

Selection From On War and Peace by Krishnamurti

J. Krishnamurti Bombay 5th Public Talk 12th March 1950

Question: How can I as an individual meet, overcome and resolve the growing tension and war-fever between India and Pakistan? This situation creates a mentality of revenge and mass retaliation. Appeals and arguments are completely inadequate. Inaction is a crime. How does one meet a problem like this?

Krishnamurti: Sir why do you call inaction a crime? There are only two ways of dealing with this, according to you, which is either to become a pacifist or to take a gun. That is the only way you respond, is it not? That is the only way most people know in which to answer a problem of this kind. To you, the gun and pacifism are the only means of action, are they not? You think you are answering the challenge when you take revenge with a gun, or whatever it is you do; and if you think that violence is no solution, you become a pacifist. In other words, you want recognition for your action, and the recognition satisfies you; you say, 'I am a pacifist', or 'I have a gun', and this labeling of yourself satisfies you, and you think you have answered the problem. Surely, that is the general response, is it not? So, that is why you say inaction is a crime. Of course it is a crime from those two points of view. A man who does not carry a gun or call himself a pacifist is to you a criminal, because you think according to the recognized labels, according to those two ways. Now, seeing that, let us find out if inaction is a crime - inaction being not to act along either of those two lines or their equivalents. Is that a crime? Is it a crime to say, 'I am neither a pacifist, nor do I carry a gun'? When would you say that? When you see that both are merely reactions to the challenge, and that through reaction you cannot solve the problem. Surely, the man who carries a gun is doing so because of his reaction, which is the outcome of his conditioning as a nationalist, as an Indian, as a Pakistani, or whatever he is called. The carrying of the gun is merely a reaction according to his conditioning. And the man who does not carry a gun, who calls himself a pacifist, is also reacting according to his particular view, is he not? Those are the two reactions which we know, with which we are all acquainted. During wartime you make the pacifist a martyr, and so on; but both are recognized means of activity, and when you act along either of those two lines, with all their implications, you are satisfied, you feel that at least you are doing something about the war, and people recognize that you are doing it. You feel satisfied and they feel satisfied; and the more carrying of guns, the better.

Now, the man who in wartime neither carries a gun nor calls himself a pacifist, who is inactive in the deep sense of the word, who does not respond to the challenge as a reaction - such a man you call inactive and therefore criminal. Now, is he the criminal? Is he inactive? Are you not the criminals, both the pacifist and the man who carries a gun? Surely, the criminal is not the man who says, 'I will not react to war in any way', because such a man has no country, he belongs to no religion, no dogma, he has no leader, political, religious or economic, he does not belong to any party, because these are all reactions; and therefore he is neither a pacifist nor does he carry a gun. And a man who does not react to the challenge, but who is the challenge, such a man you call inactive, a useless entity, because he does not fit into either of these two categories. Surely, the whole thing is wrong, pacifism as well as carrying a gun, because they are mere reactions, and through reaction you will never solve any problem. You will solve the problem of war only when you yourself are the challenge, and not merely a reaction.

So, the man who carries a gun does not solve the problem, he only increases the problem; for each war produces another war, it is an historical fact. The first world war produced the second world war, the second will produce the third, and so the chain keeps going. Now, when you see that, you react against it and say, 'I am a pacifist, I won't carry a gun and I will go to prison, I will suffer for it; I have a cause for which I am acting'. The suffering, the martyrdom, is still a reaction, and so it cannot solve the problem either. But the man who is not reacting to war in any way is the challenge itself, he is in himself the breaker of old traditions, and such a man is the only entity that can resolve this problem. That is why it is important to understand yourself, your conditioning, your upbringing, the way you are educated; because, the government, the whole system, is your own projection. The world is you, the world is not separate from you; the world with its problems is projected out of your responses, out of your reactions, so the solution does not lie in creating further reactions.

There can be a solution only when there is action which is not reaction, and that can come into being only when you understand the whole process of response to stimuli both from outside and inside, which means that you understand the structure of your own being from which society is created.

