

- Sydney 1970 -

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[ABC Television Interview](#)

TALKS AND DIALOGUES SYDNEY 1970 1ST PUBLIC TALK 21ST NOVEMBER, 1970

I THINK IT quite important that we understand each other, because we are not concerned with any Oriental philosophy or with any theory; we are not indulging in speculation, any form of theoretical assumptions. We will be concerned only with things as they are and to see if the human mind can radically bring about a change in things as they are. Therefore it is necessary to observe very clearly without any prejudice, without any conclusion what actually is going on in the world; not according to the Asiatic outlook or the Western or the communist or the capitalist but observe the various happenings that are taking place in the world.

First of all, one sees right through the world a great deal of violence, incredible brutality, destruction, a meaningless kind of violence and revolt, revolt against the established order, revolt against war, revolt against all the social moralities.

Obviously social morality is immorality. One observes the division, the fragmentation that's going on, not only at the physical level but also at the religious level. physically, geographically, there is division between nationalities, sovereign governments with their armies, defence, and so on; there is the economic division, the division between black and white and among the coloured people. There is also division among the religious people, so-called religious people. There is the Catholic against the Protestant, the Hindu against the Muslim and so on. Right through the world there is fragmentation, the businessman and the artist, the scientist and the layman, the technician and the ordinary person. This is a fact

and one sees what incredible conflict exists between human beings.

Religions, that is organized beliefs based on propaganda, have not solved this problem at all. Politicians haven't solved it. On the contrary, religions have separated man against man, politicians keep the country, the people apart and you can see both outwardly and inwardly there is fragmentation, division.

The very nature of division is to bring about conflict and man has tried many, many ways to bridge this conflict, through ideals, through revolt, through revolution - physical revolution - through every form of assertion, aggression, violence to see if man can live at peace, not only within himself but also outwardly. And this has been going on for millions of years - man fighting man, outwardly and inwardly.

When we are confronted with such a problem, what is the response? knowing that man has tried so many ways to get rid of this problem, through physical revolution which ends in tyranny, bureaucracy, dictatorship and he has tried religiously in belief - worshipping one God or one idea, one set of symbols, and again all that has failed, completely failed because man is still at war.

Within the last 5,000 years I believe there have been 15,000 wars and we have never been able to solve any of our human problems. We know how to escape from them, through amusement, through every form of deception, hypocrisy, negligence, indifference, callousness.

It is only the very serious people that live, not the people who want to be entertained, want to be amused; and I hope during these five talks, that those who are here are really serious people. This is not an entertainment, either philosophical or intellectual. We are

concerned, in observing all this, how to bring about a radical change in man, how to bring about a total revolution, not the revolution of bloodshed, physical revolution; that doesn't lead anywhere, as one has observed in the various kinds of revolution that have existed before. Physical revolution has no meaning; there is only one revolution, psychological, inward revolution because the human being - you - is the society. You have built this society and in that society, in that culture you're caught; therefore, you are the world and the world is you, not verbally, theoretically or intellectually, but actually. You are the world and the world is you and if you are confused, if you are disturbed, if you are neurotic, unbalanced, whatever structure you create as social morality, as law, as ethics or as religion must equally be confused. So, do please understand this very clearly from the very beginning of these talks.

We are concerned in bringing about a radical revolution in the human mind because the human mind creates the social, economic, religious structure out of its despair, out of its fear, out of its loneliness, misery, sorrow. Unless the human being, you, radically, fundamentally change, there is no possibility of having a different kind of world. When we say `you', you are not opposed to the community, you are the community, you are the collective. When we are concerned with a change of the human being, we are concerned with the radical revolution of the mind, not opposed to the collective mind. The collective mind is your mind, you are part of the culture in which you have been brought up, in which you have been educated, you're not separate from the society, from the world, so, unless you as a human being radically change there is

very little hope for a peaceful, religious society.

To bring about this change, man has tried everything. He has taken drugs, has joined innumerable cults, organized beliefs, worshipped this god and that god, joined various schools of meditation, read infinitely, but he remains exactly as he was before, slightly modified but essentially self-centred, aggressive, violent, concerned about himself. These are facts not assumptions, not theories. This you can observe if you are at all aware not only of yourself but also about what is happening in the world.

So, seeing this, what is one to do? There are the activists who say you must act, do something, commit yourself, get involved. But getting involved, identifying yourself in a particular group or a particular structure of thought, philosophy, doesn't solve the problem. Seeing all this both outwardly and inwardly, what shall we do? We must act, we must bring about a revolution in ourselves. How can this revolution take place? We cannot possibly go on as we are going, because our life is very superficial.

The life that one leads has no meaning, spending years in the office, living a shallow, empty life, living a secondhand existence and everlastingly fighting, both inwardly and outwardly. What can one do? Action implies, not in the future, or in the past; action is the creative moment in the present. So, what shall I as a human being, living in this world, do? First of all, I must negate everything that man has psychologically built in himself. That is, through negation I shall find out what is the positive; you understand?

You know one of the most difficult things in life is to communicate. The word communicating means to think together,

to feel together, to create together, share together. That's what we are going to do, share together. You're not just going to listen to the speaker, but share what the speaker has to say. You can only share if you neither disagree nor agree, but actually listen to find out. Listening is one of the most difficult things to do. Listening implies attention, and you cannot attend if your mind is chattering, if what is being said you compare with what you already know. The art of listening is very important and the art of listening is to communicate.

First of all, attempting to see things as they are, both outwardly and inwardly, man has tried several things. He thinks through analysis he can bring about change, analysis of what actually is going on, and through analysis to find the cause and bring about change in the cause. But analysis prevents action, that is, analysis implies time. Please, do listen to this, don't accept it or reject it, but listen to it, find out if the speaker is saying something false or true; find out, investigate, don't oppose it, or accept it, because we have to learn. We have accepted analysis as a way of resolution of our problems and the speaker says that way you'll never solve anything, and he's going to explain the reason why analysis is futile.

First of all, analysis implies time; to analyse day after day, week after week, examining, observing; analysing inevitably takes a very long time. Analysis implies the analyser and the analysed. And also that every analysis must be complete and true and finished, otherwise what the analyser has analysed he remembers and carries it over, which will prevent him from examining and analysing anew, right? You are following all this? Probably you have not

heard all this before, it may seem rather strange to you, but if you have observed, if you have analysed yourself, you will find that there is the analyser, examining, investigating, questioning; so there is the division between the analyser and the analysed.

Questioner: ...Interruption.

At the end of the talk you can ask questions, we can discuss, but you have first to find out what the speaker has to say. You may know your own thoughts very well, be familiar with your own ideas, opinions, but we are not dealing with opinions, with ideas. We are dealing with actually what is, and the actual fact is that man throughout the ages has thought that he could resolve his problems through analysis. We are showing that analysis does not solve the problem at all. We want to show you a different way of looking, not through analysis. When you understand the nature and the structure of analysis you totally discard it, and therefore your mind is free to observe anew. So you have to understand what is implied in analysis. You have to learn all about it, be familiar with it, then you can put it aside.

We are saying that analysis prevents action because it involves time. Analysis implies, also, the division between the analyser and the analysed, and hence the conflict between the analyser and the analysed. In analysis is implied the conscious and the unconscious. Why is there this division at all? It has been the fashion in recent years to talk a great deal about the unconscious. The unconscious is as trivial as the conscious; the unconscious is the residue of all the racial memories, the family memories, the religious, the cultural memories. We have divided it. We think that the unconscious is richer, nobler, wider, more significant; but, when you examine the

unconscious - and you can examine it only when you are aware of what is going on, not only at the superficial level of thinking, but deeply - when you observe it, you can see all the motives, the violence, the anxieties, the fears and so on.

Analysis implies all this, and, as it involves time, action is not possible, action being total action. Is that clear, at least for the time being? We have to act; action means in the present, psychological revolution is only possible now, not at some future date. Therefore, analysis is not possible, is not the way; nor is will. Will implies contradiction, suppression, control, and we have done all that. We have suppressed, we have controlled, we have denied and yet there is no radical change in ourselves; so, analysis is not the way, nor is the exercise of will.

One can see that any form of analysis is postponement of action; so what is one to do if analysis is not the way and exercise of will is not the way, will implying suppression, conformity, conflict, adjustment? If that has not produced a radical revolution in human beings then what is the way which is not any of this? I do not know if you ever asked this question of yourself. Man has tried several ways: identifying himself with the greater, with a principle, with an ideal, hoping thereby to dissolve his own anxieties, his own fears, his own misery, and he has not succeeded. Therefore, one must find a totally different way, a totally different perception and that's what we're going to do.

We are going to find out, together. You are not learning from the speaker, the speaker is not your teacher, is not your authority. We are going to learn together. Therefore, you as a human being, are your own teacher, your own disciple; therefore, there is no

outside authority beyond your own intelligence. It is your own intelligence, your own understanding, that is going to bring about a radical revolution. Please, do not listen, accepting a thing. We are learning together.

One of our difficulties, perhaps a major difficulty, is that we are all conformists. We conform very easily. Those who are in revolt against society are conformists. They reject one form of conformity and accept another form of conformity. They reject authority outside and accept another kind of authority. Where there is authority, there must be conformity; therefore, there is no freedom. Freedom exists only when we understand the whole structure and the nature of ourselves. Without freedom there is no creation, there is no life, there is no beauty. So, freedom is absolutely essential: freedom from authority, not to do what you like. One has to investigate and understand the whole nature of conformity, why human beings conform. We conform not only superficially but deeply. We conform to the latest fashion whether it's long hair, mini skirt or midi skirt. We conform to the social pattern, we conform to the morality which society has established, which, when you observe it, is actually immoral, and yet we conform - why? Why is it that the human mind accepts authority so easily? Obviously, fear, fear of going wrong, fear of getting hurt, both physically and psychologically, fear of not doing the right thing, fear of losing a job. If one lives in a Communist world, one accepts communism; if one lives in a Catholic world a Protestant finds it extremely difficult. So, we're all conformists, we obey. Authority, apart from the legal authority, and we're talking about psychological acceptance of authority, makes the mind shallow,

makes our life empty. We become secondhand human beings, which we are. The word individuality means indivisible. An individual means an entity who is indivisible, not fragmented but whole. And we're not. We're not individuals at all. This is the result, partly, of authority, conformity and accepting.

You observe all this in life, everyday life, not life at the moment of great crisis, but every day you see this going on, both within and outwardly, and when you reject analysis, when you reject authority, when you are no longer conforming - except superficially - what is the quality of the mind? What is the quality of the mind that has rejected all this, these things which haven't helped man? Hasn't it become extraordinarily sensitive, alive, free to look?

Most of us - all of us - are conditioned by the culture in which we live. You are conditioned as Australians with a lovely climate and all the rest of it, by the education, by the belief, by the religious structure in which you're caught, so you are conditioned. And a conditioned mind thinks it can solve the human problem. It cannot. It must be free of that conditioning. If I, born in India, remain a Hindu and want to resolve the whole human structure, human problem, human misery according to the conditioned mind in that particular culture, it will be impossible.

To solve the human problem the mind must be entirely unconditioned, that is, it has to become aware of its own conditioning, aware to observe without any choice, without any distortion and that's why it's very important to understand conflict. Every form of conflict distorts the mind. We are saying there is a way of living which is not the way of analysis, the way of will, the

way of conformity, but to observe, to see things actually as they are.

I wonder if you have ever observed anything, that is, to see things actually as they are, not as you wish them to be, or you hope they should be, but actually as they are? Have you ever observed a cloud? Have you ever observed your wife, or your husband or your friend, to see actually what is? It is not possible to observe clearly if you have a formula, if you have ideals, if you have images, if you assume you know. You can only observe with clarity, without distortion, when there is no image at all; when you look at a cloud, to look at it without the word. Do it sometime and you will see what happens when you look at something, a cloud, without a single word, or look at your wife or your husband or your friend without the image which you have built during 30 or 40 years or 10 days; just to observe.

In observation there is direct relationship, but when you have an image about her or him you are not in relationship. Surely, love is that relationship in which there is no image. So the question is, is it possible to observe oneself and the world without any distortion, without any symbol, without any formula? If you can observe it that way, then you will find action is immediate, because such observation implies that there is no division between the observer and the observed; then you are directly in relationship. To look at a tree without the botanical knowledge, without the word, then, what takes place? The word, the knowledge about that tree, separates you from the tree. There is a distance, not only physical but psychological distance, and when the psychological distance disappears there is no identity with the tree but complete cessation

of this distance. After all, that is love, isn't it?

When you say to somebody 'I love you', what does it mean? Is it your loving the image that you have built about her or him? All the troubles, all the misery, jealousies, irritations, pleasure - sexual and otherwise - is that what you call love?

What we are saying is our human problems are so complex, yet so extraordinarily simple if we know how to look at them, if we know how to look at the problem, whether there is God or not, whether there is truth or not, to understand the problem of death, the problem of life, love, to be able to look without the image - which means to look without fear. We can go into this question of fear later because most human minds, consciously as well as unconsciously, are frightened. We are frightened human beings. Out of that fear we do the most extraordinary things, cruel, brutal, aggressive things.

To look with eyes that are not confused; and there will be confusion when there is the division between the observer and the observed, and this division takes place when there is the image, the formula, the concept, the ideal. Therefore, self knowing, knowing oneself as one is, is the beginning of wisdom. It cannot possibly be bought in books. One has to observe oneself, not by analysing, but observing oneself in relationship. In relationship all your reactions come out, your antagonisms, your fears, your anxieties, your bitterness, your loneliness. Without understanding all that to try to find out if there is something beyond all human thought, if there is something real, true, is not possible. Therefore, we must lay the foundation and to lay the foundation one must observe one's life, daily, without any distortion.

Now perhaps, if you will, you can ask questions. You know one of the most difficult things is to ask the right question. The right question implies that you have thought a great deal, that you have enquired; and, we must ask questions, not only of ourselves, but about everything. We must doubt, question, to find out. Doubt is necessary, but also doubt becomes a danger. Doubt must always be held in leash. To ask questions is necessary, but if you ask a question and wait for somebody else to reply, then your questioning will have very little value, but if you question in order to discover, in order to communicate, in order to find out, asking together, investigating together, then such questions have value. To ask a question you must be intense, you must be passionate. What we are saying is that to question is to expose oneself. By questioning you are discovering yourself. This doesn't mean that the speaker is trying to prevent you from asking questions. All that he is saying is observe from what motive, what purpose, with what intention, with what passion, you're asking that question. Knowing from what depth you're asking that question, then, you'll have the answer corresponding to that depth.

Questioner: Do you say that there are cosmic laws?

Krishnamurti: Which is more important, to find out if there are cosmic laws or how to bring about order in our own lives? I'm asking sir, just asking. Which is more important? We're not children, we are supposed to be grown up. We are supposed to find out, aren't we, living in this world where there is so much disorder, so much confusion, so much sorrow; how to live without all this, how to live in order, not whether there is cosmic law. We'll find out afterwards if there is cosmic law and order if we have order

and law in our own daily lives. Our lives are so disorderly, so confused, we are so miserable, suffering, physically as well as psychologically. What is important is to find out how to live peacefully with order, with beauty, and not escape into some cosmic theories, laws and assumptions. The beauty that is beyond our thinking can only be found when we know how to live properly. To enquire into the cosmic dimension is an escape from our daily lives.

First we must know how to walk, we must know how to build before we can reach up to heaven. We don't know what love is, we are so frightened. You know what we are, and without bringing order, beauty into our lives, we want to escape into some kind of symbolic nonsense.

Questioner: Is it possible to live in this world without bringing about an outward change and yet live in this world, free?

Krishnamurti: You're asking is it possible to live in this structure, in this society, and yet be free? Is it possible to live in this world, this world being the economic, social, the religious, cultural world and yet be free of that structure?

Questioner: Is it possible to become free while that structure still remains, and if so, how?

