as the thinker made up of words, of past experiences—which are all memories, labels, stored and put in categories, in pigeonholes—, when it is not doing any of those things, then, obviously the mind is quiet. It is no longer bound, it has no longer a center as the me—my house, my achievement, my work—which are still words, giving impetus to feeling, and thereby strengthening memory. When none of those things are happening, the mind is very quiet. That state is not negation. On the contrary, to come to that point, you have to go through all this, which is an enormous undertaking; it is not merely learning a few sets of words and repeating them like a school boy—not to name, not to name. To follow through all its implications, to experience it, to see how the mind works and thereby come to that point when you are no longer naming, which means that there is no longer a center apart from the thought—surely, this whole process is real meditation. And when the mind is really tranquil, then it is possible for that which is immeasurable to come into being. Any other process, any other search for reality, is merely

self-projected, home-made, and therefore unreal. But this process is arduous, and it means that the mind has to be constantly aware of everything that is inwardly happening to it. To come to this point, there can be no judgment or justification from the beginning to the end—not that this is an end. There is no end, because there is something extraordinary still going on. There is no promise. It is for you to experiment, to go into yourself deeper and deeper and deeper, so that all the many layers of the center are dissolved; and you can do it rapidly, or lazily. But it is extraordinarily interesting to watch the process of the mind, how it depends on words, how the words stimulate memory, resuscitate the dead experience and give life to it. And, in that process the mind is living, either in the future or in the past. Therefore, words have an enormous significance, neurologically as well as psychologically. And please, don't learn all this from me, or from a book. You cannot learn it from another, or find it in a book. What you learn, or find in a book, won't be the real. But you can experience it, you can watch yourself in action, watch yourself thinking, see how you think, how rapidly you are naming the feeling as it arises—and watching this whole process, frees the mind from its center. Then the mind, being quiet, can receive that which is eternal.

Question: What is the right relationship, if any, between the individual and the collective, the mass?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do you think there is any relationship between the individual and the mass? Between you and the collective? The State, the government, would like us to be merely the citizen, the collective. But we are man first, and afterwards the citizen—not the citizen first, and man afterwards. The State would like us not to be the man, the in-

dividual, but the mass. Because, the more we are the citizen, the greater our capacity, the greater our efficiency—we become the tool which the bureaucrats, the authoritarian states, the governments, want us to be.

So, we must distinguish between the private individual and the citizen, the man and the mass. The individual, the man, has his private feelings, hopes, failures, disappointments, longings, sensations, pleasures. And there is the point of view which wants to reduce all that to the collective; for it is very simple to deal with the collective. Pass an edict, and it is done. Give a sanction, and it is followed. So, the more organizations there are, and the more efficiently they are organized, the more the individual is denied, whether by the church or by the State—we are then all Christians, all Hindus, not individuals. And with that mentality, in that state, which most of us want, has the individual reality any place? We recognize there must be collective action. But does collective action come into being with the denial of the individual? Is the individual in opposition to the collective? Is the collective not fictitious, the mass not unreal? Seeing the difficulty of dealing with the individual, we create the opposite, the mass, and then try to establish a relationship between the individual and the collective. If the individual is intelligent, he will co-operate. Surely, that is our problem, isn't it? We first create the mass, and then try to find the relationship of the individual with the mass. But let us find out if the mass is real. The group of us here can be made into the collective by hypnotism, by propaganda; through various means we can be aroused to act collectively for an ideology, for a State, for a church, for an idea, and so on, and so on. That is, collective action can be externally imposed, directed, compelled, through fear, reward, and all the rest of it. Having produced that condition, we try to establish the relation-

ship of the individual, which is the actual, with that which is produced. Whereas, is it not possible for the individual to lose his sense of separateness through definite understanding of all the implications of separateness, and therefore act co-operatively? But, as that is so difficult, States, governments, churches, organized religions, force or entice the individual to become the corporate. What place has the individual in history? What does it matter what you and I do? There is the historical movement going on. What place has reality with this movement? Probably none at all. You and I don't count at all. This movement is gigantic, it is going on; it has the momentum of centuries, and it will go on. What is your relationship, as an individual, to this movement? Whatever you do, will it affect it? Can you stop a war because you are a pacifist? You are a pacifist, not because there is a war, not because you have found a relationship with it, but because in itself war is wrong and you feel you cannot kill, and there the matter ends. But to try to find a relationship between your understanding, your intelligence, and this monstrous, logical movement of war, seems to me utterly futile. I can be an individual and yet see what creates anti-social feelings in me, and so be free of separative action. I may have a little property; surely, that doesn't make me a separative entity. But it is the whole psychological state to be separate, to be isolated, to be something—it is that which is calamitous, which is so destructive. And, in order to overcome that, we have all the external sanctions and impositions and edicts.

Question: What is the significance of pain and suffering?

KRISHNAMURTI: When you suffer, when you have pain, what is the significance of it? Physical pain has one significance, but probably we

mean psychological pain and suffering, which has quite a different significance at different levels. What is the significance of suffering? Why do you want to find the *significance* of suffering? Not that it has no significance—we are going to find out. But why do you *want* to find it? Why do you want to find out why you suffer? When you put that question to yourself, 'Why do I suffer?', and are looking for the cause of suffering, are you not escaping from suffering? When I seek the significance of suffering, am I not avoiding, evading it, running away from it? The fact is, I am suffering; but the moment I bring the mind to operate upon it and say, 'Now, why?', I have already diluted the intensity of suffering. In other words, we want suffering to be diluted, alleviated, put away, explained away. Surely, that doesn't give an understanding of suffering. So, if I am free from that desire to run away from it, then I begin to understand what is the *content* of suffering.

Now, what is suffering? A disturbance, isn't it?, at different levels—at the physical, and at the different levels of the subconscious. It is an acute form of disturbance, which I don't like. My son is dead. I have built around him all my hopes—or around my daughter, my husband, what you will. I have enshrined him, with all the things I wanted him to be. And I have kept him as my companion—you know, all that; and suddenly he is gone. So, there is a disturbance, isn't there? That disturbance I call suffering. Please, I am not being harsh, we are examining, trying to understand it. If I don't like that suffering, then I say, 'Why am I suffering?' 'I loved him so much', 'He was this'. 'I had that'. And I try to escape in words in labels, in beliefs, as most of us do. They act as a narcotic. But, if I do not do that, what happens? I am simply aware of suffering. I don't condemn it, I don't justify it—I am suffering. Then I can follow its

movement, can't I? Then I can follow the whole content of what it means—'I follow' in the sense of trying to understand something.