J. Krishnamurti Bombay 2nd Public Talk 19th February 1950

Question: Through such movements as the United Nations Organization and the World Pacifist Conferences recently held in India, men all over the world are making an individual and collective effort to prevent the third world war. How does your attempt differ from theirs, and do you hope to have any appreciable results? Can the impending war be prevented?

Krishnamurti: Let us first dispose of the obvious facts, and then go more deeply into the matter. The first fact is the impending war; and can we prevent it? Sir, what do you think? Men are bent on slaughtering each other; you are bent on slaughtering your neighbor - not with swords, perhaps, but you are exploiting them, aren't you?, politically, religiously, and economically. There are social, communal, lingual divisions, and are you not making a great ado about all this? You do not want to prevent the impending war because some of you are going to make money. (Laughter.) The cunning are going to make money, and the stupid also will want to make more. For God's sake, see the ugliness, the ruthlessness of it.

Sir, when you have a set purpose of gain at all costs, the result is inevitable, is it not? The third world war is arising from the second world war, the second world war arose from the first, and the first was the result of previous wars. Until you put an end to the cause, mere tinkering with the symptoms has no significance. One of the causes of war is nationalism, sovereign governments and all the ugliness that goes with them - power prestige, position and authority. Most of us do not want to put an end to war because our lives are incomplete; our whole existence is a battlefield, a ceaseless conflict, not only with one's wife, one's husband, one's neighbor, but with ourselves - the constant struggle to become something. That is our life, of which war and the hydrogen bomb are merely the violent and spectacular projections; and as long as we do not understand the whole significance of our existence and bring about a radical transformation, there can be no peace in the world.

Now, the second problem is much more difficult, much more demanding of your attention - which does not mean that the first one is not important. It is that most of us pay scant attention to the transformation of ourselves because we do not want to be transformed. We are contented and do not want to be disturbed. We are satisfied to go along as we are, and that is why we are sending our children to war, why we must have military training. You all want to save your bank accounts, hold on to your property - all in the name of non-violence, in the name of God and peace, which is a lot of sanctimonious nonsense. What do we mean by peace? You say the U.N.O. is trying to establish peace by organizing its member nations, which means it is balancing power. Is that a pursuit of peace?

Then there is the gathering of individuals around a certain idea of what they consider to be peace. That is, the individual resists war either according to his moral persuasion, or his economic ideas. We place peace either on a rational basis, or on a moral basis. We say we must have peace because war is not profitable, which is the economic reason; or we say we must have peace because it is immoral to kill, it is irreligious, man is Godly in his nature and must not be destroyed, and so on. So, there are all these various explanations of why we should not have war; the religious, moral, humanitarian, or ethical reasons for peace on the one hand, and the rational, economic, or social reasons on the other.

Now, is peace a thing of the mind? If you have a reason, a motive for peace, will that bring about peace? Do you understand what I mean? If I refrain from killing you because I think it is immoral, is that peaceful? If for economic reasons I do not destroy, if I do not join the army because I think it is unprofitable, is that peaceful? If I base my peace on a motive, on a reason, can that bring about peace? If I love you because you are beautiful, because you please me bodily, is that love? Sirs, please pay a little attention to it, because it is very important. Most of us have so cultivated our minds, we are so intellectual, that we want to find reasons for not killing, the reasons being the appalling destructiveness of the atomic bomb, the moral and economic arguments for peace, and so on; and we think that the more reasons we have for not killing, the more there will be peace. But can you have peace through a reason, can peace be made into a cause? Is not the very cause part of the conflict? Is non-violence, is peace an ideal to be pursued and attained eventually through a gradual process of evolution? These are all reasons, rationalizations, are they not? So, if we are at all thoughtful, our question really is, is it not? whether peace is a result, the outcome of a cause, or whether peace is a state of being, not in the future or in the past, but now. If peace, if non-violence is an ideal, surely it indicates that actually you are violent, you are not peaceful. You wish to be peaceful, and you give reasons why you should be peaceful; and being satisfied with the reasons, you remain violent. Actually, a man who wants peace, who sees the necessity of being peaceful, has no ideal about peace. He does not make an effort to become peaceful, but sees the necessity, the truth of being peaceful. It is only the man who does not see the importance, the necessity, the truth of being peaceful, who makes non-violence an ideal - which is really only a postponement of peace. And that is what you are doing: you are all worshipping the ideal of peace, and in the meantime enjoying violence. (Laughter.) Sirs, you laugh; you are easily amused, aren't you? It is another entertainment; and when you leave this meeting, you will go on exactly as before. Do you expect to have peace by your facile arguments, your casual talk? You will not have peace because you do not want peace, you are not interested in it, you do not see the importance, the necessity of having peace now, not tomorrow. It is only when you have no reason for being peaceful that you will have peace.