Krishnamurti: The same thing, sir. First of all, the social structure, the ethical, cultural structure in which is included economics, social, racial prejudices, religious beliefs, all that structure is me. I am part of that structure. I don't separate myself from that structure, I am the result of that structure. I am that culture. I am conditioned by the culture in which I have lived. Therefore, I am not separate from the culture. How am I, who am

part of this culture to be free? If I am the social, economic, cultural structure, and there is no division between me and it, I am the world, the world is me. This is not a theory, this is not a speculation, this is what is basically true. Then what am I, a human being living in this structure of which I am, what am I to do? How am I to free myself from that structure? Shall I destroy that structure, physically, throwing bombs and all the rest of it? Or, do I see the fact that I am that culture and that culture is me? I see that in me I am confused, that I don't know what to do? To bring about a change in the structure I must change myself radically, because I am that culture. Is it possible for me who is part of the world, part of that structure, part of the establishment, to radically change myself?

What is this structure? What is the 'me' who is the result of that structure? The structure is based on envy, greed, worship of success, power, position, prestige, the desire to be completely, isolatedly secure. All the wars, nationalities, divisions of religions, the family opposed to another family, all that is me. And can I in myself change all that, stop completely being competitive, imitative, conforming, violent? Obviously one can. And one must, if one wants to bring about a radical revolution both inwardly and outwardly. It must begin with the mind that is free from the conditioning which the culture has imposed upon it. And you ask how? The 'how' is to observe, to become aware, be passionate to find out, not to be caught in a series of systems, which means you have to observe, learn and be intense and passionate to change. Not to change the world but change the world which is me. Questioner: Do you accept a counter culture opposed to the present culture?

Krishnamurti: You've understood the question? Counter culture opposed to what it creates another culture. Which means what? A counter culture implies a contrary to what is and, therefore, a division. Where there is a division of any kind between you and me there must be conflict. Counter culture is to produce another series of conflicts, like belonging to Catholicism and inventing a new religion to which to belong; which is another form of division. This is much more fundamental than the division of religions or economics and so on. We are saying that where there is contradiction in oneself and in society of which I am, there must be conflict. Therefore I must understand the whole structure of division, contradiction, why human beings live in contradictions.

Questioner: Marx explained it for you.

Krishnamurti: Explanation, it doesn't matter who explains, has very little meaning. A dozen people have explained, including Marx, why human beings live in contradiction. Apparently we are satisfied by explanations, whether Marx explains it, or the capitalists explain it, or the psychologists explain it, or the religious people explain it.

Explanation is not the explained. The description is not the described. What is important is to find out for yourself, not be told by Marx, by philosophers, by psychologists, but find out for yourself why you live in contradiction. You can find out very easily, and when you do, it will be yours, not Marx's, not somebody else's philosophy-

You see what happens to us? We read all these books and are capable of explaining what others have said but we don't know a thing about ourselves. But when you accept, when you see the

radical fact that you are the world, then you have to have the passion, the intensity to learn about yourself. Then you become creative, something extraordinary; you put aside all books because you are the history of the world. Aren't you interested to find out why man is so aggressive, so violent, and whether that aggression and violence can ever end? Aren't you really interested in it? Probably not, because we enjoy being aggressive, being violent. Do you really want to go into this question of violence which seems to be such a pervading thing throughout the world and which is destroying man? Aren't you really interested to find out for yourself whether you can live absolutely, not relatively, but absolutely at peace with yourself?

You see, you don't ask those questions. You ask questions about the cosmos, you ask questions about what Marx said or what somebody else has said, you never wish to find out for yourself with your heart, whether the human being, you, can live at peace.

Questioner: What is the significance of dreams? And is there something beyond dreams?

Krishnamurti: What is the whole process of dreaming? Shall we go into it now or shall we go into it next time?

Questioner: Let's sleep on it.

Krishnamurti: You would like to sleep on it? (Laughter) Shall we discuss it tomorrow when we meet?

TALKS AND DIALOGUES SYDNEY 1970 2ND PUBLIC TALK 22ND NOVEMBER, 1970

SHALL WE CONTINUE with what we were talking about yesterday afternoon?

We are so afraid to use reason, to be objective. To think very clearly seems to be out of fashion. We are afraid of the mind and the capacity of the mind. We want to kill thought or we want to follow somebody - either Marx or St. John or some other philosopher, who, according to his own particular tendency, idiosyncrasy and conditioning, theorizes about life - what it should be.

We forget, it seems to me, that life is a vast field - very complex and demands a great deal of enquiry. It is very subtle and yet at the same time extraordinarily simple. We are apt to take one segment, one part of this vast complex and commit ourselves to that particular part, whatever it be - economic, historical, scientific or technological; neglecting the rest of the field. Either we approach this whole problem of existence through religious belief, superstition, tradition, propaganda, or we treat the whole of life as a matter of superficial existence. Control the environment and everything will come right. We have seen in recent years that when one is committed to a particular section of this vast complex existence, you gather around yourself or around the party or the theory a great many people and then you can't let go. You're frightened to let go because it's become a habit.

There are the Marxists, the Maoists - so many political divisions collecting groups around themselves and each one asserting that it

is the right way. There is so much contradiction and this contradiction is bound to exist if we don't take life as a harmonious whole - neither neglecting one nor the other part of the field. We have to take this extraordinary thing called life as a whole, not in fragmentation but as a whole, and if we do, then we shall be committed to the whole and not to the particular. When we are committed, involved in the particular - whether it is political, national, economic or a particular religious insanity, then there must be division, then there must be contradiction, then there must be conflict between each other.

I think that is clear when one observes what is going on in the world. A serious man, who is really deeply concerned with the human existence with all the travail, the misery, the conflict, the despair, the utter sense of hopelessness has to take life as a whole. That is what we are going to do, if we can, during these talks: not be committed to any particular section or involved in a particular corner of the field but being completely and totally involved in the whole problem of existence which includes religion, death, love, daily existence, relationship, meditation and trying to find out for ourselves if there is such a thing as reality - such a thing that is beyond thought, which man through centuries has been seeking. We are involved in all of that, not in one particular expression of it, so let us be clear from the beginning that we are not talking about a particular panacea, a particular solution, a particular philosophy. Philosophy means the love of truth; not the theory of truth, not the speculation about what truth is, which any intellectual person can spin endlessly. It means to discover for ourselves what truth is actually in our life, in our daily living - the beauty of it, a quality of

timelessness. All this involves that the mind must look at life non-fragmentarily, not be wholly absorbed in sex or in amusement, or in a particular form of belief, or completely lost in nationalism. We are concerned, surely, with the understanding of this whole existence; therefore a mind that wishes to understand it must be free to observe non-fragmentarily. It can't be a Marxist, it can't be a Communist or a Socialist or a Catholic or a Protestant, or a Hindu or a Buddhist, or just be concerned with Zen, and so on. If this is clear between us that we must be totally involved with the whole problem of existence, from the moment we're born till we die, with all the things that are involved in it, and to be committed to them wholly - if that is established between us then we can go into all the many problems because every problem is interrelated. There is no problem by itself, they are all interrelated.

You cannot solve one particular problem, whether it be an economic problem, a technological problem or the problem of pollution by itself. They are all dreadfully and intricately related, and to try to solve one problem at one level, discarding or neglecting the other levels, is utterly, if one may use the word, stupid. It doesn't bring about understanding, a solution. If that is completely clear between us, then we can go into the question we were talking about yesterday, which is dreams. We are going to discuss that and we're going to go into the question of fear and so on. We are not discussing dreams by themselves but in relation to the whole of our daily existence with its fears, ambitions, competition, conformity, pleasure, fear and so on. In relation to all that, we are investigating what dreams are. If we neglect all the rest of it and be concerned only with dreams then it's as though you're

playing with a toy; it has no value.

I don't know quite where to begin this question of dreams, but we'll begin somehow and see where it leads. Most people dream either fantastic or subtle or crude forms of dreams. We have never questioned why we dream at all. We have accepted dreams as we have accepted so many things, as part of daily life. We have accepted nationalism, we have accepted drugs, we have accepted alcohol, we have accepted smoking, we have accepted religious beliefs and all the rest. We accept, we fall into habits, and we drift along; whereas, we must question very fundamentally why do we dream at all? Is it necessary? Some psychologists say it is. I'm not an expert, nor have I read psychological books. I don't read books at all, except weekly magazines and detective stories; I really mean it. One can find in one's self if one knows how to observe one's self, the whole history of man, past and present. You investigate it in yourself, because yourself is the world, yourself is the division, the contradiction, the misery, the confusion, the aching loneliness and the suffering, and if you know how to look then you need not read any book because the whole history, the whole life, is there; and you are your own teacher and your own disciple. You become a light to yourself and therefore do not depend on anybody.

So why do we dream and what are dreams? In dreams, if one observes and, if you have tried it, put down on a piece of paper every morning the dreams that you have, just for fun, you will find there is a consecutive relationship between each dream. You will find that these dreams are the continuation of your daily life, only in symbolic form, with scenes, variations, with various forms of subtlety but it is the continuation of our daily life - the daily

struggles, the daily conflicts, the daily irritations, the daily fears, pleasures. It is the same movement but in words, in scenes, in symbols. I think most people would agree, except of course the neurotics to whom dreams mean so much. Through dreams one hopes to find some kind of mysterious universe, but it is really a movement of our daily life.

So what takes place? As the speaker is putting this into words, use him as a mirror, if you will, to observe yourself. He is not saying anything new, or rather, nothing ideological, nothing that can be put into categories. If you are listening and observing in the mirror, then you will see for yourself, without agreeing or disagreeing, that what he says is what you actually are. Dreams are the continuation of our daily life and our daily life is occupied, busy with constant chattering, gossiping, having opinions about this and that, judging, condemning, justifying. It is aggressive, violent; that's our daily life, and that goes on when we are asleep.

The brain, which is the residue of memory, both the conscious as well as the unconscious, continues like a machine and therefore the brain has never any rest. It's like any motor that's constantly running, all day and all night, endlessly. So, what takes place? Such a brain becomes tired, acts erratically, erroneously, gets caught in illusion; it has no vitality, no energy. Dreams become unnecessary if you know how to observe the movement of life during the day, if you are aware fully what you are doing during the day. Then, the brain becomes extraordinarily active, sensitive, awake to every movement of thought. You discover all the motives, all the hidden, subtle drives, complexities. You are awake during the day fully. The words you use, the gestures, the

contempt, the disrespect, the violence, the brutality, the competition, the vulgarity, you become aware of all that during the day, so the brain, the whole structure of the nerves, the body, the organism, being alert during the day, when it goes to sleep becomes very quiet. It has expended itself during the day, understanding what has been going on. Then the brain, when it sleeps doesn't have to bring about order in itself.

You see most of our brains are disorderly. We function with only a very small part of that brain and we have a great many disorders and much confusion. Yet the brain can only function properly, sanely, when there is order. If you have observed, as you go to sleep, the brain tries to bring about order just before it goes to sleep; have you noticed that? You try to look over what has happened during the day, in retrospect and say, 'well, I should do this - I should have done that'... 'I should not have done that'... 'I must have...' 'this is right, this is wrong'. It tries to bring about some order and as you have not brought order during the day, at night the brain brings about order. These are facts, you can experiment with yourself and you'll find out. There is nothing mysterious about it.

This bringing order during sleep is dreams. To bring about order during the day there must be order in your relationships, not order theoretically, abstractly, but order in your daily relationships - with the conductor on a bus, with your boss, with your wife, with your children, with your neighbour. Otherwise the brain tries to bring it about while the body is at rest, during sleep. This is a waste of energy. If you bring about order during the day, the brain becomes quiet at night, it refreshes itself, makes itself new, functions more

smoothly. Therefore, when you wake up, you have energy.

Dreams then are merely the continuation of one's daily life and if that daily life is contradictory, confusing, disorderly, the brain spends the night bringing about some kind of order, but it is not complete order. Unless you have complete order, the brain is slightly distorted all the time. Our question is - how to bring about order in our life, order, not according to some blueprint, not the order according to Marx or some philosopher?

All the teachers have blueprints of what order should be, and we poor monkeys imitate them, which brings about more disorder. To find out what order is, not according to any philosopher, to any book, to any social structure, one sees that there is no division between oneself and the world, that the world is oneself. In order to bring about order in the world which is so chaotic, there must be order in oneself. If you want to transform the society while being yourself disorderly, confused, messy, how can you do such a thing? It's impossible. You have to have order in yourself as a human being; not disassociated from the community because you are the community. So the question is - how to bring about order, that is, order without effort. The moment you make an effort that very effort brings disorder.

Please understand this deeply, this question. Every form of effort is distortion. Have you ever played with archery? The slightest movement sends the arrow crookedly. The whole body must be completely harmonious, relaxed to let the arrow fly smoothly. In golf, in cricket, everything must function smoothly. Effort implies contradiction, opposition, restriction, conformity. A mind that would understand order and live in order must observe

and learn what is disorder; not how to bring about order. Are we meeting with each other? You know, communication implies sharing together, learning together, building together. The word communication comes from the word common, a common relationship. When we are discussing these subtle things there needs to be hesitancy, sensitivity. Unless you are also doing the same thing, being sensitive, watching, learning, communication comes to an end.

What we are saying is: order is not a blueprint, it is not to be copied, imitated, something to which you conform, but rather it comes about naturally, easily, without any effort, if you understand what is disorder. Through negation you come to the positive, not through the positive. If you are pursuing the positive, you will create disorder. We are trying to learn, observe, and through that observation we begin to find out what the subtlety of order is.

We live in disorder, that's a fact, which means we live in contradiction. If there were no contradiction at all, we would be orderly naturally, so we have to find out for ourselves why this disorder exists and why there is this contradiction in us. Why is there contradiction in each human being? not according to Marx, not according to religious people, not according to some psychologist or philosopher. We discard all those people. We can't learn from others, we have to learn from ourselves because we are the others. We have to find out for ourselves why there is this contradiction in ourselves and why out of this contradiction there is disorder. You have understood my question? Why is there this contradiction in our lives? Contradiction implies saying one thing, doing something else, thinking something else. We become

hypocrites, not only to ourselves but to others.

One can see why there is contradiction in ourselves. First of all, we have ideals, various forms of principles, ideals about what should be. That is one of the major causes of contradiction.

We human beings are violent human beings, aggressive, competitive, and so on, and we have ideals of non-violence, that we should not be violent. Immediately there is contradiction; the violent man having ideals about not being violent, brings contradiction into his life. Why does he do it? Why does he have ideals? Because he doesn't know how to deal with violence, with actually what is, and also he may not want to deal with violence because it gives him some peculiar neurotic pleasure. Therefore he invents an ideal and that ideal is always in the distance, and in the meantime he is sowing the seeds of violence. He pretends to be non-violent, he has ideals, he practises idealism and yet he is being violent all the time.

One of the major causes of contradiction is ideals. Are you free of the ideals now as we are talking? You're not are you? You still have your ideals, you're still living in contradiction, which means you like contradiction. You are afraid to break down the ideals, you are afraid of what you might do if you had no ideals.

You don't see what ideals do. They bring about contradiction in our life because you avoid completely the actual fact of what is. Therefore the idealist is a hypocrite. All the young generation are supposed to be idealists because they want to change the world, and this young generation is as confused as the older generation.

This duality exists because of ideals and this duality, this contradiction exists because we are always conforming. From

childhood, through education, through propaganda, through the social, economic, political, religious structure, the culture in which we have been brought up demands that you comply, conform. Aren't you conforming? We are not talking about conforming superficially; when the speaker goes to India he puts on Indian clothes. If he put on Indian clothes here it would be too much of a good thing. It would become a circus, therefore one has to conform outwardly. But the speaker is asking why do we conform inwardly to anything. Why conform to what society, culture may have given you or you yourself have projected from yourself, the what should be: not what actually is but what should be, or what has been? Conformity, imitation brings about a contradiction in ourselves; and can the mind not conform at all?