So, what does it mean? What is it that is suffering? Not *why* there is suffering, not what is the *cause* of suffering, but what is actually happening? I do not know if you see the difference. Then I am simply aware of suffering, not as apart from me, not as an observer watching suffering—it is part of me, that is, the whole of me is suffering. Then I am able to follow its movement, see where it leads. Surely, if I do that, then it opens up, does it not? Then I see that I have laid emphasis on the me—not on the person whom I love. He only acted to cover me from my misery, from my loneliness, from my misfortune. As I am not something, I hoped *he* would be that. So, that has gone; I am left, I am lost, I am lonely. Without him, I am nothing. So I cry. It is not that *he* is gone, but that I am left. I am alone. To come to that point is very difficult, isn't it? It is difficult to really recognize it, and not merely say, 'I am alone, and how am I to get rid of that loneliness?', which is another form of escape; but to be *conscious* of it, to *remain* with it, to see its movement. I am only taking this as an example. So, gradually, if I allow it to unfold, to open up, I see that I am suffering because I am lost; I am being called to give my attention to something which I am not willing to look at; something is being forced upon me which I am reluctant to see and to understand. And there are innumerable people to help me to escape—thousands of so-called religious people, with their beliefs and dogmas, hopes and fantasies—'it is *karma*, it is God's will', you know, all giving me a way out. But if I can stay with it and not put it away from me, not try to circumscribe or deny it, then what happens? What is the state of my mind when it is thus following the movement of suffering? Now, please follow this,

continuing what we discussed previously.

Is suffering merely a word, or an actuality? If it is an actuality, and not just a word, then the word has no meaning now. So, there is merely the feeling of intense pain. With regard to what? With regard to an image, to an experience, to something which you have, or have not. If you have it, you call it pleasure; if you haven't, it is pain. So, pain, sorrow, is in relationship to something. Is that something merely a verbalization, or an actuality? I don't know if you are following all this. That is, when sorrow exists, it exists only in relationship to something. It cannot exist by itself—as fear cannot exist by itself, but in relationship to something: to an individual, to an incident, to a feeling. Now, you are fully aware of the suffering. Is that suffering apart from you, and therefore you are merely the observer who perceives the suffering; or, is that suffering *part* of you? Surely, we are trying to understand what suffering, pain, is; we are trying to go into it fully, not just superficially.

Now, when there is no observer who is suffering, is the suffering different from you? You *are* the suffering, are you not? You are not apart from the pain—you *are* the pain. Now, what happens? Please, follow it up. There is no labelling; there is no giving it a name and thereby brushing it aside—you are merely that pain, that feeling, that sense of agony. Then, when you are that, what happens? When you do not name it, when there is no fear with regard to it, is the center related to it? If the center is related to it, then it is afraid of it. Then it must act and do something about it. But if the center is that, then what do you do? There is nothing to be done, is there? Please, it is not mere acceptance. Follow it, and you will see. If you *are* that, and you are not accepting it, not labelling it, not pushing it aside—if you *are* that thing, what happens? Do you say

you suffer then? Surely, a fundamental transformation has taken place. Then there is no longer 'I suffer', because there is no center to suffer; and the center suffers, because we have never examined what the center is. We just live from word to word, from reaction to reaction. We never say, 'Let me see what that thing is that suffers'. And you cannot see by enforcement, by discipline. You must look with interest, with spontaneous comprehension. Then you will see that the thing we call suffering, pain, the thing that we avoid, and the discipline, all have gone. As long as I have no relationship to the thing as outside of me, the problem is not; but the moment I establish a relationship with it outside me, the problem is. As long as I treat suffering as something outside—I suffer because I lost my brother, because I have no money, because of this or that—I establish a relationship to it, and that relationship is fictitious. But if I *am* that thing, if I see the fact, then the whole thing is transformed, it all has a different meaning. Then there is *full* attention, *integrated* attention; and that which is completely regarded, is understood and dissolved, and so there is no fear; and therefore the word 'sorrow' is non-existent.

August 21, 1949

XIII

For the past few weeks we have been discussing the importance of self-knowledge, and how it is essential, before there can be any action, before there can be right thinking, that one should know oneself; not only the superficial, conscious mind, but also the hidden, the unconscious. And those of you who have tried and experimented with what we have been discussing, must have come upon a very curious thing in experimenting: that through self-know-

ledge one accentuates self-consciousness. That is, one becomes more concerned about oneself. Most of us are caught in that, and one doesn't seem able to go beyond. And I would like to discuss this evening why it is that most of us contain ourselves, limit ourselves in self-consciousness, and are not capable of going beyond. Because, there is a great deal in it which needs further explanation and discussion; but, before I go into that, I would like to point out one or two things.

First of all, please don't bother to take photographs. You know, all this, what one is talking about, is very serious, at least for me. This is not meant for autograph-hunters. You wouldn't be thinking of taking pictures and asking for autographs if you were really very, very serious. Also, if I may say so, it is so infantile, immature. And the other thing I would like to point out is that, as I have already said before, you and I are trying to experiment together here, to feel our way into the problems that confront us. And that is impossible if you are anxiously interested in taking notes of what I am saying. You should be able to deal directly with the problem, not think it over afterwards; because, when you are really experiencing something, you don't take notes. You take notes when you are *not* experiencing, when you are not really thinking, feeling, experimenting. But if you are really experiencing, going along with what is being said, then there is no time or occasion to take notes. Surely, experiencing does not come through words. That is only furthering sensation; but there is an experiencing, if we can go more and more deeply and immediately into what is being said. So, it would be good, if each one of us were serious enough to experiment with what is being said, and not merely postpone or be distracted from the central issue.

As I was saying, in the search of self-knowledge, in the exploration of

it, one gets caught in self-consciousness, one accentuates, emphasizes the me more and more; and how is it that that happens? As we have said during all these talks, what is important is the freedom from the me, the mine, the self; because, obviously, a man who does not know the whole process and content of the self, is incapable of right thinking—which is axiomatic. But yet we shun, we avoid the understanding of the self; and we think that by avoiding it, we shall be able to deal with the self or forget it more easily. Whereas, if we are capable of looking at it more intensely, more attentively, there is the danger of becoming more and more self-conscious. And is it possible to go beyond?

Now, to understand that, we have to go into the problem of sincerity. Simplicity is not sincerity. One who is sincere can never be simple; because the one who is trying to be sincere, has always the desire to fashion or to approximate himself to an idea. And one needs extraordinary simplicity to understand oneself, the simplicity which comes when there is no desire to attain, to achieve, to gain something; and the moment we desire to gain something through self-knowledge, there is self-consciousness in which we get caught—which is a fact. If you do not merely examine what the various psychologists and saints have said, but experiment with yourself, you will come to a point when you will see that unless there is, not sincerity, but complete simplicity, you cannot proceed. Self-consciousness arises only when there is a desire to achieve something—happiness, reality, or even understanding—through self-knowledge. That is, when there is a desire for achievement through self-knowledge, there is self-consciousness, which prevents going further into the problem. And as most of us, especially so-called religious people, try to be sincere, we have to understand this question, this word 'sincerity'. Because sincerity deve-

lops will, and will is essentially desire. You have to be sincere in order to approximate yourself to an idea; and hence the pattern and the carrying out of that pattern become most important. To carry out a pattern, you must have will, which denies simplicity. Simplicity comes into being only when there is freedom from the desire to achieve, and when you are willing to go into self-knowledge without any end in view. And I think that that is really important to think over. What is required is not sincerity, not the exertion of will to be or not to be something, but to understand oneself from moment to moment, spontaneously, as things arise. How can you be spontaneous when you are approximating yourself to something?