Sirs, as long as you have a reason to live, you are not living, are you? You live only when there is no reason, no cause - you just live. Similarly, as long as you have a reason for peace, you will have no peace. A mind that invents a reason for being peaceful is in conflict, and such a mind will produce chaos and conflict in the world. Just think it out and you will see. How can the mind that invents reasons for peace, be peaceful? You can have very clever arguments and counter-arguments; but is not the very structure of the mind based on violence? The mind is the outcome of time, of yesterday, and it is always in conflict with the present; but the man who really wants to be peaceful now, has no reason for it. For the peaceful man, there is no motive for peace. Sir, has generosity a motive? When you are generous with a motive, is that generosity? When a man renounces the world in order to achieve God, in order to find something greater, is that renunciation? If I give up this in order to find that, have I really given up anything? If I am peaceful for various reasons, have I found peace?

So, then, is not peace a thing far beyond the mind and the inventions of the mind? Most of us, most religious people with their organizations, come to peace through reason, through discipline, through conformity, because there is no direct perception of the necessity, the truth of being peaceful. Peacefulness, that state of peace, is not stagnation; on the contrary, it is a most active state. But the mind can only know the activity of its own creation, which is thought; and thought can never be peaceful, thought is sorrow, thought is conflict. As we know only sorrow and misery, we try to find ways and means to go beyond it; and whatever the mind invents only further increases its own misery, its own conflict, its own strife. You will say that very few will understand this, that very few will ever be peaceful in the right sense of the word. Why do you say that? Is it not because it is a convenient escape for you? You say that peace can never be achieved in the way I am talking about, it is impossible; therefore you must have reasons for peace, you must have organizations for peace, you must have clever propoganda for peace. But all those methods are obviously mere postponement of peace. Only when you are directly in touch with the problem, when you see that without peace today you cannot have peace tomorrow, when you have no reason for peace but actually see the truth that without peace life is not possible, creation is not possible, that without peace there can be no sense of happiness - only when you see the truth of that, will you have peace. Then you will have peace without any organizations for peace. Sir, for that you must be so vulnerable, you must demand peace with all your heart, you must find the truth of it for yourself, not through organizations, through propoganda, through clever arguments for peace and against war. Peace is not the denial of war. Peace is a state of being in which all conflicts and all problems have ceased; it is not a theory, not an ideal to be achieved after ten incarnations, ten years or ten days. As long as the mind has not understood its own activity, it will create more misery; and the understanding of the mind is the beginning of peace.

J.Krishnamurti New York 3rd Public Talk 18th June 1950

Is good the opposite of evil? When you deny vice and go to the opposite, is that virtue? If you deny, resist, put away the ugly, are you beautiful? Is the pursuit of an opposite ever peaceful, ever virtuous or beautiful? The opposite implies conflict, does it not? If you deny violence and pursue peace, what happens? The very pursuit of peace creates conflict, because you are denying violence. The very denial creates conflict; and is virtue ever the result of conflict? Is peace the denial of war? War is obviously the extension, the projection of ourselves, is it not? War is the spectacular and bloody projection

of our own daily existence. We call ourselves Americans, or Russians, or Hindus, or God knows what else, out of our desire to be safe; and this identification with a particular country, race, or group of people, gives us a sense of security. But identification with a group or nation means separation, leading to disintegration and war. Surely, as long as I am seeking identification in any form - with my family, with my group, with my property, with my particular ideology or belief - there must be separation, disintegration, and war. Although it is the dream of all ideologists, whether of the left or of the right, to have everybody believing in one particular theory or system, such a thing is an impossibility. Belief always separates, and therefore it is a disintegrating factor.