Conformity implies adjustment to a pattern of memory. Doesn't it? Do follow this because it is very interesting if you go into it: whether the mind can be free from all conformity. Can the mind function without the pattern which memory has created? Because then only can it be free. Technologically, there must be accumulation of knowledge. All science, all engineering, all mathematics is the accumulation of continuous knowledge which sets its own pattern. There is a form of conformity here and you must, if you want to go to the moon or live under the sea, you must then have technological knowledge, and conform to that knowledge, adding or taking away. Technologically there must be knowledge, but can the mind be free from conformity to the past? We are the past. You are the past, aren't you? You have memories, you remember certain things, pleasant, unpleasant. You are living in your youth, in your yesterdays, all the memories and the

pleasures and the fears of yesterday. You are the past. Or, you project the past into the future, modified but it's still a continuation of the past. Can the mind be free to observe, and therefore act, without the pattern which memory creates? Now, to find that out, to find out if the mind can be free from all conformity you have to know, understand the whole nature and the structure of thought.

We said, that to understand the nature of a mind that is not conforming except in the technological world, one has to investigate the whole structure of thought. What is thought? When you are asked that question, what is your answer? What is thinking? Not what you think, but what is thinking in itself? Thinking is the response of memory, isn't it? This is very simple if you go step by step. You are dealing with a very complex problem and to deal with a complex problem you must move millimetre by millimetre, patiently. So we're asking whether the mind can be free from all conformity, and to find that out you have to investigate, question the nature of thought. Thought is the response of memory; memory is knowledge; knowledge is experience. If you had no memory, you couldn't think. You wouldn't know where to go - you wouldn't know where your home was, so response of memory is thought. Memory is stored in the brain cells themselves. It's part of the brain structure.

So thought which is the response of memory which is the past can never be new. Please do understand this basic thing; thought can never be new, so thought can never be free. It may invent or it may talk about freedom, explain what freedom is, write innumerable volumes about freedom, but the thought which can write volumes is the response of its memories and therefore

thought is never, never new and therefore never free. Thought can only conform, modify, adjust, bring about certain changes, but it's still within the realm of the past which is memory.

This is not an opinion, it's not my opinion or my understanding, this is a fact. So, can the mind not conform, yet use thought whenever it is necessary, like going home, driving a car, performing the technological activities, yet inwardly, be free from any sense of response from the past? This becomes immensely complex and difficult if you haven't done it, if you haven't gone into yourself, taken time to observe. You have plenty of time, you have plenty of time to observe. You take plenty of time to amuse yourself, don't you? To go walking, sailing, watching other people play cricket, to sit in front of the radio, television, you have plenty of time. Give some of that time to look at these problems; the nature and the structure of thought. Don't learn from others. What you learn from others is not yours, it is theirs, and if you learn from others you remain secondhand; whereas if you learn from yourself by observing, a totally different kind of activity, life begins - at a different dimension altogether.

Thought, when it's conforming, brings contradiction. Contradiction implies, as we said, ideals, conformity, and there is contradiction when there is obedience, obedience to authority. The more civilized we are the more we reject outward authority. We are using the word civilized in the sense - not primitive, not responding to things violently. The response of violence is the most primitive form of action. I don't understand something, therefore kill it - throw a bomb against it, that's what's happening in the world. We must destroy this structure, therefore bomb it out. There is

contradiction when there are ideals, conformity and obedience. You know the word obedience, the root meaning of that word obedience means to hear. When you hear constantly that you are a Catholic, you must have your son baptized, you must go to the confession, you must do this and do that every day, hear, hear, hear, you obey. Or you hear - 'This is the greatest country, the noblest people, the marvellous politicians; this is the greatest religion' - repeat, repeat, repeat, and you just follow the propaganda. Where there is obedience to authority, whether it is the authority which you have selected, the authority which is imposed on you, or the authority of your own experience, then there is contradiction. A mind that can live without contradiction has to understand all this, understand the nature and the structure of thought; and from that we can go on to the question of fear.

When we are talking about fear, we are not describing fear, we are not explaining because description, explanation is not the thing described, explained. You have to feel it, you have to live with it, find out, put your teeth into it; which means you must have great intensity, passion to find out, not just calmly sit back and lazily investigate. You must give your life to this thing.

Shall we go into this question of fear? Probably sitting here in this hall for the moment you have no fear. At this actual moment you have no fear. If you think about it you can remember the fear and look at the past fear. That is, we are investigating what fear is and at the moment we are not afraid, so it is difficult to examine fear, understand it without inviting it, bringing it out. So, we are going to look at fear through one of the means which brings about fear, which is psychological dependency. Actually you depend on

somebody, psychologically you depend, don't you? On your wife, on your husband, on your children, on what people will say. And, do you know you depend? You depend don't you? Depend on a book, depend on the priest, on the politician, depend on your wife or husband, because they give you comfort, security, position, safety? And if anything happens to that on which you depend you feel lost, you get frightened, you become jealous, angry, hating, don't you? So one of the forms of fear is dependency.

Why does one depend? Not depend on the milkman, on the postman or all that, but psychologically, inwardly, why do you depend? You depend because you are frightened of yourself, you are frightened what might happen if you didn't depend on somebody or on something. The mind must be occupied, it doesn't matter with what; with the kitchen or with God, with sex or with amusement. It must be occupied. Have you ever asked yourself why this happens, why should it be occupied? If it were not occupied, what would happen? Then you have to face, look at what actually is going on. You have to observe, you are thrown upon yourself to see what's going on, which is: you're frightened of your own emptiness, of your own insufficiency. You are afraid to be alone, not isolated. To be alone is entirely different from isolation. You see the difference?

One is afraid to be alone, therefore the mind must be occupied - or, is it occupied because in oneself one is so empty, shallow, one's life is so meaningless? You may have a good house, nice husband, wife, children, a pleasant lawn and blue skies, yet one's life is very shallow and therefore you try to fill it with occupations and when there is no occupation you're frightened. We are showing how fear

comes about. You are afraid of death which is in the future, and afraid of the things that you have done in the past, so fear is in relation to something either in the past or in the future but never actually at the moment.

You know, the speaker is working very hard. I hope you are working too. You have to work, put all your energy and passion into this, otherwise you will never be free of fear and a mind that is frightened lives in darkness, its actions are neurotic. It escapes, creates so much mischief in the world, it's like living in darkness and trying to do the right action. To a mind that is frightened there is no beauty. It can visit museums, listen to concerts, but such a mind which is frightened becomes an ugly mind in action, a brutal mind, a violent mind. One has to understand and be completely free of fear, not only at the conscious level but at the deeper levels.

We are going to go into it to see if it is at all possible. I say it is possible. It is not possible to you unless you do it. We are going to examine this question of fear thoroughly and, in examining fear, we are also examining pleasure. We can't leave out one and take the other. If you want to investigate, understand, to be free of fear, you have to understand, pleasure completely. You can't say - I will divide the two and keep the pleasure and discard fear; they go together; you can't divorce them, they are the two sides of one coin.

It demands a great deal of energy to understand the deeper layers of the mind in which pleasure and fear are rooted. All our actions, activities, are based on the principle of pleasure, aren't they? Our gods are based on pleasure, our morality is based on pleasure, our relationship is based on pleasure. Subtly and deeply the current of pleasure runs through all our activity, of like and

dislike. We pursue that relentlessly and we avoid at any cost, fear; run away from it, suppress it, escape from it, distort it, because we don't know how to deal with fear. We know what to do with pleasure, the more the better, and we know the channels in which we can find it. And we have cultivated them so marvellously. Also we have cultivated all the innumerable escapes from fear. To understand all this demands a mind that is really, deeply, profoundly serious; because in the understanding of it, you live a totally different kind of life, and, as you are the society and you are the world, you bring about a radical change in the world.

Perhaps it may be better if we continue when we next meet, because this requires really deep investigation, not just a casual look at the end of an hour and a quarter, listening to something that you think will help you to get rid of fear. The question to be discussed is - is it possible to come upon the great energy needed to understand what is? If you think it is not possible, then you have no energy. Yet the impossible becomes the possible when you are deeply concerned with it.

So to find out the roots of fear which lie not only in heaven but very close to the earth, to find that out one has to go into this at the deeper layers, the hidden recesses of one's own mind. Therefore one must be capable of exposing one's self, not to others but to one's self, so that there is no hidden corner. I don't know if you've ever asked yourself whether you are honest, completely, totally honest to yourself, which means to find out if you are dependent on anything, on anybody. Am I dependent on you? You are there, a large audience, are you feeding my vanity? Am I dependent on what people say about me? Am I dependent on the company, the

friends, and so on, am I dependent? If I am dependent I am afraid, then I am dishonest, basically, deeply; then I become a hypocrite, then there is conflict, then there is duality, division, contradiction. A mind that depends and finds out whether it can be free from all fear, both physical as well as psychological, must have the capacity, have the intensity to expose itself completely to itself. We are going to do this on Wednesday.

TALKS AND DIALOGUES SYDNEY 1970 3RD PUBLIC TALK 25TH NOVEMBER, 1970

I DON'T KNOW why you clap. What we are talking about is not something that needs your approval. What it demands is that you listen to what the speaker has to say and find out for yourself the truth of the matter; not your opinion, not your conclusion, not your information but rather to consider what the speaker has to say and see for yourself whether it corresponds with what you yourself actually feel and think.

The speaker is not saying or putting forward a new philosophy, a new series of ideas and conclusions, but rather we are going to investigate together the whole question of fear, pleasure and joy.

Before we go into that, I think we should be clear that we are so capable of self deception, we so easily deceive ourselves that we have to be extremely watchful when we discuss together this question. It is complex and needs a great deal of attention.

We are going to discuss fear, pleasure and joy and whether the mind can ever be free of fear, not only the conscious mind but also the deeper layers that lie below the conscious; whether one can expose all the content of that and whether fear which is so deeply rooted and to which one has become so accustomed can be totally understood and therefore completely and absolutely freed. Fear in its various forms destroys the capacity to see clearly, to think logically and to perceive actually what is. Fear distorts all of our conduct. After all, behaviour is righteousness and any form of fear, perceived or not perceived, makes every behaviour into a contradiction.

So, as we discuss this evening, together, the question of fear, we have to be very watchful that we don't slip into some form of formula that will help us to cover up our fears.

What we are going to concern ourselves with is not only fear but the necessity of being free from it, completely. Otherwise, human conduct, behaviour, cannot possibly undergo a radical revolution. We are concerned with that revolution, not physical revolution but psychological revolution, the conditioning which has been brought about through fear. Until we really, deeply understand fear, pleasure and joy, there cannot be a radical change in the very structure of our life, and the very structure of our thinking and action cannot possibly undergo a mutation. So, it is absolutely essential that we understand this very complex problem of fear. We have to look at it, not at the description but rather at the fact. We are going to look at it both analytically and non-analytically, verbally and non-verbally. Therefore, when we are examining what fear is, we mustn't get stuck with mere explanation or mere words. One has to be aware of one's own fear; actually. You may not have that fear at this moment sitting in this hall but the indication of that fear as dependency on another, attachment, the fear of not being, of not becoming, the fear that lies behind all our activity. One has to be aware of it, to look at it.

One of our difficulties is going to be that we are apt to escape through the word, and through the habit which we have cultivated for so long, which is to escape, fly away from what actually is.

As we said the other day, we cannot possibly understand what fear is unless we understand what pleasure is and also, in understanding pleasure, to know what joy is and ecstasy. They're

all interrelated and we cannot possibly separate one from the other and hold on to one and avoid the other. They are all interrelated, complex, and this needs a great deal of enquiry, observation and learning.

We are using those words, 'to learn' perhaps in a peculiar way. Learning implies an observation which is not acquisition; to observe without acquiring. When we use the words 'to learn', we generally mean to accumulate knowledge, to pile up knowledge so that according to that knowledge we will act. That's what we generally mean by learning. Having learnt Italian, Greek, whatever it is, one can speak that language. Having learnt mathematics, then one can become an engineer or what you will. The accumulation of knowledge through learning is one thing and learning without accumulation is another. Learning and acquiring knowledge; action from that becomes routine, automatic. It's like a man in a factory, having learned a few movements, he can keep on repeating and repeating and repeating. Having learned a particular language, acquired the words, the verbs, the irregular verbs and so on, and having accumulated knowledge, he can then speak. That's one thing. Whereas, learning without accumulation is a constant movement of observation.

I hope this point is somewhat clear, because there have been experiments, I've been told, in American factories where the worker is allowed to learn as he goes along and he produces more; whereas, the man who has learnt and keeps on repeating, to him it becomes a bore, therefore he doesn't produce so much.

What we are concerned with is learning. Accumulation of knowledge is necessary, otherwise we couldn't go home, speak

English, or Italian or what you will, but when we are looking, examining this factor which guides, shapes most of our life, which is fear, one has to learn about it. Therefore, we must come to it afresh, not with a conclusion, not with condemnation or justification. Justification and condemnation are born out of knowledge which is the past and therefore there is the cessation of learning anew.

So, we are going to learn, together, about this whole thing called fear and pleasure and joy; learn together, not hear what the speaker has to say, or learn some technique from him and then apply it. Then you won't be able to understand or deal afresh with the factor of fear.

One can be totally and completely free of fear. Physical fear is one thing and psychological fear is another; and most of our fears are psychological, inward, not physical fears. We don't live in the wild, we are not attacked by another in a so-called civilized society. Physical fears we can deal with and we know what to do when we meet a wild animal or a snake or this or that - we know what to do. But we don't know what to do with psychological fears which are much more complex, so we have to learn about them; not learn from the speaker, as knowledge, and apply what you have learnt to the fear that you may have in the future. I don't know if we are communicating together over this question.

So, we are sharing together, not knowledge, but the act of learning and therefore, the awareness, the intention and the intensity to observe. It's not through the description of what the speaker is saying, but in observing your own fear.

As we said, there must be, not only socially and

environmentally, radical change in the social structure. Appalling things are happening, violence, brutality, wars, and a man who is at least civilized and thoughtful and wants to live completely at peace must understand this question - why human beings are so violent in all their relationships. And in understanding this question of fear you will understand the nature of violence. So, what is fear?

Obviously, it doesn't exist by itself, it exists in relation to something, either in the past or in the future: fear of loneliness, fear of frustration, fear of not being identified with something, fear of not succeeding, fear of being completely isolated, fear of death, which is fear of not being, and also the fear of not becoming. Fear is always in relation to something. It doesn't exist by itself. When we enquire into the unconscious where there are a great many fears stored up, how are you going to look into it? You understand my question? How is the conscious mind to look into the so-called hidden parts of the mind? I don't know why we call it the unconscious, it's really a misnomer; the unconscious is very conscious, only we are not aware of it, that's all.

My question is, please follow this - how can your conscious mind, the mind that thinks, observes, watches, looks, how can that mind look into something that is unknown, hidden, where most of our fears lie? You understand my question? We are sharing together, please listen to what the speaker has to say, we are sharing together, we are not teaching. I am not your teacher or your philosopher, or your authority; that would be terrible. We are sharing together to find out whether it is at all possible for the mind to be totally and completely free of fear.

If there is any shadow of fear lurking it distorts all thought, all

life, it destroys affection, love, therefore one has to really understand it. My question is, and I am sure you must have put this question to yourself also, and if you have not, please put it now: how can the conscious mind, the mind that is daily active, how can that mind enquire or look into the hidden parts of itself? Because that's where all our subtle forms of fear are; our attachments, our demands for success, the competitive aggression, anxiety, guilt - it is all there. Merely to say 'I must get rid of fear' or suppress fear, has no meaning.

The question is: how can such a mind which is daily active, occupied with daily things, enquire into something which is hidden, deep? Does it lie through analysis? Can you, can the conscious mind analyse the hidden fears, hidden motives, all that goes on below, or must the conscious mind be completely still, so that its very silence and its observation reveal the whole content of the hidden? You follow my point?

As we said the other day, analysis doesn't reveal a thing. On the contrary, it prevents observation and direct action. Whereas, if there is no analysis at all but only observation, then the mind, the daily active mind (to observe all the hidden layers and their content) must be completely still.

You know, if I want to listen to a concert, to a symphony, I must listen to it silently. Don't you do that, when you are listening to some piece of beautiful music, Bach or whatever you will, don't you listen completely, quietly? Your body, your mind, your whole nervous organism is completely quiet. You are listening. You are not comparing the previous symphony which was played in another part of the world, you are listening without comparing,

actually completely absorbed.