When do you discover anything in yourself? Only at unexpected moments, when you are not consciously, deliberately, shaping your mind, your thoughts and feelings; only when there is a spontaneous response to the incidents of life. Then, according to those responses, you find out. But a man who is trying to be sincere to an idea can never be simple; and therefore, there can never be full, complete self-knowledge. And self-knowledge can be discovered more fully, more deeply and widely, only when there is passive awareness, which is not an exertion of will. Will and sincerity go together; simplicity and passive awareness are companions. Because, when one is passively aware, deeply, then there is a possibility of immediate understanding. As we discussed, when you want to understand something, if you are all the time consumed with the desire to understand it, making an effort to understand it, naturally there is no understanding. But if there is a passive, alert awareness, then there is a possibility of understanding. Similarly, to understand oneself ever more deeply and widely, there must be passive awareness, which is extremely difficult; for, most of us either condemn or justify. We never

look at anything passively. We project ourselves upon the subject—a painting, a poem, or anything else—, especially where *we* are concerned. We are incapable of looking at ourselves without any condemnation or justification; and that is essential, surely, if we are to understand more and more widely and deeply. As most of us, in the search of self-knowledge, get caught in self-consciousness, the danger is, that being caught, we make that in which we are caught the most important thing. To go beyond self-consciousness, there must be freedom from the desire to achieve a result. Because, after all, the attainment of a result is what the mind wants: it wants to be secure, to be safe, and therefore projects, out of its own momentum, an image, an idea, in which it takes shelter. And to avoid all the illusions that the mind creates, to avoid being caught in them, is possible only when there is no desire for a result; only when one is living from moment to moment.

Question: Would you please explain what you mean by dying daily?

KRISHNAMURTI: Why is it that we are so frightened of death? Because death is the unknown. We don't know what is going to happen tomorrow; actually, we don't know what is going to happen. Though we build for tomorrow, actually, realistically, we don't know; and so there is always the fear of tomorrow. So, fear is the guiding factor, which is the incapacity to meet the unknown, and therefore we continue taking today over into tomorrow. That is what we are doing, is it not? We give continuity to our idiosyncrasies, to our jealousies, to our stupidities, to our memories; wherever we are, we carry them over from day to day. Don't we do that? And so there is no dying, there is only an assurance of continuity. That is a fact. Our names, our actions, the things that

we do, our property, the desire to be—all these give a continuity. Now, that which continues obviously cannot renew. There can be renewal only when there is an ending. If you are the same tomorrow as you are today, how can there be renewal? That is, if you are attached to an idea, to an experience, which you have had yesterday and which you desire to continue tomorrow, there is no renewal; there is a continuity of the memory of the sensation of that experience, but the experience itself is dead. There is only the memory of the sensation of that experience; and it is that sensation you want to continue. And where there is continuity, obviously there is no renewal. And yet it is what most of us want: we want to continue. We want to continue with our worries, with our pleasures, with our memories; and so most of us are actually uncreative. There is no possibility of a rebirth, a renewal. Whereas, if each day we died, finished at the end of the day all our worries, all our jealousies, all our idiocies and vanities, our cruel gossip—you know, the whole business; if each day we came to an end and did not carry all that over into tomorrow, then there would be a possibility of renewal, would there not?

So, why do we accumulate? And what is it that we accumulate, apart from furniture and a few other things? What is it that we accumulate? Ideas, words, and memories, do we not? And with these we live—we *are* those things. With those things we want to live, we want to continue. But if we did not continue, there would be a possibility of a new understanding, a new opening. This is not metaphysical, this is not something fantastic. Experiment with it yourself and you will see that an extraordinary thing takes place. How the mind worries over a problem, over and over and over again, day after day! Such a mind is incapable, obviously, of seeing something new, is it not? We are caught in our

beliefs—religious, sociological, or any other form of belief; and those beliefs are oneself. Beliefs are words, and the word becomes important; and so we live in a sensation which we want to continue, and therefore there is no renewal. But if one does not continue, if one does not give continuity to a worry, but thinks it out, goes into it fully, and dissolves it, then one's mind is fresh to meet something else anew. But the difficulty is that most of us want to live in the past, in past memories, or in the future, future hopes, future longings; which indicates that the present is not significant, and therefore we live yesterday and tomorrow, and give continuity to both. If one actually experiments with this thing, really dying each day, each minute, to everything that one has accumulated, then there is a possibility of immortality. Immortality is not continuity, which is merely time; there is continuity only to memory, to ideas, to words. But, when there is freedom from continuity, then there is a state of timelessness, which cannot be understood if you are merely the result of continuity. Therefore, it is important to die every minute and to be reborn again—not as you were yesterday. This is really very important, if you would go into it seriously. Because, in this there is a possibility of creation, of transformation. And most of our lives are so unhappy, because we don't know how to renew; we are worn out, we are destroyed by yesterday, by yesterday's memories, misfortunes, unhappiness, incidents, failures. Yesterday burdens our minds and hearts; and with that burden we want to understand something which cannot be understood within the limits of time. And that is why it is essential, if one would be creative, in the deep sense of that word, that there be death to all the accumulations of every minute. This is not fantastic, this is not some mystical experience. One *can* experience this directly, simply, when one understands the whole

significance of how time as continuity prevents creativeness.

Question: How does a truth, as you have said, when repeated, become a lie? What really is a lie? Why is it wrong to lie? Is this not a profound and subtle problem on all the levels of our existence?

KRISHNAMURTI: There are two questions in this, so let us examine the first which is: When a truth is repeated, how does it become a lie? What is it that we repeat? Can you repeat an understanding? I understand something. Can I repeat that? I can verbalize it, I can communicate it; but the experience is not what is repeated, surely. But we get caught in the word, and miss the significance of the experience. If you had an experience, can you repeat it? You may *want* to repeat it, you may have the desire for its repetition, for its sensation; but once you have an experience, it is over, it *cannot* be repeated. What can be repeated is the sensation, and the corresponding word that gives life to that sensation. And as, unfortunately, most of us are propagandists, we are caught in the repetition of the word. So, we live on words, and the truth is denied.

Take, for example, the feeling of love. Can you repeat it? When you hear, 'Love your neighbor', is that a truth to you? It is truth, only when you love your neighbor; and that love cannot be repeated, but only the word. Yet most of us are happy, content, with the repetition, 'Love your neighbor', or, 'Don't be greedy'. So, the truth of another, or an actual experience which you have had, merely through repetition does not become a reality. On the contrary, repetition prevents reality. Merely repeating certain ideas is not reality.

Now, the difficulty in this is to understand the question without thinking in terms of the opposite. A lie is not something opposed to truth.