So, as long as you and I are in conflict inwardly, psychologically, there must be the projection of that conflict in the world as war. Without understanding your own inward conflict, merely to become a pacifist, or join an organization for peace, has no meaning. A man who merely resists war while remaining in psychological conflict only creates further confusion. But if you really understand this total process of inward conflict, which projects itself in the world as war, then obviously you are neither a war monger nor a mere pacifist - you are something entirely different; because you are at peace with yourself, you are at peace with the world. Being at peace inwardly and therefore outwardly, you will obviously not belong to any nationality, to any religion, to any particular group or class; and if you are brought before the tribunal to be conscripted, or whatever it is called, you will probably be shot. But that is not your responsibility: it is the responsibility of society, because society rejects you. After all, society is not very intelligent anyhow. What is society? It is your own projection, is it not? What you and I are, society is. So, don't call society stupid and laugh at it. Society is the structure of ourselves in projection; and if we want to bring about a fundamental revolution in society, there must be a fundamental revolution in ourselves - which is an enormously difficult task. Any revolution based on an idea is never a revolution: it is merely a modified continuity. Ideas can never be revolutionary, because ideas are merely the reactions of memory. Thought is mere reaction; and an action based on reaction can never be fundamental, can never be true.

Surely, then, whether or not you should be a pacifist, is not the problem. We see that everything in the world is contributing to war. War is obviously no means of settling any thing, but apparently we are incapable of learning that. We change enemies from time to time, and we seem to be quite satisfied with this process, which is kept going by propaganda, by our own desire to be revengeful, by our own inward, psychological conflict. So, we are encouraging war through nationalism, through greed, through the desire to be successful, to become somebody. That is, we encourage war inwardly, and then outwardly want to be pacifists, and such pacifism obviously has no meaning. It is only a contradiction. We all want to become something: a pacifist, a war hero, a millionaire, a virtuous man, or what you will. The very desire to become, involves conflict; and that conflict produces war. There is peace only when there is no desire to become something; and that is the only true state, because in that state alone there is creation, there is reality. But that is completely foreign to the whole structure of society - which is the projection of yourself. You worship success. Your god is success, the giver of titles, degrees, position and authority. There is a constant battle within yourself, the struggle to achieve what you want. You never have a peaceful moment, there is never peace in your heart, because you are always striving to become something, to progress. Do not be misled by the word 'progress'. Mechanical things progress, but thought can never progress except in terms of its own becoming. Thought moves from the

known to the known; but that is not growth, that is not evolution, that is not freedom.

So, if you want to be a pacifist in the true sense of the word, which is to be free of conflict, you have to understand yourself; and when the mind and heart are peaceful, quiet, then you will know what it is to be without conflict, which will express itself in action, whatever that action may be. But to make up your mind to become something, is merely a process of striving, which inevitably creates further conflict and strife. As every war produces another war, so each conflict produces more conflict. There can be real peace only when conflict ends, and to end conflict is to understand the whole process of oneself.

J. Krishnamurti Ojai 7th Public Talk 7th July, 1940

Questioner: What is best attitude towards this terrible war in Europe? Can we do anything by thought? I feel the horror and suffering of this war. Can I escape from it? Can I escape from it if I dissociate myself from it? Will you consider the present world conditions in your talk?