Now if you are absorbed by the music, if the music takes over, takes you over, it's like a child with a toy. He's completely absorbed and when he has finished with the toy he's back again. So it is not absorption that is required but attention, and therefore you have to observe with a clarity of mind that is completely quiet. Are you doing this as we are talking? You understand what we are trying to explain, knowing that the explanation is not that which is explained?

We are saying that if you would understand the deep content of the mind, the deep layers of the me, the self, with all its fears, anxieties, troubles and agonies, you can observe it only when the mind, the superficial mind, is extremely quiet; not make the mind quiet; but see the truth of it; and when you see the truth of it, it happens. You are getting all this? Are we following each other?

When you look with that quality of mind that is very quiet, there is no verbalization, there is no comparison, there is no justification or condemnation, just watching. To watch, the mind, the daily activity of the mind must completely end. To understand anything, the mind must be completely still, especially when you are observing yourself, when you are observing your own fears, anxieties, loneliness, despair, demands for pleasure and all the rest of it; to observe that completely, really at great depth, the superficial mind must be completely still. You have to see the reason of it. It's fairly simple, a chattering mind can't see, can't listen, can't observe, can't do anything. See actually for yourself, the truth: that to observe yourself and the content of yourself, the superficial mind must be still.

If you are doing that as the speaker is going into it, then what is there in the so-called hidden layers?

There are many things involved, and we are only dealing with fear and nothing else for the moment. Either that fear is associated with the past, or with the future; what might happen or what has happened. Fear is the outcome of the past or of the future. You're watching your own fear, not my fear. What gives a continuity to fear? I've had physical pain a week ago, a bad pain and it's gone but I am afraid that it might return, that is, the past and the future. What sustains this fear? I've had a bad pain a week ago, it is finished, but yet thought goes on with it, carries on that it might come back. Thought which is the response of memory, of the pain that it had a week ago, that memory, with its thought says, it might come back. Thought sustains fear, gives nourishment to fear, gives a continuity to fear, thinking about what happened a week ago or thinking of what might happen tomorrow; thinking breeds fear. Then the next question is: how will you stop thinking? Do you follow me?

An incident took place yesterday which gave me pain; it is finished; it's over but thought goes on, thinking, thinking, thinking about it, and so sustains the fear. Watch it a minute. Let's examine what is pleasure. What is pleasure, on which all our social morality is based, all our search, all our activity? All this demand, the searching for truth and all that nonsense is based on pleasure. Your gods are based on pleasure, your virtue is based on pleasure, your morality is based on pleasure; so what is pleasure, which every human being demands? What is pleasure? Again, there was an incident yesterday which was a great delight. It filled your whole

mind, your whole heart; you looked at the cloud, the water, at the sailing ships, it was a great delight. But thought comes in and says, I would like that to be repeated it was so pleasurable I must have it. Right? There is the pleasure of sex. Thought builds the image, all the stimuli are sustained by thought, and the fulfilment of it tomorrow. So, thought sustains fear and gives continuity to pleasure. You don't finish with that incident of yesterday whether it is pleasurable or painful. It is finished; but thought goes on living with it. Right?

We are learning, please, I am not teaching. We are learning together. So thought is responsible for pleasure and pain, which is the sustaining of pleasure and continuing of fear.

The next question is, how can one not think about this? It was so beautiful yesterday, so marvellous, and there is the thinking about it. It was so painful and that pain is over, but, thought thinks about it. So one asks, is there a possibility for thought not to think about it at all, not to think about the pain or the pleasure? How is this to be done? Joy is not pleasure. You can't think about joy, you can think about it and reduce it to pleasure, but the thing that is called joy, ecstasy, is not the product of thought. Haven't you noticed when there is a great burst of joy you can't think about it the next day; and, if you do, it has already become pleasure? So, fear and pleasure are sustained by thought, given continuity by thought. How is one to look at great beauty, the beauty of a cloudless sky, the beauty of a sunset, the beauty of a face, the beauty of truth; to look at it and end it, and not think about it? Are you following? How is this to be done? Do you understand my question? If it is not clear, it must be made clear because one can

see that fear continues by thinking about it, as you do with pleasure. Pleasure we want, the more of it the better, therefore we think about it; but we don't want fear, yet thought thinks about it, what might happen.

Is it possible for an incident, whether it is painful or pleasurable, to end and not leave a mark on the brain? The mark on the brain is the memory and then the memory responds, which is thought. So, can the mind observe the sunset, the beauty of the landscape, the curve of a wave, observe it and end it, and not carry it over? How is this to be done?

Please bear in mind what we are discussing. We are saying there must be a radical change in the human mind and heart, a total revolution. When there is that radical revolution in the human being then you will create a totally different kind of society, there will be a totally different kind of relationship between human beings. The miseries and the misfortune and the violence that comes in the human mind spring from fear; and as long as fear doesn't completely and absolutely end, man will be violent, and so there is no radical revolution.

Our concern is the understanding of fear, a total, absolute understanding and being free, completely, of fear. And we say that it is possible, not theoretically, not in abstraction, but actually, to be aware of that incident of beauty or that incident of grief, of danger, which causes fear, to be aware of it and end it as it arises.

Is this possible? Can the mind not keep a record of the incident that gave great delight or a happening which gave pain? Not keep a record, that is, for that incident not to leave a mark as memory in the brain? How is this possible? It is really quite simple. You know

we are so frightened to be simple. We want things to be complicated and the more things are complicated the more we think we are intellectual. We are never simple, we don't know how to look at things simply. When you can look at things simply, you are beyond all the intellectual words, then you see something real, it's yours, it's not cooked up by the brain. There was that incident of the beautiful sunset; as you looked at it there was great delight. You observed it, the colours, the light on the water, the various shades of light in the cloud, you observed it. Can you observe it without the word? The moment you use the word, that word has associations and that association is part of this memory. When you say how extraordinarily beautiful it is, you have already gone away from looking, from observing, from seeing the sunset. So, can you look at that sunset without the word? Which means to look at that sunset completely, with complete attention, not comparing with the sunset you saw in California or in another part of the world, or say to your friends how lovely it is, but just to look, without the word. That means look with complete attention. Then you will find if you so look, that very perception prevents a memory being formed about that sunset. Which doesn't mean that you haven't any joy, delight in the sunset.

You've had pain a week ago. The pain has left a memory and that memory responds and therefore you think about it. Whereas, if you observe that pain completely, attentively, wholly, not saying I must go to the doctor, I'm frightened, you know all the chatter that goes on when you have pain, just to observe it, totally with complete attention, then you will see you are finished with it, therefore thought doesn't pick it up and carry it over. You have

understood this?

If I may go into this in a different way: There were two monks walking from village to village, preaching. They had taken vows of poverty, celibacy, charity and all that business. When you take a vow, then you are lost, then you are in battle with yourself, but when you understand everything, then you don't take a vow, you simply live it without effort. These two monks were going from village to village, preaching. One morning as they were walking along they came to a river and they saw by the side of the river a girl, weeping. One of them said to her, 'Sister what are you crying for?' And she said 'This morning early, I waded across the river and my home is on the other side and there is no boat and I can't wade it now because the river has swollen and I don't know what to do and that's why I am crying.' One of the monks said, 'Don't cry, it's quite simple'. He picks her up, wades across, leaves her on the other bank and goes on. The two monks walk on and after two hours the other monk says 'Brother, we have taken a vow never to touch a woman. Brother, what did it feel like to carry that woman, didn't you get excited, didn't you feel extraordinary things happening to you?' And the other replies 'I left her two hours ago and you are still carrying her'.

That's what we do. We carry our pleasures and our fears. As a human being, you, the self, the me, is the burden of the fear and the pleasure. And you are afraid to lose that burden. A mind that understands the nature and the structure of thought is free of fear. And because it understands fear, it understands, also, pleasure, which doesn't mean that you cannot have pleasure. When you look at a cloud and a leaf it is a pleasure to look, the beauty of anything

is a pleasure, but to carry it to the next day, then pain begins. Joy is something entirely different from pleasure. You can invite pleasure, you can think about it, sustain it, nourish it, seek it out, pursue it, hold it; but you cannot with joy, with ecstasy. And that happens naturally, easily, without any invitation, this ecstasy, when you understand fear and pleasure. A mind that is really free of this, or rather understands it, then such a mind which is with ecstasy, is never violent, is never ambitious, never seeking position, prestige and all the rest of that nonsense.

You will find also that love is not pleasure and, one asks, what is love? We all talk about it, the politician, the admiral, the butcher; everyone talks about it, the priest. What does it mean?

You know, to find out what it is, you must totally deny what it is not. Through negation of what it is not, it is. One has to find out if pleasure is love. Is desire love? Love is associated with sex, and sex has become extraordinarily important, hasn't it? You see it everywhere, pick up any magazine, walk down any street, endlessly, this `love'. Why has sex become so colossally important, and with it is associated what we call `love'. Why? Have you ever asked this question? Why? Go right through the world, it doesn't matter where it is, perhaps in the Asiatic world it is hidden but it is there, whereas in the western world it is all open, completely permissive. Why has sex with which is associated love become so extraordinarily the only thing in life, apparently? Have you noticed how our lives are mechanical, repetitive? Going to the office day after day for 40, 50, 60 years, living with ourselves, with our anxieties, problems, with our routine, with the problems that go on, repeating, repeating, repeating? Have you noticed how

mechanically our minds work? Please watch it. You repeat what you have read, what you have heard. You are a Catholic because for 2000 years it has been repeated that you are a Catholic. You must believe, the only saviour; and in India for 5000 years or less they have repeated their stories. Our lives are routine, habitual. You smoke because others smoke; you drink, it's habit, it's mechanical. Haven't you noticed this, that our lives are utterly meaningless? We can invent a meaning. We can give a significance to life, intellectually, but actually, our lives have no meaning whatsoever; the way we live. It is a constant repetition in conflict. Our lives are mechanical, secondhand, we are secondhand human beings. Our education is mechanical. This is obvious. So, sex becomes important because it is not mechanical. You can make it mechanical by thinking about it, as pleasure. Pleasure inevitably becomes mechanical. Through sex you hope to find heaven, some extraordinary, illuminating experience, something beyond the routine, the mechanical. Your whole life, from birth till you die, has become mechanical and the one thing you hope you have that is non-mechanical, sex, you soon reduce to a mechanical thing. That's why sex has become all important. That you call love. With it goes tenderness, jealousy, anxiety, anger, bitterness, hate. All that you call love. So, can you deny all that, not verbally but actually put it out completely? That is, not to be jealous, not to be competitive, because an ambitious man doesn't know what love is. How can he? A man who is seeking success, position, prestige, does he know what love is? He will know what pleasure is in the fulfilment of his ambition. Can you as a human being, caught in the thing called love with all its agony, suspicion, hatred, can you,

actually, happily, put all this aside? Otherwise, you are caught in a trap, the trap which is the moral social structure.

A mind that enquires into this question of pleasure, fear and the beauty of ecstasy must find out what it is to love, what it means, not intellectually, but what it actually means to love. You know, when you say you love your wife or your husband or your friend and at the same time are concerned with your own particular little problems, your own particular fears and anxieties and ambitions, how can you love another? All these isolate. These are self-centred activities and how can such a mind and heart love? If you really loved, would you have wars? Would you allow your sons and daughters to be killed? Would you allow it? You don't love your children. You may love them as toys when they are very young, but as they grow older you let them go. You educate them, and part of this education is to destroy your neighbour. All this you call love. So, as you don't love here, in this world, then you must love God. Do you understand? And there, too, you are competitive. All the saints are competitive. They are record-breakers. Don't laugh please. We are not saying anything funny, this is dreadfully serious. All our life we say one thing and do another. We are hypocrites. We will always be hypocrites if we have fear and if we are merely pursuing pleasure, therefore love is not pleasure. If you loved you would educate your children totally differently, you would end wars, instantly. But you are not interested in all that, you want your own particular little security, the security of your own pleasures, not the mind that wants a totally different kind of existence, a different way of living. There is a different way of living that can only come about when you have really deeply,

radically understood these things. Do you want to ask any questions?

Questioner: What is your approach to life after death?

Krishnamurti: Do you want to discuss that this evening? Perhaps we will go into it on Saturday afternoon. Have you any questions on what we have been talking about?

Questioner: Can one observe without effort and if you observe without effort will this observation dissolve fears?

Krishnamurti: I have been talking about it the whole evening. Can you observe without effort? Now, can you observe with effort? (audience - no...) Don't yell sir, find out, can you observe anything with effort? If I want to see you, must I make an effort to see you? Can't I see you because I am interested in seeing you? We have made everything into an effort. To get up is an effort, to go to bed is an effort, everything has become an effort. Why? Why is it we can't do anything simply, easily, happily, why? Why has all of life, the way we live, become a constant struggle, conflict and effort? First, let us look at it very simply. You make effort because you are comparing. You are comparing yourself with another, yourself with an idea, yourself as you think you should be. You are comparing. In education when you are a little boy the teacher compares you with the other boy who is still more clever. The mother compares herself with another woman, so, where there is measurement, comparison, there must be effort. Can you live without comparing? Never to compare, that means never to have an ideal, never to have a hero, by which you measure yourself with another. When you see a man riding in a big car, you look at it and you compare. You compare yourself with a man who is clever,

bright, and you say, 'I am dull'. Therefore, recognising through comparison you are dull, you make an effort to be bright. Please see this, the truth of it, that when you compare yourself with another or identify yourself with another, which is a form of comparison, there must be conflict. Can you live without comparison at all, which means seeing what is, and never comparing what is with what should be? You have understood? Never to compare, which means when you don't compare, you have to observe yourself and therefore through observation you become a light to yourself. Light doesn't compare itself with anything, it is light. When you are tremendously joyous, there is no comparison; but when you are comparing, when there is comparison you say, I had pleasure yesterday and I want more of it. To wipe out in our vocabulary in our thinking, the 'better', the 'more'. The better is the enemy of the good. If there is conformity there must be effort, if you are conforming to the social pattern, to what people say, conforming to an ideal, conforming to the past image of yourself or the future image of yourself, there is constant comparison, constant conformity. You train the child to conform. That is what the Stalins, Hitlers and all the tyrannical rulers of the world have done; conform. All the religious people have conformed and that's why there are saints. Can the mind not compare, not conform? That you can only find out by being aware, every day, seeing how you are comparing, how you are conforming, deeply, not at a superficial level, putting on these trousers or some other trousers, but deeply, inwardly conforming, comparing.

Then you can live a life without conflict, when there is no

comparison and there is no conformity, because then life is intelligence and that intelligence is not yours or mine, but intelligence, which is wisdom.

TALKS AND DIALOGUES SYDNEY 1970 4TH PUBLIC TALK 28TH NOVEMBER, 1970

I THINK WE were going to talk over together the question of death. Before we go into that we ought to consider habit, time, and what we call living. Death and living are not two separate things though we have divided them, though we have through our fear of death put it far away from our minds and from our hearts, from our daily activity. We ought to be concerned with the totality of life, not a particular part of it - what we call living - and try to put away from us this question of death.

We are so easily gullible, we take things for granted, we accept so easily, we never question, we don't seem to have fundamental questions at all. We never ask, and if we do we expect someone else to answer. We never search out in ourselves, deeply, to find the right answer to most fundamental questions.

One of the fundamental questions is death, as is love, as living is. We have made living into a habit. There is nothing new in our lives. There's a great deal of excitement, entertainment, escape either through the church or through watching football. We have never, unfortunately, questioned the whole implication of habit and whether; caught in many habits, not only superficial habits but deeply rooted habits, whether one can be free of them, not gradually but instantly, immediately.

We have never questioned for ourselves, deeply, inwardly, what time is. When we do begin to enquire into the question of habits, both superficial and deep, we don't seem to be able to be free of them. One of the accepted habits is that gradually, psychologically

we will change, slowly, step by step. We have developed a sense of gradualness. One can see that in the technological world, in the scientific world gradually one accumulates knowledge about space, all the outward effects of life; one must have time there, to accumulate knowledge, slowly, carefully, painstakingly, not with a personal attitude but with a logical, sane pursuit of knowledge. And one asks if there is psychologically any progress at all, or is it also a peculiar habit that we have cultivated that says there will tomorrow: that at the end of many tomorrows I will change. That allows time, a gradual process of achieving.