One can see the truth of what is being said, not in opposition, or in contrast, as a lie or a truth; but just see that most of us repeat without understanding. For instance, we have been discussing 'not naming'. Many of you will repeat it, I am sure of it, thinking that it is the 'truth'. You will never repeat an experience if it is a direct experience. You may communicate it; but when it is a *real* experience, the sensations behind it are gone, the emotional content behind the words is entirely dissipated.

Take, for example, the question, which we discussed a few weeks ago, that the thinker and the thought are one. It may be a truth to you, because you have directly experienced it. But if I repeated it, it would not be true, would it?—true, not as opposed to the false, please. It wouldn't be actual, it would be merely repetitive, and therefore would have no significance. But you see, by repetition, we create a dogma, we build a church, and in that we take refuge. The word, and not truth, becomes the 'truth'. The word is not the thing. But to us, the thing is the word; and that is why one has to be so extremely careful not to repeat something which one does not really understand. If you understand something, you can communicate it; but the words and the memory have lost their emotional significance. Thereby, in ordinary conversation, one's outlook, one's vocabulary, changes.

So, as we are seeking truth through self-knowledge, and are not mere propagandists, it is important to understand this. Because, through repetition one mesmerizes oneself by words, or by sensations. One gets caught in illusions. And, to be free of that, it is imperative to experience directly; and to experience directly, one must be aware of oneself in the process of repetition, of habits, of words, of sensations. That awareness gives one an extraordinary freedom, so that there can be a renewal, a constant experiencing, a newness.

The other question is: "What really is a lie? Why is it wrong to lie? Is this not a profound and subtle problem on all the levels of our existence?" What is a lie? A contradiction, isn't it?, a self-contradiction. One can consciously contradict, or unconsciously; it can either be deliberate, or unconscious; the contradiction can be either very, very subtle, or obvious. And when the cleavage in contradiction is very great, then either one becomes unbalanced, or one realizes the cleavage, and sets about to mend it. Now, to understand this problem, what is a lie and why we lie, one has to go into it without thinking in terms of an opposite. Can we look at this problem of contradiction in ourselves without trying not to be contradictory? I don't know if I am making myself clear. Our difficulty in examining this question is, isn't it?, that we so readily condemn a lie; but, to understand it, can we think of it, not in terms of truth and falsehood, but of what is contradiction? Why do we contradict? Why is there contradiction in ourselves? Is there not an attempt to live up to a standard, up to a pattern—a constant approximation of ourselves to a pattern, a constant effort to be something, either in the eyes of another, or in our own eyes? There is a desire, is there not?, to conform to a pattern; and when one is not living up to that pattern, there is a contradiction.

Now, why do we have a pattern, a standard, an approximation, an idea which we are trying to live up to? Why? Obviously, to be secure, to be safe, to be popular, to have a good opinion of ourselves, and so on, and so on. *There* is the seed of contradiction. As long as we are approximating ourselves to something, trying to be something, there *must* be contradiction; therefore, there must be this cleavage between the false and the true. I think this is important, if you will quietly go into it. Not that there is not the false and the true;

but why the contradiction in ourselves? Is it not because we are attempting to be something—to be noble, to be good, to be virtuous, to be creative, to be happy, and so on, and so on? And, in the very desire to be something, there is a contradiction, not to be something else. And it is this contradiction that is so destructive. If one is capable of complete identification with something, with this or with that, then contradiction ceases; but when we do identify ourselves completely with something, there is self-enclosure, there is a resistance, which brings about unbalance—which is an obvious thing.

So, why is there contradiction in ourselves? I have done something, and I don't want it to be discovered; I have thought something which doesn't come up to the mark, which puts me in a state of contradiction, and I don't like it. So, where there is an approximation, there must be fear; and it is this fear that contradicts. Whereas, if there is no becoming, no attempting to be something, then there is no sense of fear; then there is no contradiction; then there is no lie in us at any level, consciously or unconsciously—something to be suppressed, something to be shown. And as most of our lives are a matter of moods and poses, depending on our moods, we pose—which is a contradiction. When the mood disappears, we are what we are. It is this contradiction that is really important, not whether you tell a polite white lie or not. As long as this contradiction exists, there must be a superficial existence and therefore superficial fears which have to be guarded—and then white lies, you know, all the rest of it follows. We can look at this question, not asking what is a lie and what is truth, but without taking the opposites, go into the problem of contradiction in ourselves—which is extremely difficult. Because, as we depend so much on our sensations, most of our lives are contradictory. We depend on memories, on opinions; we have so many

fears which we want to cover up—all these create contradiction in ourselves; and when that contradiction becomes unbearable, one goes off one's head. One wants peace, and everything that one does, creates war, not only in the family, but outside. And, instead of understanding what creates conflict, we only try to become more and more one thing or the other, the opposite, thereby creating greater cleavage.

So, is it possible to understand why there is contradiction in ourselves—not only superficially, but much more deeply, psychologically? First of all, is one aware that one lives a contradictory life? We want peace, and we are nationalists; we want to avoid social misery, and yet each one of us is so individualistic, limited, self-enclosed. So we are constantly living in contradiction. Why? Is it not because we are slaves to sensation? This is neither to be denied nor accepted. It requires a great deal of understanding of the implications of sensation, which are desires. We want so many things, all in contradiction with one another. We are so many conflicting masks; we take on a mask when it suits us, and deny it when something else is more profitable, more pleasurable. It is this state of contradiction that creates the lie. And, in opposition to that we create 'truth'. But, surely, truth is not the opposite of lie. That which has an opposite, is not truth. The opposite contains its own opposite, therefore it is not truth; and to understand this problem very profoundly, one must be aware of all the contradictions in which we live. When I say, 'I love you', with it goes jealousy, envy, anxiety, fear—which is a contradiction. And it is this contradiction that must be understood; and one can understand it only when one is aware of it, aware without any condemnation or justification—merely looking at it. And to look at it passively, one has to understand all the processes of justification and condemnation. So, it is not an easy

problem to look passively at something; but in understanding that, one begins to understand the whole process of the ways of one's feeling and thinking. And, when one is aware of the full significance of contradiction in oneself, it does bring an extraordinary change: you are yourself then, not something which you are *trying* to be. You are no longer following an ideal, seeking happiness. You are what you are, and from there you can proceed. Then there is no possibility of contradiction.

Question: I feel sincerely that I desire to help people, and I think I can help; but whatever I say or do to another is interpreted as interference, and as the desire to dominate. So I am thwarted by others and feel myself frustrated. Why does this happen to me?