Krishnamurti: We often mistakenly think that the world's chaos and misery arise from a single cause and by overcoming it we shall bring order and happiness to the world. Life is a complex process and we must have wide and deep understanding to grasp its vastness. War is the result of our daily life, of our acquisitiveness, of our general attitude towards our fellow men in so-called peace-time. In our daily life we are competitive, aggressive, nationalistic, vengeful, self-seeking, which inevitably culminates in war; intellectually and emotionally we are influenced and limited by the past which produces the present reaction of hate, antagonism, and conflict. Intellectually we are incapable of clear discernment, and so we are confused; we are incapable of critical discernment because our faculty to think has become dulled by previous influences and limitations. Until thought is freed from them, struggle and war, pain and sorrow, will continue. Until our own lives are no longer aggressive and greedy, and psychologically we cease seeking security, and so breaking up the world into different classes, races, nationalities, religions, there cannot be peace.

Though, superficially, there might be a cessation of this carnage, yet until we direct our minds and hearts earnestly and strenuously to understand and so free ourselves from those psychological causes of acquisitiveness, possessive love, and continuity of self, struggle and misery must ever be. Peace is from within, not from without. This understanding of peace requires deep thought and earnestness.

You ask if you can escape from war if you dissociate yourself from it. How can you dissociate yourself from war? For you are the cause of war. Why are you associated with this war that is going on? Either because your relations are involved in it or you are emotionally caught up in it. If your relations are involved in it, such a sorrow is understandable, but merely to be emotionally involved in it is thoughtless. If you merely dissociate yourself from this form of excitement you will undoubtedly turn to other forms. So unless you understand why you depend upon sensation, upon this constant search for excitement, which becomes vulgar and degrading, you will ever find new forms of excitement, satisfaction. The cause is deep and you have to understand it to be free from its superficialities.

Do not think by merely wishing for peace, you will have peace, when in your daily life of relationship you are aggressive, acquisitive, seeking psychological security here or in the hereafter. You have to understand the central cause of conflict and sorrow and then dissolve it and not merely look to the outside for peace. But you see, most of us are indolent. We are too lazy to take hold of ourselves and understand ourselves, and being lazy, which is really a form of conceit, we think others will solve this problem for us and give us peace, or that we should destroy the apparently few people that are causing wars. When the individual is in conflict within himself he must inevitably create conflict without, and only he can bring about peace within himself and so in the world, for he is the world.

J. Krishnamurti Ojai 5th Public Talk 1945

Questioner: You said last Sunday that each one of us is responsible for these terrible wars. Are we also responsible for the abominable tortures in the concentration camps and for the deliberate extermination of a people in Central Europe?

Krishnamurti: Is it not very evident that each one of us is responsible for war? Wars do not come into being out of unknown causes, they have definite sources and those who wish to extricate themselves from this periodical madness called war must search out these causes and free themselves. War is one of the greatest calamities that could happen to man who is capable of experiencing the Real. He must be concerned with eliminating the cause of war within himself, not with who is less or more degraded and terrible in war. We must not be carried away with secondary issues but be aware of the primary issue which is organized killing itself. The secondary issues may cause fear and the desire for vengeance, but without understanding the essential reasons for war conflict and sorrow will not cease.

To kill another is the greatest crime, for man is capable of realizing the Highest. War, the deliberate organization of murder, is the greatest catastrophe that man can bring upon himself for with it comes untold misery and destruction, degradation and corruption; when once you admit such a vast "evil" as the organized murder of others, then you open the door to a host of minor disasters. Each one of us is responsible for war for each one has brought about the present condition, consciously or unconsciously by his attitude towards life, by the false values he has given to existence. Having lost the eternal value the passing sensory values become all important. There is no end to ever expanding desire. Things are necessary but have no eternal value and the mad desire for possessions ever leads to strife and misery.

When acquisitiveness in every form is encouraged, when nationalism and separate sovereign states exist, when religion separates, when there is intolerance and ignorance then killing your fellowman is inevitable. War is the result of our every day life. Passion, ill will and oppression are justified when they are national; to kill for the State, for the country, for an ideology, is considered necessary, noble. Each one indulges in this degrading ruthlessness for there is in each one the desire to do harm. War becomes a means of releasing one's own brutal instincts and encourages irresponsibility. Such a state is only possible when sensate values predominate.