Now is there, psychologically, tomorrow at all? Please don't, if we may suggest, accept anything, especially what the speaker is saying. Let us investigate together, enquire together, actually share the enquiry, the understanding, together. We are asking if there is, psychologically, tomorrow at all. We have fallen into the habit of thinking that there is a tomorrow. Chronologically there is tomorrow; by the watch. You have to make arrangements for tomorrow, for the various complications and projects of tomorrow. But inwardly, is there a tomorrow at all? Or, are we caught in the habit of becoming: becoming gradually wise, gradually enlightened, gradually be free to investigate, to observe, gradually wade through this confusion and sorrow. This gradual acceptance, the acceptance of gradual process, is there any validity in that at all?

We see outwardly a building can't be put up immediately, therefore there must be a gradual structure of that building. And psychologically, inwardly, we also think it is a gradual process to bring about a radical change. Is it so? This is one of the most

fundamental questions that you must ask.

It's like a man who is terribly violent, has an ideal of non-violence, and is going to achieve it someday. In the meantime, he is sowing the seeds of violence, he is being violent while he is pretending to follow the ideal. Isn't it a trick of the mind, this idea that you'll gradually, slowly change?

We have so many habits, physical as well as psychological. A particular habit, like smoking or eating meat, after all, is a habit. Can that habit be dropped immediately, a particular habit, or must it be done gradually? One has to enquire, go into this question of time. Is there a living, is there an action which is total, which is not involved in the gradual process of achievement? When we talk about time, and, most of us are concerned with time, time as getting old, time to realize, to understand, to accomplish, to fulfil, to be free and so on. One must go into this question of time altogether totally.

We are sharing this question together, you are not merely, if I may point out, listening to the speaker. What he says has very little importance, but what you discover through what he is saying has tremendous importance; what you discover, what you find out. But if you're merely trying to understand what the speaker is saying, then you'll be lost in words. If you employ the words of the speaker to find out, to investigate, to discover for yourself, then it's yours. Then we shall be sharing together. And it's much more vital, and much more fun, if one can use that word.

There is chronological time. There is time by the watch, and we depend a great deal on that to do anything, to go from here to your house or travel, anything involves chronological time, time as

yesterday, today and tomorrow. How, inwardly, psychologically is there time at all? Is there tomorrow at all? That means one has to find out what it means to become, because most of us are concerned in becoming. Aren't we? We are slaves to the verb 'to be'. That's one of our peculiar, consistent slaveries to a word. To be, to become, this shall be and what has been. That word conditions the mind; do follow this a little bit because we are slaves to words. 'Australian', that means a tremendous lot to you, and the word 'Hindu' means a great deal to those who live in India and the word 'Arab' means something tremendous to the Arab. The verb 'to be' has extraordinary significance in our life. That verb has conditioned our thinking, and when you observe yourself you will see, if you have not already done so, that we are always postponing, that we are always caught in the habit of becoming. Therefore the negation of becoming is 'not being'. Therefore we are afraid of 'not being'.

To explore together this question of what is death and what lies beyond, if there is something beyond, one has to learn very deeply the question of time. Is it possible to change instantly and not be concerned with time at all? When you are concerned with time it involves gradualness; and when a change is to take place, psychologically, inwardly through time there are many factors which will prevent the radical change. A human being is violent; for various reasons which we won't go into now, because that's not what we're concerned with. Human beings throughout the world are aggressive, brutal, ready to kill, violent. They've destroyed so many species of animals, they're making the earth almost uninhabitable. They're violent. Can this violence be completely set

aside, not gradually, but immediately? If you introduce time into this between what you want to achieve and what actually is, there is an interval, there is a gap, a lag of time. In that interval a great many other factors happen, a great many other causes, influences take place and therefore you can never possibly be free of total violence.

Human beings, you and I, must radically change, because we are the society and the society is us. We are the community, and to bring about a change in the social structure which is so ugly, we ourselves have to change, because we are part of that structure, we have created that structure; and to bring about this change shall we depend on time, the many tomorrows? Or, is it possible for the human mind to change instantly? Probably you have not put this question to yourself, ever, because we are caught in the habit of gradualness which is quite terrible really. We see evolution in the species, and we see things evolving like a motor car; a bullock cart evolving into a jet. We think we human beings can also do that, gradually. Gradually we shall be happy people. We shall love each other, we shall live in harmony and all the rest of it. I think that is totally absurd. It is a lie.

What has validity, vitality, passion is to find out if it is possible for the human mind to change instantly. We say it is possible. Don't accept it. We are going to look into it. You know, first of all, one must put away, altogether, the idea of gradualness; it has no meaning. When you have pain, a really serious pain, you don't think it will gradually disappear. You do something instantly. When you see the danger of nationalism, or the danger of division between human beings, the Catholic, the Protestant, the Hindu, not

only the division between human beings outwardly, when you see the effect of division, the danger of it, if you actually see the danger of it as you see the danger of a snake, of a precipice, you act instantly. If you see the danger of this division between human beings then there is instant action.

So the problem is, why don't we see the psychological dangers that we have cultivated for so long? Why is it that we don't see the world and living as a total unit, as a whole movement; not a separate movement as the individual and the collective. The word 'individual' means indivisible. The human being who is not fragmented in himself is the true individual. But we're not individuals, we are fragmented, we are contradictory, we are not harmonious, complete; therefore, to call oneself an individual has no meaning. Yet we have fallen into the habit of it. Why is it that we don't see the danger of our psychological habits, like belonging to a particular nation, accepting a particular organization such as Catholicism or Hinduism and so on? We don't see the danger of it. Why? If you see the danger you would act instantly. What makes the mind dull? You know this fact, an absolute fact, that any kind of division between human beings will inevitably bring about conflict, war, hatred, Jew against Arab and so on.

Intellectually we think we see that division creates harm. Verbally we agree, but apparently we don't feel, deeply, the danger of this division. Why?

In asking that question, why, we're not going to analyse, that is, through analysis discover the cause of why the human mind is so appallingly dull. In analysing why human beings don't see the danger, the psychological danger, in analysis time is involved. And

that is going to prevent you from acting. In asking why, we're not analytically, intellectually examining. We can, afterwards, if we wish, but in asking 'why' you are confronted with your own mind which has become terribly dull to danger. Are you, if I may ask, are you aware of the danger of division? Are you aware, conscious, not just intellectually saying I understand what you mean, but actually understand? The word understand; what does it mean to understand something? There is no understanding if it's mere verbal comprehension. Surely, that's not understanding. A verbal agreement or disagreement, that's not understanding.

Understanding implies, doesn't it, not only hearing the word, recognising the meaning of that word, but also going beyond the word; that is, you understand something when you listen to it totally, which is non-verbally, non-intellectually, but totally. So, we put the question, why the human mind through so many centuries has accepted this division and perceives the danger of this division and yet doesn't end the division. Is it that it doesn't actually see the danger? To see the danger one must not verbalize or escape through the word but actually be in contact with your heart and your mind with the question.

I want to know why my mind, this mind, accepts the psychological dangers and lives in that terrible state of not perceiving what is really most destructive. Why? When I ask that question of myself, am I asking the question because you have asked me? Or, am I asking that question because it is an important question to myself? You know, to be told that you are hungry is one thing, and to feel hungry is another. Which is it? You're being told that your mind is dull because you don't see the danger. You

are told; or, do you realize that your mind is dull because you don't see the danger? And, therefore no one is instructing you of the danger, you yourself have discovered the danger. And therefore, that discovery is the instant action. The perception of danger is immediate action. If I perceive the danger of smoking which is habit, nervousness, accepted by society, the result of propaganda and also perceive that it stimulates or dulls - you know what cigarettes do, tobacco does - see the danger of it, not of smoking, but the danger of habit, see it, totally; then you will find that in dropping smoking there's no conflict at all. You do it and you'll find out for yourself.

After considering what time is, we'll have to consider now what living is. Not what living should be or the ideal of living but what actually is living, the living that we do every day. What is it? It's a series of efforts, battles, a series of - you know what life is don't you, need I describe it: confusion, misery, anxiety, guilt, an appalling sense of loneliness, ugliness, old age, all the fear of disease, fear of insecurity, clinging on, depending on someone. This is what we call living. We want to find in this living, a meaning, a significance, and if you are very clever you invent a significance as all the churches of the world have, as the philosophers have. We try to find something outside this frightful confusion and mess. And, not being able to find something beyond it, we cling to what we have. We cling to our sorrows, cling to our problems, our fears, our anxieties, and our miseries. And that's what we call living, an everlasting battle from the moment we are born till we die, with an occasional flare of something.

We have divorced from this living what is called death, put it

away as far as possible. Knowing that it is inevitable we begin to speculate on what is beyond death, or accept as truth what others say lies beyond. So, we believe. Belief implies accepting as true what we don't know. You never believe in the rising sun, it is there. Our belief is the acceptance of something being true.

We're going to find out whether we can change totally what we call living, not gradually but completely, put aside all our miseries, all our problems. What is a problem? It is something that has not been resolved which you carried over to the next day. It is not resolved because you want that particular problem solved in your particular way, according to your conditioning, your particular prejudice or pleasure, or fear. You never face the problem. You don't finish it as it arises, and to finish it as it arises is to be totally aware of that problem. You cannot be aware if you are condemning it, judging it or wanting it resolved in a particular way.

The thing that we call living is actually a terrible affair. We don't know what to do and we escape through so many ways. One of the ways is to believe in something. To face this confusion completely, not move away from it, to be totally aware of this confusion which means to give all our attention (not to trying to find out the cause of it, that again is very simple to explain) but to be aware that we are completely in confusion, which we are. The man who is confused, trying to seek reality, trying to find out what is the right action will only further increase his confusion. Out of this confusion, when he chooses, his choice is also confused. Be aware completely without any distortion of this confusion; when you see the danger of it there is a totally different kind of action.

We're going to find out, together, what death means. What is it

that dies? This is a complex question. People have written volumes about it. One has to put aside everything other people have said. That's the first truth. One has to find out for oneself, absolutely, otherwise you live always in the shadow of fear. The organism grows old, grows unnecessarily decrepit, senile, has many diseases, because we have abused the organism. The organism is mechanical, is a machine and we have misused it. And, naturally, it dies. We know that. That isn't what is causing deep fear, there is something else. We are afraid not only of the unknown, but also afraid of letting go the known. Letting go your furniture, you know, actually your furniture which you have cherished, which you have polished every day. You have bought it and given so much attention to the beastly thing, however beautiful it is, and you're part of that furniture. You are the furniture. Do observe it, you're part of that house, which you have bought through so much difficulty. You've identified yourself with a particular community, with a particular family; so, you are the community, you are the family, you are the book, whether that book is the red book of China or the black book or the red book of some other country. You are what you have identified yourself with, whether it is the image that you have identified yourself with, or the image which you have built about yourself. You're that, and you're also this terrible confusion, mess, misery, torture of living. You're all that. All that is the word and the memory of association, association which has its memories.

This is a fact. It is not what you and I wish, but it is so. Then we see the impermanency of the furniture, the impermanency of ourselves, so thought begins to invent the soul, as the permanent.

The Hindus have done this beautifully. They've had time, 10,000 or 5,000 years, so they have invented this extraordinary structure; the higher self, the Atman, the ultimate and the physical. Gradually through birth after birth, reincarnation, all the rest of it, you'll ultimately reach whatever that is you're going to reach. You have also, in the Christian world, this whole idea of resurrection; only it's not so complicated. The Hindus have a very cunning mind and they have invented extraordinary things, but the Christian mind is a little more unsophisticated. They accept so easily. They're as superstitious as anybody else. So, you're all that. That's an absolute, psychological fact. That is what is.

You say to yourself, when I die I hope something of me will continue. What is this me that, according to the whole Asiatic world believing in reincarnation, is to be reborn again? What is that thing that you call the `me' which is the permanent, which is going to be reborn... you follow?... if you believe in that. What is that `me'? What are you? If you look at yourself, what are you? Not only the physical appearance, the few clothes and the house and all the rest of it. What are you, actually, inwardly? Unless you look and not be afraid to discover what you are, you'll avoid this question very cleverly. What are you? You are a series of memories, experiences, knowledge that you have acquired, a conditioned mind that is shaped according to the particular culture in which it is born. If you were born in the Communist world you don't believe in God; that, they say, is silly, bourgeois. If you were born in the Western world, brought up in the particular culture, you believe, which is the same as being conditioned in the Communist world where you do not believe. You are the result of your culture,

of your conditioning. That's a fact also. Don't escape from this. You say you also have looked at it and you say there must be something much more fundamental; much more permanent, real, which will, when we die, perhaps continue.

You have lived an unfortunate life, not really beautiful, rather shoddy, superficial, joined this and that cult, believed in this or that; lived a superficial life and when the inevitable comes, off you go. If you really want to find out while living, living, not diseased, not neurotic, actually to find out what it means to die you have to ask this question. The question is: Is there anything permanent in you? Or, is the you a series of bundles of memories with all its associations? To believe in reincarnation; in that is involved something that is going to be reborn next life, something that you, now have which is not transient, which is going to take shape again on earth. When you believe in reincarnation, you believe you are going to be better next life; that is, if you are a poor, unfortunate person, next life you'll be the most beautiful person. If you believe that, then what you do matters infinitely, because what you do now is going to shape your future. Those people who believe in reincarnation don't care a pin what happens now, what they do now. They gossip, they butcher, they are violent, they are ugly, superficial, stupid, and yet they believe. When you are concerned with right conduct which is righteousness, when you are behaving totally, completely rightly, then it doesn't matter where you are, whether you are born next life or you die.

This is not only physical, obviously, but also psychological, the dying to all things that you have cherished including the piece of furniture, and furniture I'm afraid does play a tremendous part in

our life. Eventually you're going to die to the furniture, so find out if you can die to your furniture now; not to be attached to anything. Not to be attached doesn't mean indifference, it doesn't mean callousness; on the contrary, when you are not attached you have tremendous vitality. There is tremendous passion, there is great energy and that energy, then, can act totally. Is it possible to die every day to everything, to your image, to your memories, to your various dogmas, beliefs, hopes, fears? Die to everything, so that your mind is fresh, young, innocent?

The word innocence means not to hurt, not to have the capacity to hurt or be hurt. Can your mind find a way of living where it is never hurt. Not by resistance, not through isolation, but by dying to all identification, to all attachment, dependency, inwardly, because inevitably that's what is going to happen. When death comes you're either diseased, 'ga-ga' or unconscious. Whereas now, having full vitality, not neurotic, but sane, balanced, capable of reason, with energy; to die to all these things that one has accumulated in oneself. Otherwise there is no freedom. Dying every day is to love. One cannot love if there is no freedom. There is no freedom if there is the 'me' which is the accumulation, the images, the movement of identification and detachment; that 'me' prevents love. One has to die every day to know what love is. Then you'll bring a different kind of world into being.

Would you like to ask any questions about all that we have talked this afternoon?

Questioner: If nobody cares for their furniture isn't the world going to be rather flat?

Krishnamurti: Do you mean to say the furniture makes the

world beautiful? What is beauty? Is beauty in the architecture, in the structure of a building, in the painting, in music, in the word? What is beauty? You know, we are enquiring, therefore we must share it together. Don't just sit there and listen to my enquiry. Share with it.

Questioner: Beauty is working among the poor. Love is beautiful. Krishnamurti: If I may say so, don't assert anything. Don't say love, beauty is this, that. We're questioning, enquiring, we'll find out sir, give it a chance, have patience. You see, we find beauty in nature, we find beauty in the building, in a poem, in a boat that is sailing in the wind, we see beauty out there, in the tree, in the cloud, in the movement of the water, in the flight of a bird, in the leaf trembling in the breeze. Is it out there? Go slowly. Where is it? In your heart, in your mind? Is it there? Or is it in the tree, in the picture that you see in the museum, in the Velasquez which has just been bought for five million pounds, or whatever? Where is beauty, and what does beauty mean? You know, as long as there is a division, the observer and the observed, you the observer looking at the picture and saying how beautiful it is, is there beauty? Go slow, please, just enquire, don't answer me. As long as there is a division between the onlooker and the thing that he looks upon is there beauty? As long as there is a division of any kind between you and the cloud, between you and the child with the smiling face, is there beauty? Not that you identify yourself with the child, or with the cloud, or with the flutter of the sail; when you identify, again there is a duality; you identifying yourself with another.