KRISHNAMURTI: When we say we want to help another, what do we mean by that word? Like the word 'service'; what does it mean? You go to the gas station, the attendant serves you, and you pay him; but he uses the word 'serve', like all the business people. All the commercial people use that word. Now those who wish to serve, have they not also the same spirit? They want to help if you also give them something; that is, they want to help *you* in order to fulfill *themselves*. And when you resist, you begin to criticize, they feel frustrated. In other words, they are not really helping you. Through help, through service, they are fulfilling themselves. In other words, they are seeking self-fulfillment under the guise of help and service—which, when thwarted, gets angry, begins to gossip, begins to tear you to pieces. This is an obvious fact, is it not? And can you not help and serve another without asking anything?—which is most difficult, which is not easy, you cannot just say, 'It can be done'. When you give something to somebody, a few

hundred dollars, haven't you something with which you are tied, don't you tie yourself with that hundred dollars, hasn't it a tail? Can you give, and forget? This giving from the heart is real generosity. But the generosity of the hand has always something to be held; and it holds. Similarly, those who want to help, when they are prevented for various reasons, feel frustrated, feel lost; they won't stand criticism; it is misrepresented, mistranslated, misinterpreted; because through their anxiety to help you, they are fulfilling themselves.

So, the problem is, is it not?, is there self-fulfillment? That is the next question. Is there self-fulfillment? Is not that word 'self-fulfillment' a contradiction? When you want to fulfill yourself in something, what is that something in which you are fulfilling? Is it not self-projection? Say, I want to help you. I use the word 'help', which covers my desire for self-fulfillment. What happens when I have such a desire? I neither help you, nor fulfill. Because, to fulfill means, for most of us, to have pleasure in doing something which gives us gratification. In other words, self-fulfillment is gratification, is it not? I am seeking gratification, superficial or permanent, which I call self-fulfillment. But can gratification be permanent? Obviously not. Surely, when we talk about self-fulfillment we mean a gratification that is deeper, more profound, than the superficial; but can gratification ever be permanent? As it can never be permanent, we change our self-fulfillment—at one period it is this, and later it is that; and ultimately we say, 'My fulfillment must be in God, in reality'. Which means, we make of reality a permanent gratification. So, in other words, we are seeking gratification when we talk of self-fulfillment. And, instead of saying, 'I want to help you in order to gratify myself', which would be too crude and we are too subtle for that, we say, 'I want to serve you, I want

to help you'. And when we are prevented, we feel lost, we feel frustrated, angry, irritated. Under the guise of help and service we do a lot of monstrous things—deceptions, illusions. Therefore, words like 'self-fulfillment', like 'help', like 'service', need examination. And when we really understand them, not just verbally, but deeply, profoundly, then we will help without asking anything in return. Such help will never be misrepresented—and even if it is, it doesn't matter. Then there is no sense of frustration, no sense of anger, criticism, gossip.

Question: What is aloneness? Is it a mystical state? Does it imply freeing oneself from relationship? Is aloneness a way to understanding, or is it an escape from outward conflicts and inward pressures?

KRISHNAMURTI: Are not most of us trying to isolate ourselves in relationship? We try to possess people, we try to dominate people—which is a form of isolation, is it not? Our beliefs, our ideas, are a form of isolation. When we withdraw, when we renounce, it is a form of isolation, is it not? The inward pressures and outward conflicts force us to protect ourselves, to enclose ourselves. That is a form of isolation, is it not? And through isolation, can there be any understanding? Do I understand you if I resist you, if I enclose myself within my ideas, my prejudices, my criticism of you, and so on, and so on? I can understand you only when I am not isolated, when there is no barrier between us, neither a verbal barrier, nor the barrier of psychological states, of moods and idiosyncrasies. But to understand, I must be alone, must I not? Alone in the sense of unenclosed, uninfluenced. Most of us are put together; we are made up of memories, of idiosyncrasies, of prejudices, of innumerable influences. And through all that we try to understand something. How

can there be understanding when we are produced, brought together, made up? And when there is a freedom from that, there is an aloneness which is not an escape. On the contrary, it is the understanding of all these things that brings about an aloneness, with which you meet life directly. If we are a mass of opinions, beliefs, if we are merely put together, we think that we are an integrated being, or we try to seek integration with all these burdens. Surely, there can be integration, not merely at the superficial level, but completely, right through, only when there is a freedom, through understanding, from all the influences that are constantly impinging upon one—beliefs, memories, idiosyncrasies, and so on; one cannot merely throw them aside. Then, as one begins to understand these, there is an aloneness which is not contradiction, which is not an opposite of the collective or the individual. When you would understand something, aren't you alone? Aren't you completely integrated at that moment? Is not your attention completely given? And through withdrawal, can there be any understanding? Through resistance, can there be any understanding? When you renounce something, does that bring understanding? Surely, understanding comes, not through resistance, not through withdrawal, not through renunciation. Only when you understand the full significance of a problem, then the problem disappears. You don't have to renounce it. You don't have to renounce wealth, certain obvious greeds. But when you are capable of looking at them directly, without any criticism, being passively aware of them, they drop away from you. And in that state of passive awareness, is there not complete attention?—not as an opposite, or exclusive concentration. It is an awareness in which there is no contradiction; and therefore loneliness disappears. Most of us are lonely, most of us are solitary—there is no depth, we come to an end

very quickly. And it is this loneliness that creates the withdrawals, the escapes, the covering up; and if we would understand that loneliness, we must discard all these coverings, and be with it. It is that *being* that is alone. Then you are uninfluenced, then you are not caught in moods; and it is essential to be alone—which most of us dread. We hardly ever go out by ourselves; we always have the radio, magazines, newspapers, books; or, if we haven't those, we are occupied with our own thoughts. The mind is never quiet. It is this quietness that is alone. That aloneness is not induced, is not made up. When there is a lot of noise and you are silent, you are alone, are you not? You *must* be alone. If you are a success, then there is something obviously wrong. Most of us seek success, and that is why we are never alone; we are lonely, but we are never alone.

Only when there is aloneness, then you can meet that which is true, which has no comparison. And, as most of us are afraid to be alone, we build various refuges, various safeties, and give them big-sounding names; and they offer marvellous escapes. But they are all illusions, they have no significance. It is only when we see that they have no significance—actually, not verbally—only then are we alone. Then alone can we really understand; which means that we have to strip ourselves of all past experiences, of memories, of sensations, which we have built so sedulously and guard so carefully. Surely, only an unconditioned mind can understand that which is unconditioned, reality; and to uncondition the mind, one must not only face loneliness, but go beyond; one must not hold on to memories that are crowding in. For memories are mere words, words that have sensations. It is only when the mind is utterly quiet, uninfluenced, that it can realize that which is.

August 27, 1949

XIV

This morning I shall answer some of the questions first, and then wind up with a talk. Many questions have been sent in, and, unfortunately, it has not been possible to answer all of them. So, I have chosen those which are representative and have tried to answer as many of them as possible. And also, in answering questions, naturally one cannot go into full details, because that would take too long; and so one can only deal with the fundamentals: the details will have to be filled in by yourself. Those of you who have been coming here regularly will find that, if you carry away not merely a memory of the words and the pleasant sensations of listening under trees, of being distracted by birds, cameras, notes, and the various things that divert the mind—if you live not merely in words, but are really living, actually experiencing those things that we have discussed, then you will find that, having understood the outline from the answers which have been somewhat brief and succinct, you can fill in the details.