As each one is responsible for the shaping of this culture, if each one does not radically transform himself then how can there be an end to this brutal world

and its ways? Each one is responsible for these tragedies and disasters, for tortures and bestialities, if he thinks-feels in terms of nations, groups, or thinks of himself as Hindu or Buddhist, Christian or Moslem. If a so-called "foreigner" in India is killed by a nationalist, then I am responsible for that murder if I am a nationalist; but I am not responsible if I do not think-feel in terms of nations, groups or classes, if I am not lustful, if I have no ill will, if I am not worldly. Then only is there freedom from responsibility for killing, torturing, oppressing.

We have lost the feeling of humanity; we feel responsible only to the class or group to which we belong; we feel responsible to a name, to a label. We have lost compassion, the love of the whole, and without this quickening flame of life we look to politicians, to priests, to some economic planning for peace and happiness. In these there is no hope. In each one alone is there creative understanding, that compassion which is necessary for the well-being of man. Right means create right ends, wrong means will bring only emptiness and death, not peace and joy.

Krishnamurti to Himself Brockwood Park Thursday 31st March, 1983

There are demonstrations all over the country against particular kinds of war, against nuclear destruction. There are pros and cons. The politicians talk about defense, but actually there is no defense; there is only war, there is only killing millions of people. This is rather a difficult situation. It is a great problem which man is facing. One side wants to expand in its own way, the other is aggressively pushing, selling arms, bringing about certain definite ideologies and invading lands.

Man is now posing a question he should have put to himself many years ago, not at the last moment. He has been preparing for wars all the days of his life. Preparation for war seems unfortunately to be our natural tendency. Having come a long way along that path we are now saying: what shall we do? What are we human beings to do? Actually facing the issue, what is our responsibility? This is what is really facing our present humanity, not what kinds of instruments of war we should invent and build. We always bring about a crisis and then ask ourselves what to do. Given the situation as it is now, the politicians and the vast general public will decide with their national, racial, pride, with their fatherlands and motherlands and all the rest of it,

The question is too late. The question we must put to ourselves, in spite of the immediate action to be taken, is whether it is possible to stop all wars, not a particular kind of war, the nuclear or the orthodox, and find out most earnestly what are the causes of war. Until those causes are discovered, dissolved, whether we have conventional war or the nuclear form of war, we will go on and man will destroy man.

So we should really ask: what are essentially, fundamentally, the causes of war? See together the true causes, not invented, not romantic, patriotic causes and all that nonsense, but actually see why man prepares to murder legally - war. Until we research and find the answer, wars will go on. But we are not seriously enough considering, or committed to, the uncovering of the causes of war. Putting aside what we are now faced with, the immediacy of the issue, the present crisis, can we not together discover the true causes and put them aside, dissolve them? This needs the urge to find the truth.

Why is there, one must ask, this division - the Russian, the American, the British, the French, the German and so on - why is there this division between man and man, between race and race, culture against culture, one series of ideologies against another? Why? Why is there this separation? Man has divided the earth as yours and mine - why? Is it that we try to find security, self-protection, in a particular group, or in a particular belief, faith? For religions also have divided man, put man against man - the Hindus, the Muslims, the Christians, the Jews and so on. Nationalism, with its unfortunate patriotism, is really a glorified form, an ennobled form, of tribalism. In a small tribe or in a very large tribe there is a sense of being together, having the same language, the same superstitions, the same kind of political, religious system. And one feels safe, protected, happy, comforted. And for that safety, comfort, we are willing to kill others who have the same kind of desire to be safe, to feel protected, to belong to something. This terrible desire to identify oneself with a group, with a flag, with a religious ritual and so on, gives us the feeling that we have roots, that we are not homeless wanderers. There is the desire, the urge, to find one's roots.

And also we have divided the world into economic spheres, with all their problems. Perhaps one of the major causes of war is heavy industry. When industry and economics go hand in hand with politics they must inevitably sustain a separatist activity to maintain their economic stature. All countries are doing this, the great and the small. The small are being armed by the big nations - some quietly, surreptitiously, others openly. Is the cause of all this misery, suffering, and the enormous waste of money on armaments, the visible sustenance of pride, of wanting to be superior to others?