So, one discovers that there is no beauty at all when there is any kind of division or identification. I identify myself with the

beautiful blue sky or with the beauty of my wife or husband. In that identification there is division. So one discovers that there is no beauty if there is any kind of division and distance, a time interval. Can this division between you and the light on that water end, in the sense that there is no division, there is no space, no time interval? For that to happen there must be no observer; there must be no me. The `me' must be abandoned. The `me' creates the division, as the observer. For that to end there must be passion; if you have no passion (not lust) there's no beauty. You can visit all the museums in the world, compare Michelangelo with da Vinci and so on; in that there is no beauty. Beauty implies total self-abandonment and with passion so that there is no division. After all, that is love. When there is that quality of mind that has no division, and therefore loves, that is beauty.

Questioner: Does the insanity of violence bring about the privilege of death?

Krishnamurti: Why can't we be simple about all this? Life is very complex. It's terribly complex. All our relationships are complex. Society is getting more and more and more complex. And apparently we can't be simple enough to look at all this with clear, simple eyes. What I said was, there is no new life unless you die to yesterday. That's all. That's a simple fact. If you want to discover something totally new, you have to abandon all the old.

Questioner: In a book that you wrote previously you said you had spoken to your brother after he died, you'd seen him. Doesn't this prove to you there's life after death?

Krishnamurti: In a book you wrote, you saw your brother when he died, and how do you explain that? That was the question wasn't

it?

Questioner: That's right.

Krishnamurti: Did you hear the previous answer which I talked about, which is to live a simple life? Or were you occupied with some other question? Apparently, you're asking whether when the speaker's brother died about 45 years ago, he saw him. How do you explain that? That's the question. Are you interested in it? Yes? Good Lord. You see, you're really not interested in the real things. You're really not interested to find out how to live a different kind of life, deeply, beautifully. All right, sir. First of all, it may be imagination. That's a tremendous possibility, isn't it? When you love or so-called love your brother and he's gone, there is great sorrow, there is a great feeling of apartness, and in that state you see all kinds of things, don't you? You see yourself lonely; I'm not talking about myself, I'm talking about the human being. You see yourself as lonely, deprived of companionship, things that had meaning, gone; and what you could have done and didn't do, the regrets, the pleasures, you see so many things, don't you? Both the past and the future. And among those you see perhaps through imagination or the thought, the form of a thought, you understand? You see that. You know, all these things exist. There is thought transference, you know it, don't you? When you are very close to somebody, husband, wife, the wife hasn't to say a thing, and you do it, or you think it, there is immediate transference. There is also extra-sensory perception, all kinds of powers as you begin to investigate yourself deeply. All kinds of capacities come, so-called clairvoyance and other kinds of powers. But a wise man puts aside all those because they are irrelevant. But, people who want

excitement, power, position, use those as a means of exploiting. A wise man avoids all this and moves away from all this.

I'm sure I haven't answered your question. We want comfort and therefore we want the solace that we find in the companion who has gone. Therefore the mind can do all kinds of tricks, caught in all kinds of illusion; and that doesn't lead to clarity, to truth. The mind must be free of every form of deception.

Questioner: If there is no God what does it matter what we do or think? Krishnamurti: Because you have God does it matter what you do and think? Does it? Because you believe in God, do you think what you do matters? If it does, what matters is what you do, not what you believe in; what you do for itself, not because of something else. This question of God we can't go into today, we'll go into it tomorrow. This is one of the questions, a part of our life, God, death, beauty, love, pain, suffering, it's all one. One has to understand all of it, not just God and something else, apart from that. It's a total movement of life and not a fragmentary movement in which there is God and the other fragments in which there is no God. To go into this question, whether there is or there is not, and not according to your conditioning or the speaker's conditioning - if he is conditioned - but to find out, actually, not verbally but deeply to find out if there is such a thing as something immortal, something timeless, something that is not measured by thought; to find that out requires not just an afternoon or an hour, an hour of controversy or discussion or dialogue, but requires your whole life, the way you live it. We'll go into that if you don't mind, tomorrow morning.

TALKS AND DIALOGUES SYDNEY 1970 5TH PUBLIC TALK 29TH NOVEMBER, 1970

I SEE MANY of you have no coats. May I take my coat off too?

We were going to talk about religion and if there is such a thing as God - if there is or if there is not; to find out the truth, which doesn't depend on any organized belief. Obviously, no religion as it exists, right throughout the world, can honestly and truly claim to understand what truth is. This morning, if we may, we will go into this whole question, rather deeply, and find out through perception, through seeing, what is and what is not truth.

First of all, one has to find out what action is, an action that would be total, complete, non-fragmentary, because our life, as it is now, is fragmented. There is the action of the business man apart from the artist and the artist apart from the scientist and the scientist apart from the so-called religious man and the religious man apart from the labourer and so on. There are the various fragmentations of religions, the fragmentations of political, national division, economic, moral. The morality which society sustains is no morality at all, it is really, actually, immoral.

So one has to find out for oneself an action that covers all this; non-fragmentary, but something complete, total, non-contradictory, that will apply both to the artist and the businessman, that will be true, consistent, constant and alive. We have to find such an action, because all our life is a movement in action. All living is relationship in action and if that action is contradictory, broken up, it must inevitably breed conflict, pain, sorrow, a great deal of mischief and antagonism. So one has really, basically to find out if

there is an action that will be whole, total, never contradictory. I think that is one of the primary issues, if one really wants to find out what religion is.

First, the religion that one has - a vast machinery of propaganda, is no religion at all; it's merely a mass hypnotism, an instrument of very clever, cunning propaganda, insisting on its tradition, on rituals, on authority, on the hierarchical principle. I do not know if you have noticed all this. Whatever religion that exists on this earth at this moment is based on repetition, rituals, authority, hierarchical outlook, sustaining a morality which is not moral at all. Whether it is in India or Asia or in Europe or in America or here in Australia, it's a religion that says one thing and does another. It says 'love your neighbour' and sustains the machinery of war.

Probably one of the few religions in the world that has not shed blood is Buddhism and perhaps after it Hinduism, but the rest have brought about a great many wars and destruction; and most of these religions are based on belief.

Please let us be clear that we are not attacking any of these so-called religions. We are merely stating what actually is taking place, merely observing the actual facts; not stating what religions should be, that's an abstraction and, therefore, no value at all. We are only examining what actually is and therefore it's not an attack. It's not an assertion of another system of religious thought. It is only pointing out - and the speaker is not pointing out but all of us observing that throughout the world there can be seen this plain and simple fact; authority, propaganda, hypnotism, a repetitive ritual stimulus and belief.

Belief is the acceptance of things that may be true, accepting

things that may be.

A man who would really go into the question of what actually, religion is, to find out deeply, not according to his temperament or his idiosyncrasy or his culture, his conditioning, but actually to find out if there is such a thing as God, as truth, such a man must set aside all belief, obviously, and all rituals, because they are merely repetitive, meaningless stimuli, as any other stimuli. He must set aside, also, all the authoritarian hierarchical outlook. To find out, all this must be totally, completely set aside, because the mind must be free. Freedom is absolutely necessary. Without a free mind, a mind that's not distorted, that's not crippled by the cultural conditioning, without such a mind which is free, one cannot possibly perceive what is truth.

Therefore, it is absolutely essential that a mind be free to enquire, to observe and to understand.

There is freedom from something; freedom from anger, freedom from competitive, aggressive drive. Freedom `from' is one thing, and freedom is another. Freedom `from' something is a reaction, a contradiction, pursuing the opposite; whereas, there is such a thing as freedom, not `from' something. This may be rather difficult to comprehend but we have to understand it. We are always thinking in terms of freedom from something, freedom from tyranny, freedom from attachment, and so on. Actually, if you go into it, you will see that that is not freedom at all. In that there is always suppression, conformity or adjustment, because the opposite always contains its own opposite, whereas freedom is something entirely different.

Freedom has no opposite. If I want to see something very

clearly, the mind must be totally free to observe and that freedom is not a reaction or response from what is.

In trying to find out what religion is one must understand the nature of belief, authority, conformity and the utter inanity of rituals. In understanding these there is, naturally, freedom; not freedom `from' rituals. We are trying to find out if there is an action which is not contradictory in itself an action that is always consistent, has no hypocrisy involved in it, an action that covers the whole movement of life, like a thread running through a necklace.

If we don't find such an action, our actions will be contradictory, hypocritical and therefore involved with various forms of strains, distortions; such a mind cannot possibly be free.

Then, there is the question of search, seeking, seeking truth. Search implies: searching `for' something that you can find. What you can find is what is recognizable. You set out to find out what truth is and you seek, you ask, you enquire into the various structures and organizations which believe in religion and so on. You are seeking. Seeking implies that you will find and what you find must be known, must be recognizable; that is so. If you can recognise something it is already known. Therefore it is not new. Therefore it's not true.

This is rather an important question. Why do we seek at all? If life, the living, were something extraordinarily beautiful, or something in which there was no pain, no sorrow, if the thing in itself were profound, you wouldn't seek.

Because we are shallow, rather empty, lead a rather sordid life, we want to seek something more. The more is what we call the

truth and when you seek and you hope to find, what you hope to find must already have been experienced, otherwise you can't recognise it. Therefore, a mind that seeks will never find truth.

I hope we are sharing this together, not agreeing or disagreeing but seeing the validity, the reason, the logic of this, because we must use reason, not your reason or my reason but reason.

A mind that is moving away from itself is a movement towards what it considers is bigger, nobler or truer. This movement away from itself is what is called searching. Therefore, search becomes an escape from what is; but in the understanding of what is, you enter into quite a different movement, not away from. There are two different kinds of movement - the movement away, leading away, and the movement that is not away but entering in itself, entering into what is.

It is not an inward look opposed to the outward look. The outward look is the extrovert look, going away, outward, and the introvert is looking within which is merely the opposite of the outward. But this, what we are talking about, is neither of these, it is a movement that understands the outer, that understands the opposite which is the inward and therefore it is entirely different.

You see, the speaker doesn't prepare these talks, therefore he comes to it fresh, he's enquiring, he's going into it with you and if you don't follow, if you don't share it it's no fun.

One must understand this question of seeking. Then you will ask, can a mind that doesn't seek and therefore has no challenge (challenge which depends on seeking, questioning, demanding, enquiring), can such a mind keep awake? Most of us need challenges, challenges in different forms and if we have no

challenge most of us will go to sleep; and when there is a challenge we respond inadequately because we are so living in the past and the past responds to challenge which is always new and so the response must inevitably be inadequate and contradictory.

We depend on challenge. That's what is happening in the world, everybody is questioning the value, the truth of Catholicism, Protestantism, the social structure, the immorality of the social order, questioning everything. But, this challenge has to be answered with a mind that is new, not a mind that is steeped, living in the past. Searching implies challenge also, so can a mind be totally awake without challenge? We will go into that. We'll come to it presently if we have time. We are asking: what is religion? What is action that is whole, complete? What is a mind that has actually set aside, intelligently because it understands, belief, the hierarchical outlook, authority, the inanities of rituals and so on, completely set aside all that? Belief implies acceptance of something as being true. We accept because our own life is rather uncertain, confused, and if we have belief in something, it doesn't matter what it is, how true or false, a belief in something, accepting something as true, gives us a certain quality of stability. This means we are frightened, we are lost without a belief an ideal.

When you have a belief, an ideal, it must be contrary to what is. All your ideals, obviously, are the opposite of what is, and therefore inevitably there is conflict which leads to hypocrisy. That's one thing; then we have to enquire into the whole question of what meditation is.

Meditation is a word that has been used recently in the West and has become rather fashionable, unfortunately. There are

various exponents of what meditation is and each exponent offers a system, a system that will lead to enlightenment. One has to find out the significance of system, not of any particular system or method, but system. They say by practising a certain system day after day you will come to that state of mind that will receive, whatever it will receive. System implies repetition, repeating over and over and over that which somebody has said is the system, and you follow it, hoping to achieve. This means the mind becomes repetitive, mechanical. How can a mechanical mind see something which is non-mechanical, which is something extraordinarily alive, which is constantly in movement? If you see the truth of this fact, that any system, whether in the scientific or in the technological world or in the world of meditation, must make the mind dull, must make the mind so insensitive, so, if I may use the word - stupid - (it's only the stupid mind that accepts systems) - if you see the truth of that, then your mind is no longer pursuing a practice but becomes constantly aware, constantly alive, non-mechanical.

There are the Zen systems - you know Zen? Do you know about all this? What a waste of time, isn't it? Because they all offer systems and when once you have seen the truth of a system you'll never touch it - it doesn't matter who offers it. Then there is, again, a recent fashion of so-called transcendental meditation, which is absolute nonsense because - need I go into all this? You know, a dull mind repeating a certain word, hoping it will achieve some extraordinary state, will still remain a dull mind. No? You know, there is this whole system in India, and I assure you when I go to India I have to battle with all these stupidities - there is a system in India called Mantra Yoga which is the repetition of a secret word

given unto the disciple and he repeats that word 10,000 times a day, or whatever it is. Through that repetitive word he hopes to achieve a tremendous experience. Now that has been brought to this country - and elsewhere, and one of the odd things about it is that you pay for it. The more secret it is the more expensive it is. Don't laugh, please. See, the church has done this too. We are so eager to be exploited.

There are two things involved in this. First of all, a repetition of a word, it doesn't matter what word it is, Sydney, Sydney, Sydney would do just as well as another word. If you repeat that word; do it yourself, it's rather fun sometimes, play with it a little bit, the repetition creates a certain sound. The tonality of that sound without the word becomes vibrant, and that sense of vibrancy gives you a certain quality of intoxication. That intoxication is as good as taking whisky; any stimulus is as good as another. You hope to achieve an experience. One has to understand that word 'experience'. We all want deeper, wider, nobler, vaster experiences. That is all we are craving. Everybody wants a transcendental, marvellous experience, because our own life, the daily life, is so petty, so small, so shallow, so meaningless. Therefore we want deep experiences, and when you do experience something, unless you recognise it as an experience, it has no validity. The moment you recognise it, it's already the old, therefore it's not really, basically an experience in freedom. Have you heard that word Yoga? The word Yoga in Sanskrit means something, which we needn't go into and I think it is a wrong interpretation. Yoga is a form of exercise. Through that exercise you hope to achieve all kinds of states, but a stupid mind practising yoga will still remain

stupid.

We were travelling once in India on a train and it stopped at a station. Just outside the window a man was doing yoga on the ground. Marvellously it was done, with such grace, with such ease, with such perfection, and people were throwing coins to him. He was a beggar. You see the significance of it? No? That's all.

You see we give importance to things that are not important at all. And also in the question of this meditation and experience is involved drugs, LSD, marijuana, various forms of 'Speeds' and so on. It has been going on in India and in Asia for thousands of years, taking drugs, and now it is relegated to the lowest social strata. The poorest, the uneducated - you've no idea, because taking drugs brings about nostalgic remembrances of things that have happened, of psychedelic states. But it's all chemical formula which has no validity at all.

A dull, cunning, stupid mind taking drugs, being conditioned, will experience a great many things, but when the drug wears off he's back to his own backyard. So, a man who is enquiring into the question of what is a religious mind must be free of all this, completely; free of drugs, alcohol, any form of stimulus, so that his mind remains clear, without any distortion. Then one can ask, what is meditation? You understand, we are enquiring into what is religion, what is action which is total, whole, complete, without any distortion, without the trivialities that man has invented, the various systems in order to achieve a quality of mind which is religious. Such a mind must be free of all the things that make it dull, because you need a very clear mind, a mind that is capable of reason and you cannot possibly reason if there is any form of

prejudice, if your reason is not objective, or is personal. A mind must be completely sane, which means healthy.