Question: Ideas do separate, but ideas also bring people together. Is this not the expression of love which makes communal life possible?

KRISHNAMURTI: I wonder, when you ask such a question, whether you do realize that ideas, beliefs, opinions, separate people; that ideologies break up, that ideas inevitably disrupt? Ideas do not hold people together—though you may try to bring together people belonging to differing and opposed ideologies. Ideas can never bring people together, which is obvious. Because, ideas can always be opposed and destroyed through conflict. After all, ideas are images, sensations, words. Can words, sensations, thoughts, bring people together? Or does one require quite a different thing to bring

people together? One sees that hate, fear, and nationalism, bring people together. Fear brings people together. A common hatred sometimes brings together people opposed to one another, as nationalism brings together people of opposing groups. Surely, these are ideas. And is love an idea? Can you think about love? You are able to think about the person whom you love, or the group of people whom you love. But is that love? When there is thought about love, is that love? Is thought love? And, surely, only love can bring people together, not thought—not one group in opposition to another group. Where love is, there is no group, no class, no nationality. So, one has to find out what we mean by love.

We know what we mean by ideas, opinions, beliefs, which we have sufficiently discussed during the past several weeks. So, what do we mean by love? Is it a thing of the mind? It is a thing of the mind, when the things of the mind fill the heart. And with most of us, it is so. We have filled our heart with the things of the mind, which are opinions, ideas, sensations, beliefs; and around that and in that we live and love. But is that love? Can we *think* about love? When you love, is thought functioning? Love and thought are not in opposition, do not let us divide them as opposites. When one loves, is there a sense of separateness, of bringing people together, or disbanding them, pushing them away? Surely, that state of love can be experienced only when the process of thought is not functioning—which does not mean that one must become crazy, unbalanced. On the contrary. It requires the highest form of thought to go beyond.

So, love is not a thing of the mind. It is only when the mind is really quiet, when it is no longer expecting, asking, demanding, seeking, possessing, being jealous, fearful, anxious—when the mind is really silent, only then is there possibility of love. When the mind is no longer project-

ing itself, pursuing its particular sensations, demands, urges, hidden fears, seeking self-fulfillment, held in bondage to belief—only then is there a possibility of love. But most of us think love can go with jealousy, with ambition, with the pursuit of personal desires and ambitions. Surely, when these things exist, love is not. So, we must be concerned, not with love, which comes into being spontaneously, without our particularly seeking it, but we must be concerned with the things that are hindering love, with the things of the mind which project themselves and create a barrier. And that is why it is important, before we can know what love is, to know what is the process of the mind, which is the seat of the self. And that is why it is important to go ever more deeply into the question of self-knowledge—not merely say, 'I must love', or, 'Love brings people together', or, 'Ideas disrupt', which would be a mere repetition of what you have heard, therefore, utterly useless. Words entangle. But, if one can understand the whole significance of the ways of one's thought, the ways of one's desires and their pursuits and ambitions, then there is a possibility of having or understanding that which is love. But that requires an extraordinary understanding of oneself. When there is self-abnegation, when there is self-forgetfulness—not intentionally, but spontaneously; that self-forgetfulness, self-denial, which is not the outcome of a series of practices, disciplines, which only limit—then there is a possibility of love. That self-denial comes into being when the whole process of the self is understood, consciously as well as unconsciously, in the waking hours as well as in dreaming. Then, the total process of the mind is understood as it is actually taking place in relationship, in every incident, in every response to every challenge that one has. In understanding that, and therefore freeing the mind from its own self-erecting, self-limiting pro-

cess, there is a possibility of love. Love is not sentiment, not romanticism, not dependent on something; and that state is extremely arduous and difficult to understand, or to be in. Because our minds are always interfering, limiting, encroaching upon its functioning; and therefore it is important to understand first the mind and its ways; otherwise we shall be caught in illusions, caught in words and sensations that have very little significance. And as, for most people, ideas merely act as refuge, as an escape, ideas which have become beliefs, naturally they prevent complete living, complete action, right thinking. It is possible to think rightly, to live freely and intelligently, only when there is ever deeper and wider self-knowledge.

Question: Would you kindly explain the distinction you make between factual and psychological memory?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do not let us bother for the moment with the distinction between factual and psychological memory. Let us consider memory. Why do we live in memories? Are memories separate from us? Are you different from memory? What do we mean by memory? It is the residue of certain incidents, experiences, sensations, is it not? You have had an experience yesterday; it has left a certain mark, a certain sensation. That sensation we call memory, verbalized or not; and we are the sum total of all these memories, all these residues. Surely, you are not different from your memory. There are conscious memories, as there are the unconscious. The conscious memories respond easily, spontaneously; and the unconscious memories are very deep, hidden, quiet, waiting, watchful. All of that, surely, is you and me: the racial, the group, the particular—all that, all those memories, are you and me. You are not different from your

memories. Remove your memories, where are you? If you remove them, you will end up in an asylum. But, why does the mind—which is the result of memories, of the past—, why does the mind cling to the past? That is the question, is it not? Why does the mind—which is the result of the past, which is the outcome of yesterday, of many yesterdays—, why does the thinker cling to yesterday? Memories, without any emotional content, have their significance; but we give to them emotional content, as like and dislike: this I will keep, that I won't keep, this I will think about, and that I will ponder over in my old age, or continue in my future. Why do we do that? Surely, that is the problem, is it not? Not that we must forget factual or psychological memories. Because, all the impressions, all the responses, everything is there, unconsciously: every incident, every thought, every sensation which you have lived through, is there—hidden, covered up, but still there. And as we grow older, we return to those memories and live in the past, or in the future, according to our conditioning. We remember the pleasant times we had when we were youthful, or we think of the future, what we are going to be.

So, we live in these memories. Why? We live as though we were different from those memories. Surely, that is the problem, is it not? We mean, by memories, words, don't we? Images, symbols, which are merely a series of sensations; and on those sensations we live. Therefore, we separate ourselves from the sensations, and say, 'I want those sensations'. Which means that the I, having separated itself from memories, gives to itself permanency. But it is not permanent. It is a fictitious permanency.

Now, this whole process of the I separating itself from memory, and giving life to that memory in response to the present, this total process obviously hinders our meeting the present, does it not? If I would

understand something, not theoretically, verbally, abstractly, but actually, I must give my *full* attention to it. I cannot give my full attention to it if I am distracted by my memories, by my beliefs, by my opinions, my experiences of yesterday. Therefore, I must respond fully, adequately, to the challenge. But that I, which has separated itself from memory, thus giving itself permanency, that I, regards the present, looks at the incident, the experience, and draws from it according to its past conditioning—which is all very simple and obvious, if you examine it. It is the memory of yesterday—of possessions, of jealousies, of anger, of contradiction, of ambition, of what one ought or ought not to be—it is all these things that make up the I; and the I is not different from memory. The quality cannot be separated from the thing, from the self.