It is our earth, not yours or mine or his. We are meant to live on it, helping each other, not destroying each other. This is not some romantic nonsense but the actual fact. But man has divided the earth, hoping thereby that in the particular he is going to find happiness, security, a sense of abiding comfort. Until a radical change takes place and we wipe out all nationalities, all ideologies, all religious divisions, and establish a global relationship - psychologically first, inwardly before organizing the outer - we shall go on with wars. If you harm others, if you kill others, whether in anger or by organized murder which is called war, you, who are the rest of humanity, not a separate human being fighting the rest of mankind, are destroying yourself.

This is the real issue, the basic issue, which you must understand and resolve. Until you are committed, dedicated, to eradicating this national, economic, religious division, you are perpetuating war, you are responsible for all wars whether nuclear or traditional.

This is really a very important and urgent question: whether man, you, can bring about this change in yourself - not say. 'If I change, will it have any value? Won't it be just a drop in a vast lake and have no effect at all? What is the point of my changing?' That is a wrong question, if one may point out. It is wrong because you are the rest of mankind. You are the world, you are not separate from the world. You are not an American, Russian, Hindu or Muslim. You are apart from these labels and words, you are the rest of mankind because your consciousness, your reactions, are similar to the others. You may speak a different language, have different customs, that is superficial culture - all cultures apparently are superficial - but your consciousness, your reactions, your faith, your beliefs, your ideologies, your fears, anxieties, loneliness, sorrow and pleasure, are similar to the rest of mankind. If you change it will affect the whole of mankind.

This is important to consider - not vaguely, superficially - in inquiring into, researching, seeking out, the causes of war. War can only be understood and put an end to if you and all those who are concerned very deeply with the survival of man, feel that you are utterly responsible for killing others. What will make you change? What will make you realize the appalling situation that we have brought about now? What will make you turn your face against all division - religious, national, ethical and so on? Will more suffering? But you have had thousands upon thousands of years of suffering and man has not changed; he still pursues the same tradition, same tribalism, the same religious divisions of 'my god' and 'your god'.

The gods or their representatives are invented by thought; they have actually no reality in daily life. Most religions have said that to kill human beings is the greatest sin. Long before Christianity, the Hindus said this, the Buddhists said it, yet people kill in spite of their belief in god, or their belief in a savior and so on; they still pursue the path of killing. Will the reward of heaven change you or the punishment of hell? That too has been offered to man. And that too has failed. No external imposition, laws, systems, will ever stop the killing of man. Nor will any intellectual, romantic, conviction stop wars. They will stop only when you, as the rest of humanity, see the truth that as long as there is division in any form, there must be conflict, limited or wide, narrow or expansive, that there must be struggle, conflict, pain. So you are responsible, not only to your children, but to the rest of humanity. Unless you deeply understand this, not verbally or ideationally or merely intellectually, but feel this in your blood, in your way of looking at life, in your actions, you are supporting organized murder which is called war. The immediacy of perception is far more important than the immediacy of answering a question which is the outcome of a thousand years of man killing man.

The world is sick and there is no one outside you to help you except yourself. We have had leaders, specialists, every kind of external agency, including god - they have had no effect; they have in no way influenced your psychological state. They cannot guide you. No statesman, no teacher, no guru, no one can make you strong inwardly, supremely healthy. As long as you are in disorder, as long as your house is not kept in a proper condition, a proper state, you will create the external prophet, and he will always be misleading you. Your house is in disorder and no one on this earth or in heaven can bring about order in your house. Unless you yourself understand the nature of disorder, the nature of conflict, the nature of division, your house, that is you, will always remain in disorder, at war.

It is not a question of who has the greatest military might, but rather it is man against man, man who has put together ideologies, and these ideologies, which man has made, are against each other. Until these ideas, ideologies, end and man becomes responsible for other human beings, there cannot possibly be peace in the world.