Then we can proceed to enquire. We have laid the foundation. The mind can then proceed to enquire, what is discipline, what is virtue? Discipline, the word, means to learn, not to conform, not to imitate, not go through the drill. To learn what is disorder. It is not discipline imposed upon you by society or by yourself or by your culture or by your guru, by your teacher. All that is really a form of suppression, therefore contradiction and therefore conflict.

Such disciplines make the mind dull, insensitive. Whereas, we are going to enquire into the very meaning of that word discipline, it means to learn, and we are going to learn what virtue is. Do we know what disorder is? There is disorder, not only outwardly but also inwardly. There is confusion outwardly, confusion inwardly. Watch yourself, if you care to and you will see how disorderly your thinking is, your activity is, how contradictory, how confusing. In the understanding of this disorder, by observing it, not bringing a blueprint to correct the disorder, but watching it, being aware of it, becoming sensitive to it, then out of this disorder comes order, which is virtue; not the practising of some stupid quality, but simply becoming aware, highly sensitive to the disorder: the political, economic, social, the religious disorder, outwardly; and the disorder within oneself, the contradictions, the miseries, the confusion, the ambitions, the whole drive from a self-centred activity. All that is disorder and in becoming aware of all that you will find there is a different kind of order, and that it's a living order, not an order which is imposed through compulsion. Virtue, like humility is not something you learn, it's not something

you practise, but you see that vanity, pride, all that creates disorder, and in the observing of that disorder comes real humility. Do it, please, as you go along, you will see.

After laying the foundation, which is order, virtue, and setting aside all the trivial inventions that man has built in himself and around himself as a religious structure, which is no religious structure at all, we can ask and find out together now, what is meditation.

You know it is one of the most extraordinary things if you know what meditation is. First of all we have to understand what awareness is: to be aware, aware outwardly, the colours, the proportions of this hall, aware of the various colours that you have on, aware without any choice, just to watch. And also to be inwardly aware of all the movement of thought, the movement of your gestures, the way you walk, the things you eat, the habits you have formed, again without choice - merely to observe attentively. You cannot be aware if there is a division between the observer and the observed, because that division creates a contradiction.

You also have to understand what attention is. I do not know if you have ever given complete attention to anything. To attend means to give your mind, your heart, your nerves, completely. In that attention there is no observer, there is no me. When we are completely attentive the `me' doesn't exist at all. The `me' is the censor which is the past. So, there is a quality of attention which is completely different from concentration because concentration implies exclusion, building a barrier, a wall, putting away everything and concentrating on one thing. That`s fairly simple and fairly easy to achieve, every schoolboy does that. But attention

implies the understanding of concentration and attending so that in that attention there are no borders, no frontiers because there is no centre from which you are attending.

Meditation implies a quality of mind that can completely attend, therefore, a mind that can be completely still. The mind is always chattering, always talking, either to itself, within itself or to somebody, always in movement. How can such a mind which is everlastingly chattering, how can it perceive anything? Only a mind that is completely attentive has the total energy to observe: because you need tremendous energy to observe. The religious monks and others say that you cannot waste energy, therefore no sex if you want to be a saint. And when you become a celibate and have taken vows of celibacy there is havoc in you, because you are denying the whole biological system and there is a wastage of energy, you're battling, battling, battling. Or you go to the other extreme, indulge, which is another form of wasting energy.

Whereas, if you are attentive it is the greatest form of all summation of energy. It means intensity, passion, and you cannot be passionate if you are wasting. Without any effort the mind can become completely quiet and therefore full of energy without any distortion.

That is the beginning or rather that is the continuation of meditation which we began this morning. We began by asking what is religion. We began by asking if there is an action that is so complete, that is never contradictory, and therefore a life that is totally harmonious and we discarded the various systems because systems mean, as I explained, repetition. The mind, observing from the beginning of this talk till now, becomes extraordinarily

sensitive. Being sensitive implies great intelligence, totally attentive and therefore completely quiet. Meditation is a movement of understanding of every action, a mind that is truly religious, that has no belief, that doesn't belong to any group, to any community, that stands completely alone.

There is a difference between aloneness and isolation. Isolation leads to neuroticism, various forms of it, because in isolation there is exclusion, separateness, but a mind that is completely attentive, is completely alone, is therefore, capable of seeing what is true. So far one can verbalize, put into words, but after that nothing can be said. The man who says 'I know' does not know. He does not know that which lies beyond, that which is not put together by thought, by our conditioning. Meditation is just opening the door. What lies beyond it can never be expressed in words and anybody who expresses it in words is not aware, does not know. The mind is a religious mind that has compassion, love, that has no fear, that is capable of standing completely alone. Therefore, it finds a reality which is not measurable.

If you want to, ask any questions about all this.

Questioner: You said yesterday that 'When we perceive danger, physical danger, there is immediate action'. In that action is there any violence involved? And, if we see psychological dangers and there is instant action is there not also in that instant action violence?

Krishnamurti: What is violence? Resistance is a form of violence isn't it? Conformity is a form of violence. Denying what is, but conforming, is violence. Fear does breed violence. There is violence in a crowded city because there is no space. Man requires

space both outwardly and inwardly and when the outward space is denied, which is being denied more and more through overpopulation, there must be violence, especially in cities. So you ask: if one sees psychological danger, is there not violence, an action which is violent? Is it violence if you see danger and act? Bearing in mind that any form of resistance is violence, any form of conformity is violence, that fear breeds violence: when you really understand that completely, and when you see danger, the psychological, inward danger of greed, the danger of nationalism, the danger of division between people, is there violence in that action at all? Obviously not.

Now, I hear that siren. Listen to it. Either you listen to it with no resistance at all, or you listen to it with resistance. If you resist that noise then there is violence. But if there is no resistance at all, but complete attention to that siren, listening to it completely, is that violence? Obviously not.

Questioner: Why not silence?

Krishnamurti: Why not silence? I don't know why not. Do you know what silence means? Is silence between two noises? Is silence between two thoughts? Is silence the result of control, suppression? Does silence come about because you have drilled yourself to be silent? Or is silence natural? Silent; to be completely quiet, not only physically but inwardly without any movement of thought. You know you can speak out of silence; that is, an action which is total, complete, non-fragmentary, non-contradictory, comes about out of complete emptiness of silence. But, we don't know really what it means to be silent.

Questioner: You didn't answer the question.

Krishnamurti: I am answering it sir. We are not silent. You mean to say, sir, that we can sit here quietly for an hour and a quarter, silently? Have you ever sat quietly for a few minutes without a movement of your eyes, without movement of thought? When you ask `Why not silence?', it's very simple to answer, because you are noisy. [Applause]

Krishnamurti: Please....

Questioner: Why not renunciation?

Krishnamurti: I beg of you, don't applaud. It has no meaning at all. If it releases your energy by clapping, do it when we are not here.

The gentleman asked `why not complete renunciation?' What do you mean by that word renunciation? To renounce, to give up? Have you ever given up, renounced, one pleasure? Have you? Have you ever completely, easily put away something? Renunciation implies, doesn't it, that you give up something with pain, as a sacrifice, as something you have to do. Surely, that is not renunciation at all.

Questioner: Please answer the question.

Krishnamurti: I am answering it sir. You ask why not renunciation?

Questioner: Why don't you renounce?

Krishnamurti: Who? Are you asking me, why don't you renounce? Is that it? What have I to renounce? Look at it quietly. What have I to renounce and what have you to renounce? The gentleman asked why don't you renounce, which is me, the speaker. What have I to renounce? Property - because I haven't got any.

Questioner: Words.

Krishnamurti: I'm coming to that, sir.... patience. Have I to renounce publicity? Have I to renounce you sitting there and I sitting here? It doesn't mean to me whether I talk or don't talk because I've gone through that. There's nothing to renounce. And you say 'renounce words'. It is very easy to renounce words, put aside words. Then we must communicate in silence. You understand? How? We can communicate in silence, which means that you must be completely silent. We have done this for 45 years and more, it isn't just one day's idea of something we pick up. To communicate implies not only verbally but non-verbally. Now after verbalizing, if you are silent, completely attentive, then there is a communion which is not verbal.

Questioner: If you do not carry over the past, would there be any creative action as dance, as painting?

Krishnamurti; What does that word mean, creative, to create? When the housewife bakes bread is it creation? Why not? When the painter draws something on a canvas and says he is creative, what does that mean? That he is fulfilling himself on the canvas? Can there be creativity? As long as there is no self-fulfilment, me fulfilling, me acting, me wanting to be silent, me wanting to renounce; as long as there is not that movement, then there is creation.

Questioner: As one uses a crutch when one is lame, when one is weak, just beginning, should not one use this mantra yoga - that is, repetition of a word?

Krishnamurti: Who tells you that you are weak, that you are lame? Who tells you, sir? Or, have you found yourself that you are

weak? And therefore, you need a crutch, therefore you need a mantra which is a repetition of a word

Why do you assume that you are weak and therefore you need this which will ultimately lead you to strength, and therefore freedom? Do you follow what's involved in this?.... a gradualness: I am stupid now but gradually I will become intelligent, and while I am stupid I will use all the things that will make me still more stupid. The yoga, mantra yoga, repetition of words, rituals. Really what we want is to find pleasure. What we want is pleasure. We don't say we want pleasure, we say we want to achieve some noble thing, but when you repeat a word hoping that it will lead you to some extraordinary state, what you are seeking is pleasure.

You have been hypnotized for so many generations and now you are also being hypnotized by this word mantra yoga, the repetition of a word. Sir, why do you make so much of it? Repeat a word like 'pepsi cola' or 'coca cola', that's good enough, you don't have to pay thirty or one hundred dollars. Pick up any word, 'ava maria' or any other word and repeat it and you will see what happens to your mind.

Do it, sir. And also some time pick up a piece of stone with some shape to it or a piece of stick with some curve in it, put it on the mantelpiece, put flowers to it every day, with some respect, and you will see at the end of a month you are completely hypnotized by that stick, because you have given your devotion, your reverence, your love to that piece of stone and that becomes a habit and you are hypnotized. It's a form of self-hypnosis with which most of us are familiar, though we're unconscious of it.

Questioner: You are using words to hypnotize us.

Krishnamurti: Am I?

Questioner: To de-hypnotise us.

Krishnamurti: Oh, I'm using words to de-hypnotise you? I'm not sir. I'm neither hypnotizing you nor de-hypnotising you. The speaker is not interested in doing anything to you. All that he says is, observe yourself, know yourself, observe what happening around you, look at yourself, the misery, the tortures, the agonies that you go through. Learn about yourself, not from somebody, including the speaker, but learn about yourself by watching yourself. There's great beauty in that. Then you will find out in watching what it means to be aware, to be attentive, and a mind that is so attentive is a religious mind, is a clear mind and from that you can act totally. That's all he is saying. Do what you want, and you are inevitably going to do what you want, but be aware of what you want to do, for in that awareness your mind becomes sensitive, intelligent and from that intelligence there is an action which is total.

TALKS AND DIALOGUES SYDNEY 1970 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 17TH NOVEMBER, 1970

THIS IS SUPPOSED to be a discussion, or rather, a dialogue to talk things over together and understand and perhaps resolve the problems that one has. You know, the more one goes through the world, not only in this country but in India, Europe and America - there are so many conflicting problems, so much confusion and brutality, such a desperate violence; human beings don't seem to change very much.

We have many problems not only the physical problems of environment, ecology, but also the deeper inward problems, problems of relationship, problems of conflict, despair, loneliness, misery, confusion and sorrow. We have accepted these and live with them as though it is part of our life.

Perhaps we could this morning go into any one of these issues deeply, not theoretically, not in abstraction but actually, go into them in detail and also to get the general picture. Then perhaps it might be worthwhile if we could take one issue, whatever it is that you wish, and talk it over together so that we understand it completely. And when we leave this place, this hall, then perhaps we will be able to be free of it. So, what would you like to talk over?

Questioner: Could we speak of death?

Questioner: Hate?

Questioner: Can we talk of self-doubt? Can we go beyond doubting ourselves?

Krishnamurti: Can we talk over together this question of self-

doubt, having no confidence in oneself and go beyond it?

Questioner: Fear?

Questioner: Can one actually live what you speak of and raise a family in this world of conflict?

Krishnamurti: Can one live in this terrible, mad world sanely and at the same time earn a livelihood raising a family and so on? Is that the question, Madam?

Questioner: Can we bring in sensitivity?

Krishnamurti: Can we bring in sensitivity? We can bring a lot of things. (Laughter.)

Questioner: Can we talk about how to see properly, how to see clearly?

Krishnamurti: Shall we take up that question and then we can include all the other questions in it: fear, self doubt. I've forgotten the rest.

The question is, now can one see things very clearly without prejudice, without bringing our own particular opinion, conclusions, our own form of conditioning? Without all that is it possible to see, totally, the whole vast spectrum of life?

To see. What does that mean? To see clearly, now what does that word imply? Seeing, observing, to see without any image, to see things actually as they are without any form of conclusion; is that possible at all? I want to see not only outwardly what's going on: the wars, the contradictions of nationalities, the linguistic differences, the fragmentation caused by religions. I want to see all that very clearly, the outward phenomena; and, also I want to see very clearly what's going on within myself, within the skin, without any distortion. Distortion comes when there is any kind of effort.

Are we following each other? We'll discuss this, we'll talk it over; I'm just explaining perhaps what it means to see, to observe, to observe clearly without any distortion what is actually taking place, not translating what I see in terms of my own conclusion, prejudice, fears and so on. Is that at all possible? Can we discuss this? Do you think that will be worthwhile?

We have so many prejudices, conclusions, opinions, we have knowledge about so many factors, and these obviously prevent perception. I want to understand what you are talking about. I must listen, and to listen implies that there must be no interpretation but I must actually listen. That implies while I am listening there must be no comparison with what I have already learnt because you may be saying something entirely different. So, I must have the capacity and the art of listening, otherwise I can't understand what you are talking about. In the same way to observe clearly what is going on outwardly and inwardly, without any image; is that possible? Which means really to observe without any conditioning as a Christian, Communist, a hippie, a square and all the rest of it; to listen so completely, to see without any form of distortion. Now is that possible?

It is only possible, surely, when I know all my prejudices, the formulas that I have, the conclusions, the opinions that I have gathered; becoming aware of those and putting them aside. Then I can listen. Then I can observe. Is that possible? Is it possible for me to put aside my particular form of conclusion, my prejudice, my conditioning as a Communist, as a Hindu, as a Christian or whatever?

Questioner: Just because you become aware of a certain

conditioning doesn't automatically mean that you conquer it.

Krishnamurti: I'm going to show it to you in a minute. Go slowly, have a little patience please.

I said be aware of one's conditioning. How, what does this awareness mean? To be aware. What do you think it means?

Questioner: To be conscious.

Krishnamurti: To be aware, to be conscious, to be sensitive; what does it imply?

Questioner: To be identified with the things as they really are.

Krishnamurti: To be aware, you say, is to identify oneself with the thing you are aware of.

Questioner: You are the thing you are aware of

Krishnamurti: Look Sir, follow this step by step, go into it because if we could understand this one thing we would resolve a great many problems. When you say you identify yourself with the thing you are aware of, who is the entity that identifies itself?

Let us just look. We are trying to find out what it means to be aware, aware of this hall, the proportions of it, the colour of it, the steel beams, the cross-beams, the bricks, the windows and aware of the people sitting in it, the coats, the colour - to be aware. Now are you aware of all this if you begin to say 'I don't like that colour', 'I don't like that particular dress, mini or midi or whatever it is'? The moment there is a certain kind of prejudice stepping in you are not aware. Right? I have learnt one thing. This is a process of learning, isn't it? I've learnt that there is no awareness if any form of interference as knowledge, as prejudice, as like and dislike comes in. We are learning not theorizing.

To be aware implies to be conscious without any choice,

without any distortion or prejudice. Are you doing it? I am aware of my conditioning, as a Hindu, Christian, Communist, a hippie, or whatever it is. To be aware of my conditioning without any distortion, without any choice, just to see what that conditioning is.

Questioner: But, Sir, we don't see it.

Krishnamurti: Why don't we - why don't we see our conditioning?