So, memory is the self. Memory is the word, the word which symbolizes sensation, physical as well as psychological sensation; and it is to *that* we cling. It is to the sensations we cling, not to the experience; because in the moment of experience, there is neither the experiencer nor the experience—there is only *experiencing*. It is when we are not experiencing that we cling to memory, like so many people do, especially as they grow older. Watch yourself and you will see. We live in the past or in the future, and use the present merely as a passage from the past to the future; therefore, the present has no significance. All the politicians indulge in this, all the ideologists, all the idealists—they always look to the future, or to the past.

So, if one understands the whole significance of memory, one does not put away memories or destroy them or try to be free of them, but one understands how the mind is attached to memory and thereby strengthens the me. The me, after all, is sensation, a bundle of sensations, a bundle of memories. It is the known, and from the known we want to under-

stand the unknown. But the known must be an impediment to the unknown; because, to understand reality, there must be a newness of the mind, a freshness—not the burden of the known. God, or reality, or what you will, cannot be imagined, cannot be described, cannot be put into words; and if you do, that which you put into words is not reality; it is merely the sensation of a memory, the reaction to a condition; and therefore it is not real. Therefore, if one would understand that which is eternal, timeless, the mind as memories must come to an end. Mind must no longer cling to the known, therefore it must be capable of receiving the unknown. You cannot receive the unknown if the mind is burdened with memories, with the known, with the past. Therefore, the mind must be entirely silent—which is very difficult. Because the mind is always projecting, always wandering, always creating, breeding; and it is this process that must be understood in relationship to memory. Then the distinction between psychological and factual memory is obvious and simple. So, in understanding memory, one understands the process of thinking, which is, after all, self-knowledge. To go beyond the limits of the mind, there must be freedom from the desire to be, to achieve, to gain.

Question: Is not life true creation? Are we not really seeking happiness, and is there not serenity in life, that true being of which you speak?

KRISHNAMURTI: In answering this question, to understand it fully and significantly, should we not perhaps understand first this idea of seeking? Why are we seeking happiness? Why this incessant pursuit to be happy, to be joyous, to be something? Why is there this search, this immense effort made to find? If we can understand that and go into it fully, which I will do presently, perhaps we shall know

what happiness is, without seeking it. Because, after all, happiness is a by-product, of secondary importance. It is not an end in itself; it has no meaning if it is an end in itself. What does it mean to be happy? The man who takes a drink is happy. The man who drops a bomb over a great number of people feels elated, and says he is happy, or that God is with him. Momentary sensations, which disappear, give that sense of being happy. Surely, there is some other quality that is essential for happiness. For happiness is not an end, any more than virtue. Virtue is not an end in itself; it gives freedom, and in that freedom there is discovery. Therefore, virtue is essential. Whereas, an unvirtuous person is slavish, is disorderly, is all over the place, lost, confused. But to treat virtue as an end in itself, or happiness as an end in itself, has very little meaning. So, happiness is not an end. It is a secondary issue, a by-product which will come into being if we understand something else. It is this understanding of something else, and not merely the search for happiness, that is important.

Now, why do we seek? What does it mean to make effort? We are making effort. Why are we making effort? What is the significance of effort? We say we are making an effort in order to find, in order to change, in order to be something. If we did not make effort, we should disintegrate, or retard, go back. Is that so? Please, this is very important to go into fully, and I will try as much as I can this morning to go into it. If we did not make effort, what would happen? Would we stagnate? But we are making effort. And why? Effort to change, effort to be different in ourselves, to be more happy, to be more beautiful, to be more virtuous—this constant strife and constant effort. If we can understand that, then perhaps we will understand more deeply, other issues.

Why do you seek? Is the search prompted by disease, by ill-health, by

moods? Do you make an effort because you are unhappy and you want to be happy? Do you seek because you are going to die, and therefore you want to find? Do you seek because you have not fulfilled yourself in the world, therefore you want to fulfill here? Do you seek because you are unhappy, and, hoping for happiness, you seek, you search, you try to find out? So, one must understand the motive for one's search, must one not? What is the motive for your eternal search?—if you are *really* searching, which I question. What you want is substitution: as this is not profitable, perhaps that will be; as this hasn't given me happiness, perhaps that will. So one is really seeking, not truth, not happiness, but a substitution that will give one happiness; a thing that will be profitable, that will be safe, that will give one gratification. Surely, that is what we are seeking, if we were very honest and clear in ourselves; but we clothe our gratification with words like God, love, and so on.

Now, why do we not approach this question differently? Why don't we understand what is? Why are we not capable of looking at the thing exactly 'as is'? Which means that, if we are in pain, let us *live* with it, look at it, and not try to transform it into something else. If I am in misery, not only physically but especially psychologically, how am I to understand it? By not wishing it to be different, surely. First, I must look at it, I must live with it, I must go into it; I mustn't condemn it, I mustn't compare it, wish it to be something else; I must be entirely with that thing, must I not? Which is extremely arduous, because the mind refuses to look at it. It wants to go off at a tangent, it says, 'Let me seek an answer, a solution, there *must* be one'. In other words, it is escaping from what is. And this escape, with most of us, is what we call search—search for the Master, search for truth, search for love, search for God: you know the

various terms we use to escape from what exactly is taking place. And, do we have to make an effort to understand what is taking place? We have to make an effort to escape when we don't want it. But when it is there, to understand it, do we have to make an effort? Obviously, we have made effort to escape, to avoid, to cover up what is; and, with that same mentality, which is to make an effort in order to avoid, in order to escape, we approach what is. Do you understand what is, with an effort? Or, must there be *no* effort to understand what is? So, that is one of the problems, is it not? This constant effort to avoid the understanding of what is, has become habitual with most of us, and with that same mentality of making an effort in order to escape, we say, 'All right, I'll drop all escapes and make an effort to understand what is'. Do we understand anything really, significantly, deeply, do we understand anything that has a meaning, through effort? To understand something, must there not obviously be a passivity of the mind, an alertness which is yet passive? Please, you cannot arrive at that passivity of the mind which is alert, through effort, can you? If you make an effort to be passive, you are no longer passive. If one really understands that, the significance of that, and sees the truth of it, then one will be passive. One doesn't have to make an effort.

So, when we seek, we are seeking either with the motive of escape, or of trying to be something more than what is; or else one says, 'I am all these things, I must run away'—which is unbalance, insanity. Surely, the search for truth, for the Master, is a state of insanity when the thing is there which *must* be understood before you can go further. That breeds illusion, ignorance. So, first one must find out what one is seeking, and why. Most of us know what we are seeking, and therefore it is a projection, therefore unreal; it is merely a home-made thing. Therefore, it is not truth, it is not the real.

And, in understanding this process of search, this constant making effort to be, to discipline, to deny, to assert, one must inquire into the question of what is the thinker. Is the one who makes the effort separate from the thing which he wants to be? Sorry, it may be a little difficult to pursue this, but I hope you don't mind. You have asked the question, and I am going to try to answer it.

Is the maker of effort different from the object toward which he is making effort? This is really very important; because if we can find the truth of this, we will see that there comes immediate transformation, which is essential for understanding—which is understanding, rather. Because, as long as there is a separate entity which makes the effort, as long as there is a separate entity as the experiencer, the thinker, different from the thought, from the object, from the experience, there will always be this problem of seeking, disciplining, bridging the gulf between the thought and the thinker, and so on. Whereas, if we can find the truth of this matter, whether the thinker is separate from the thought, and see the real truth of it, then there will be quite a different process at work. Therefore, you have to find out before you seek, before you find the object of your search—whether it is a Master or a cinema or any other excitement, they are all on the same level—, whether the seeker is different from the object of his search, and why he is different. Why is the maker of effort different from the thing which he wants to be? And is he different? To put it in another way: you have thoughts, and you are also the thinker. You say, 'I think. I am this, and I must be that. I am greedy, or mean, or envious, or angry, I have certain habits, and I must break away from them'. Now, is the thinker different from the thought? If he is different, then the whole process must exist of making an effort to bridge, of the thinker trying to alter his thought, the thinker trying to concentrate, to avoid, resist the

encroachments of other thoughts. But if he is not different, then there is complete transformation of the way one lives. So, we will have to go into that very carefully and discover—not at the verbal level at all; but experience it directly, if we can, as we go along this morning. Which is not to be mesmerized by what I am saying, or accept it, because that has no meaning; but actually to experience for oneself, whether this division is true, and why it exists.

Surely, memories are not different from the me which thinks about them. I am those memories. The memory of the way to the place where I live, the memory of my youth, the memories of both inexperienced and fulfilled desires, the memories of injuries, resentments, ambitions—all that is me, I am not separate from it. Surely, that is an obvious fact, isn't it? The me is not separate, even though you may believe that it is. Since you can think about it, it is still part of thought, and thought is the result of the past. Therefore, it is still within the net of thought, which is memory.

The division between the maker of thought, the seeker, the thinker, and the thought, is artificial, fictitious; the division has been made because we see that thoughts are transient, they come and go. They have no substance in themselves, and the thinker separates himself to give himself permanency: he exists while thoughts vary. It is a false security; and if one sees the falseness of it, actually experiences it, then there are only thought, and not the thinker and the thoughts. Then you will see—if it is an actual experience, not merely a verbal assertion nor just an amusement, a hobby—then you will find, if it is a real experiencing, that there is a complete revolution in your thinking. Then there is a real transformation, because then there is no longer a seeking for quietude or aloneness. Then there is only the concern with what is thinking, what is thought. Then you will see, if this transformation takes place, that there

is no longer an effort, but an extraordinary, alert passivity, in which there is understanding of every relationship, of every incident as it arises; therefore, the mind is always fresh to meet things anew. And hence that silence, which is so essential, is not a thing to be cultivated, but comes into being naturally when you understand this fundamental thing, that the thinker is the thought, and therefore the I is transient. Therefore, the I has no permanency, the I is not a spiritual entity. If you are able to think that the I is gone, or is something spiritual, everlasting, it is still the product of thought, and therefore of the known, therefore not true.

Therefore, it is really important, essential to understanding, to have this sense of complete integration—which cannot be forced—between the thinker and the thought. It is like a deep experience which cannot be invited; you cannot lie awake thinking about it. It must be seen immediately; and we do not see it because we are clinging to past beliefs, conditioning, what we have learned—that the I is something spiritual, more than all the thoughts. Surely, it is so obvious that whatever you think is the product of the past, of your memories, of words, sensations, of your conditioning. You cannot think about the unknown, surely; you cannot know the unknown, therefore, you cannot think about it. What you can think about is the known. Therefore, it is a projection from the past. And, one must see the significance of all this, and then there will be the experiencing of that integration between the thought and the thinker. The division has been artificially created for self-protection, and is therefore unreal. When once there is the experiencing of that integration, then there is a complete transformation with regard to our thinking, feeling, and outlook on life. Then there is only a state of experiencing, and not the experiencer apart from the experienced, which has to be altered,

modified changed. There is only a state of constant experiencing—not the core experiencing, not the center, the me, the memory, experiencing, but only a *state* of experiencing. We do this occasionally when we are completely absent, when the self is absent.

I do not know if you have noticed that when there is a deep experiencing of anything, there is neither the sensation of the experiencer nor the experience, but only a state of experiencing, a complete integration. When you are violently angry, you are not conscious of yourself as the experiencer. Later on, as that experience of anger fades, you become conscious of yourself being angry. Then you do something about that anger to deny it, to justify it, to condone it—you know, various forms of trying to pass it away. But if there is not the entity who is angry, but only that state of experiencing, then there is a complete transformation.

If you will experiment with this, you will see that there is this radical experiencing, this radical transformation, which is a revolution. Then the mind is quiet—not *made* quiet, not compelled, disciplined. Such quietness is death, is stagnation. A mind that is made quiet through discipline, through compulsion, through fear, is a dead mind. But, when there is the experiencing of that which is vital, which is essential, which is real, which is the beginning of transformation, then the mind is quiet, without any compulsion. And, when the mind is quiet, then it is capable of receiving, because you are not spending your efforts in resisting, in building barriers between yourself and reality, whatever that reality may be. All that you have read about reality, is not reality. Reality cannot be described; and if it is described, it is not the real. And, for the mind to be new, for the mind to be capable of receiving the unknown, it must be empty. The mind can be empty only when the whole content of the mind is understood. To understand the content of the mind, one must be watch-

ful, aware of every movement, of every incident, of every sensation. Therefore, self-knowledge is essential. But, if one is seeking achievement through self-knowledge, then again self-knowledge leads to self-consciousness, and there one is stuck; and it is extraordinarily difficult to withdraw from that net when once you are caught. Not to be caught in it, we must understand the process of desire, the craving to be something—not the desire for food, clothes and shelter, which is quite different, but—the psychological craving to be something, to achieve a result, to have a name, to have a position, to be powerful, or to be humble. Surely, only when the mind is empty, then only can it be useful. But a mind crowded with fears, with memories of what it has been in the past, with the sensations of past experiences—such a mind is utterly useless, is it not? Such a mind is incapable of knowing what is creation.

Surely, we must all have had experiences of those moments when the mind is absent, and suddenly there is a flash of joy, a flash of an idea, a light, a great bliss. How does that happen? It happens when the self is absent, when the process of thought, worry, memories, pain is still. Therefore, creation takes place only when the mind is quiet, self-knowledge, has come to a state when it is completely empty. All this means arduous attention, not merely indulging in verbal sessions, seeking, going from one guru to another, from teacher to teacher doing absurd and vain rituals, repeating words, seeking Masters—all these are illusions, they have no meaning. They are hobbies. But to go into this question of self-knowledge and not be caught in self-consciousness, to go ever more deeply, more profoundly so that the mind is completely quiet—that is true religion. Then the mind is capable of receiving that which is eternal.

August 28, 1949