Questioner: Because if we could see it, it would have a hold over us.

Krishnamurti: No Sir, no, no, why don't we see our conditioning as a Christian or whatever it is?

Questioner: It's a protection.

Krishnamurti: Which means what? That you don't want to see that you are conditioned? that if you saw it there might be certain action which might lead to danger? Therefore you don't want to see, therefore you are not aware. Don't let us talk theoretically of being aware which is mere pretension and hypocrisy. I see that in this world there are divisions as Christians, Communists, Socialists, Capitalists, Hindus - division. That division has created such havoc, such misery and as a human being I am part of this. I must be aware of this conditioning, of this division in myself, if I want to understand the structure and the nature of the society in which I live. If there is to be a radical revolution the mind must be free from its conditioning. Why isn't one aware of one's conditioning? Is it danger? Is it fear? Go slowly, is it fear, or is it a great indolence, laziness, indifference, letting things drift? After all we have lived with this confusion, war and misery for so many millennia, what does it matter one more life? Is that it - laziness,

indifference, laissez-aller and fear? Or, is it also the fear of what might happen if I become suddenly aware how silly it all is? Aware that I'm the result of vast propaganda, whether it is the propaganda of the Christians, the Communists or the Hindus; that I'm caught in the trap and I'm too frightened to leave that trap? Which is it, please, not theoretically, actually when you look at yourself, which is it? Why aren't you aware of your conditioning? Is it fear?

Questioner: Fear of being alone.

Krishnamurti: Fear of being alone. Is that the fear?

Questioner: Is it because we imagine there are things coming from outside ourselves?

Krishnamurti: Is it that we imagine that it is outside of ourselves?

Look Madam, you are conditioned aren't you? We are all conditioned terribly by the environment, by the society in which we live, and we are part of that conditioning, part of that society. When we are aware of what is happening in the whole world - the appalling brutality, the violence, the destruction, the misery, don't we feel we have to act? The house is on fire you can't say 'I'm too lazy to put it out. I'm afraid to get burnt'. All that indicates a mind that demands a kind of isolated security. To be aware of all that. Now when one becomes aware of one's conditioning what takes place? I am aware that I am conditioned as a stupid Hindu or a clever Hindu, conditioned as a Hindu through centuries of propaganda and tradition. Now, what takes place when I am aware that I am conditioned? Questioner: You really don't see it.

Krishnamurti: Don't I? I say I am seeing it. Sir, it's so simple. Why do you complicate it?

Questioner: You get out of it.

Krishnamurti: Madam, don't get out of it. We are going to examine, we are going to learn and find out.

Questioner: When you become aware in this sense you have to become involved and when you become involved it's painful, arduous; only a little bit joyful.

Krishnamurti: You are already coming to a conclusion. I don't think it is arduous at all. It is very simple. Please go with me a little, you will see what is involved in it. I become aware of my conditioning as a Catholic, as a Communist. That conditioning has taken place through centuries of propaganda - that there is God or there is no God, that there is a Saviour, that there is no Saviour, you follow? Conditioned according to the culture in which you have lived. I become aware of it, then what takes place?

Questioner: You start seeing your conditioning, you see yourself as a Catholic, you see your limitations.

Krishnamurti: You see that and what takes place?

Questioner: You see it as limited. It's incomplete.

Krishnamurti: That's only a conclusion. What actually takes place?

Questioner: You are free. Krishnamurti: You are not learning from observation. Please, to observe means to learn, doesn't it? To find out, to enquire, to push through, to find out whether the mind can really be free of its conditioning, not to say yes it can be or cannot be, but to find out, to learn. So what takes place when I am aware that I am conditioned as a Hindu? Watch it Sir, find out.

Questioner: There is an emptiness within the mind.

Krishnamurti: There is an emptiness within the mind. Is that so?

I am aware of my conditioning. I am aware that I am a Hindu with all its prejudices, superstitions, with its tradition and all the rest of it. Now, go slowly, who is it that is aware of this conditioning?

Questioner: The conditioning.

Questioner: The conditioned.

Krishnamurti: Don't guess, please.

Questioner: I see the conditioning in my mind.

Krishnamurti: Who is it that sees the conditioning?

Questioner: The 'I'.

Krishnamurti: Who is the 'I'?

Will you allow me to speak just two minutes. I am aware of my conditioning; in that awareness there is a division isn't there? The observer and the observed, the 'I' that observes that he is conditioned. There is a division between the observer and the thing observed. Are you quite sure?

Questioner: Yes. Questioner: No.

Krishnamurti: Learn Sir. Don't say yes, no. Let's find out. Don't come to any conclusion. That prevents you from learning, from observing. I want to see what happens when I become aware that I am conditioned. Do I want to be free of that conditioning? Who is the entity who says that I must be free or the entity that says I must conquer it, I must escape from it, or I'm afraid of it? Who is this entity, who is this censor, the observer that says: this must be, this must not be?

Questioner: The thing created by the conditioning.

Krishnamurti: Created by the conditioning? Who is the censor? Therefore, you see, there is a division between the censor and the thing he condemns or approves. There is a division. Why is there

this division?

Let's leave that for the moment and look at something else. When you look at somebody, a tree, a mountain, the sea, or a face or a person, you look with an image, don't you? The image as knowledge. When you see a tree you say that is a Chestnut and the word itself becomes the barrier of perception.

Questioner: Sir, when you identify it, isn't that the next stage after just seeing a tree?

Krishnamurti: You want to go so fast. Go step by step, please. You look at things with an image, with a conclusion. And what happens? The image looks. There is no looking, but looking through an image. And perception is distorted the moment there is an image. I look at my conditioning and there is a division between the observer and the thing observed. I say to myself why does this division exist at all, because if that division doesn't exist then the whole problem is changed. It's because of that division there is conflict, isn't there? I see I am conditioned, there is a division, then the I, the observer, the censor, the thinker says - I must get rid of it, I'm afraid of it, I must change it, I must suppress it, I must do something about it because he has separated himself from the thing observed. The division brings about conflict.

Are you learning this with me? You are probably not used to this kind of enquiry.

Questioner: Is it the same thing as seeing blind?

Krishnamurti: As seeing?

Questioner: He isn't interpreting anything, he is seeing blind.

Krishnamurti: Not quite Sir. I want to learn about this thing called conditioning. I don't know anything about it. I see I am

conditioned. I want to learn all about it therefore I must observe it. I must be curious about it. I must be passionate about it, otherwise I can't learn. I must have intensity, I must have passion otherwise I can't learn. In observing I see there is a division and I see that division brings about conflict, because if there is only the thing observed without the observer then there is no problem.

Questioner: Does that mean to concentrate on the problem?

Krishnamurti: Who is it that is going to concentrate? Have you tried to concentrate on anything? What is involved in this concentration?

Questioner: The experiencer.

Krishnamurti: Who is the experiencer? Who is the thinker? Is there a thinker apart from thought? Questioner: The thinker is distilled memory.

Krishnamurti: Which means what? Thought - which means there is no thinker if there is no thought. You are not used to this.

Questioner: There is no thinker with no thought, but there is consciousness without thinking.

Krishnamurti: When you say consciousness, is it made up of the content or separate from the content?

Now, I want to learn about this conditioning in which every human being is trapped. To learn I must observe and in observing I see there is a division between the observer and the thing observed. This is really the root of the matter, if you could understand this deeply you will have solved the whole works. I'll show it. You see where there is a division there must be conflict, as an Englishman and a Frenchman, there is conflict. As an Englishman and a German - conflict, you follow? the conflict between the division as

a Catholic and a Protestant, the Baptist and the Arab. As long as there is any kind of division there must be conflict. National division produces inevitably conflict. You have to learn this, you have to see it. The mind that wants to live completely at peace must have no division as the black as the white and all the rest of it.

So, I see the root of all division in human beings is the division in himself as the observer and the observed, we and they, my party and your party, my God, your God and all the rest of it. Can this division disappear altogether? Otherwise we shall live in conflict.

Questioner: There is such fear at the thought of losing our centre, our control.

Krishnamurti: I am coming to that, Madam. You are not doing this, you are not learning, not following this tremendously important thing. Questioner: We must relax and become aware there is nothing to fear.

Krishnamurti: Alright, Sir, fear. Do you want to discuss fear?

Questioner: Let's finish this.

Krishnamurti: If we could understand what is happening in the world, outwardly, which is the constant fragmentation, the businessman and the scientist, the religious man and the layman, the yogi, the guru and the disciple, the teacher and the follower; the division, you understand, the Pope and the poor chap, the rich man - division.

Because this division exists there is bound to be conflict of various kinds. A mind in conflict, whatever it does, must distort. Obviously. I have to learn about it, how to live in this world without conflict, when everything around me is in conflict, when everything sustains this division. How?

This is an imperative necessity, it is not just a theory. As a human being which has evolved through thousands of years, living like a savage, fighting, fighting, fighting, within himself and outside, how can this conflict come to an end? This conflict comes to an end only when there is no division inside myself, because I am part of the society - part of the culture which I have bred. I am the world, the world is not separate from me. I observe this conditioning going on; so I must learn totally about the whole thing. I see this division in myself as the observer and the observed. Why does this division exist? I must learn, find out, enquire why this division in me exists. What is this division? This division is contradiction. Questioner: Is it not the residue of the past?

Krishnamurti: It is, but that doesn't solve the problem. Why is there this contradiction in me and in you, this hypocrisy, why? Contradiction - weekend religion and the rest of the week butcher people. We talk about internationalism and hold on to beastly nationalism. This contradiction; private life and public life. Why this contradiction?

Questioner: We want to be the best, important. Krishnamurti: Is that it? We want to be important?

Questioner: We move away from what we are to what we think we should be.

Krishnamurti: Which means what?

Questioner: That we are in contradiction.

Krishnamurti: Go into it a little deeper. Why is there this contradiction? One of the major reasons for this contradiction is non-acceptance of what is. Which is, I have an ideal of what should

be. That's one factor. The other is, I'm always living in comparison, comparing myself with somebody else or with a principle or with an ideal. This means I never accept the fact of what is. I am angry. Immediately I say I must not be angry. I am jealous, eaten up with ambition and I say no. You follow? Why don't I accept, why don't I see the fact, as it is, and not compare, not say it will be different tomorrow? Look, I see I am jealous, envious, brutal and what happens? The mind, thought says I must suppress it, that it is not right, that I should not be jealous, that jealousy is very painful, leads to hatred and all the misery it involves, I must avoid it, and so there is a duality. Now, can the mind observe jealousy and not get away from it? I am jealous, now what does that mean? What is involved in it? I don't want to suppress it, run away from it or change it. The fact is that I am jealous.

Questioner: If you see this then you have to be as jealous as you are.

Krishnamurti: Madam, please observe simple things. You are jealous aren't you? You know what that means jolly well, don't you? Most people do unfortunately. This is not to have a reaction about it - but observe it.

Questioner: As soon as you start observing you are separated from it.

Krishnamurti: When you are observing, when you are giving attention to the thing you are observing, is there a duality? You don't do these things, you are just playing with it. Look Sirs, have you ever given attention to something completely? Do you know what it means to give attention?

Questioner: In this case there is none.

Krishnamurti: Have you done it, Sir?

Questioner: I have tried.

Krishnamurti: You can try. Have you ever given attention completely, totally to something? Are you giving attention completely now, to what is being said? Are you? Obviously not. To give attention means to give your mind, your heart, your whole being to find out, not from books and somebody else, but to find out for yourself. Because you see, unless this takes place, unless the mind is completely free of all distortion which is all form of effort, what is truth can never be found out. And a man who lives superficially cannot possibly live fully. When one is aware there is this duality one asks why this duality exists. This duality exists because we have ideals, we have formulas, principles, according to which we live and therefore we never observe actually what is. Then what takes place? Am I explaining myself? Personally I have no ideals - they are too silly no beliefs, no conclusions, only actually what is. That way you avoid all hypocrisy. Then what takes place? I see actually I am angry. Then what takes place? You see one of the difficulties is, we think that it is not possible to change human beings. We have come to the conclusion that it is not possible, human beings cannot be changed I cannot change myself. You understand? Don't you say that? Is it possible to change what is? I've come to the point when I see actually that I'm not moving away from what is, neither verbally nor intellectually nor in any ideological sense. I remain actually with what is. Then what takes place?

Questioner: I disappear.

Questioner: Then I am the present.

Krishnamurti: No, no. When you say I am - who is the I? You are that anger, you are that jealousy, you are that brutality, that violence. Then what happens?

Questioner: It changes.

Questioner: The confusion goes away.

Krishnamurti: What takes place when you don't move away in any direction from what is, it doesn't matter what it is?

Questioner: You become the observer.

Questioner: No reaction.

Krishnamurti: No Sirs, watch it.

Let me approach it differently. I have never looked at my conditioning. I've accepted it. I have lived with it. I've been a Hindu for 80 years or 10 years and I have lived with it. You come along and point out to me that I am conditioned and I begin to realize the implications of that conditioning; what it does, how it destroys, how it separates. In observing, the mind has become sensitive, hasn't it? The mind has become sensitive which means intelligent; observing not from books, not from Freud or this and that but by merely observing itself in relation with the world it has become extraordinarily sensitive. Right? The mind through observation becomes intelligent and therefore extraordinarily sensitive, doesn't it? That sensitivity and that intelligence is not personal; intelligence is never personal, it's not my intelligence. I don't know if you are following. The moment it is personal, limited, it ceases to be intelligent; therefore, the mind through observing all its conditioning has learnt the implications of that conditioning, has remained with what is, not tried to run away from it or to suppress it, but it has remained with it and wants to find out

what takes place next. It can only find out if the mind is extraordinarily alert and sensitive, otherwise it comes to another conclusion.

Look, Sirs, what is happening in the world? There is a revolt against the establishment; perhaps a little in this country, tremendous in America and in certain parts of Europe and very little in India. Who are the people who are in revolt against, who want to alter the structure of society? They, if you talk to them, are as confused as the people who are caught in the establishment. Out of their confusion of which they are unaware they are going to create a new society. So, confusion is going to breed more confusion. When there is an awareness of this confusion and there is light, then the creative activity of an enlightened mind is entirely different from the action of revolt.

So, we come back. Can the mind remain without distortion with what is? Do you understand the implications of that - to observe without the word. The word is not the thing. The description is not the described. Can the mind look at what is without the word; jealousy, anger? The word is the thought. This isn't an entertainment. This is tremendous work. The word is the thought. Right?

Questioner: We can't feel it.

Krishnamurti: What is feeling it?

Questioner: Being aware.

Krishnamurti: Are you aware with feeling? You are aware with your mind, with your heart. You are aware. You don't say I am aware with my feeling, or aware with my intellect. That's only another division. You're aware totally.

If you want to learn, look. Can you look at what is without the word? Can you look at jealousy without the word jealousy? You understand?

The word is anchored in the past. The word is the past and the word prevents you from looking at what is. So can the mind look at what is without the word and therefore not calling it jealousy at all?

The moment you say 'I'm going to remain with what is', which is jealousy, then you have identified the thing that is happening with the past. Therefore, it is not new. Therefore, your mind always lives in the past. Can you look at what is without the word? If you can look without the word, the word being the thought, thought being the response of memory which is the past, then you look without the past. Then what happens?

Questioner: You are seeing. Krishnamurti: You are just guessing, for the love of Pete!

Questioner: It really is what is.

Krishnamurti: Look carefully, Sir, please do observe it. I have looked at what is with the word - jealousy - jealousy is a word of association with the past. That's simple. So I am looking at what is with the eyes of the past.

Questioner: Now - what's now?

Krishnamurti: The now is only possible when you can look without the word - without the past. I am greedy. That's a fact. Can I look at that fact without the word, without the word greedy, because the word greedy has innumerable associations, of virtue, of non-virtue, it should or should not be. The word with its associations is rooted in the past. When I say I'm greedy I am really looking at something which is new with the eyes of the old. Can I

look without the eyes of the past, without the word? You do it. You will see what takes place.

To put it round the other way, can you look at your wife or husband or your friend without the image you have built through thirty years or ten days about that person? Can you look without the image? You can't can you - why not? I have lived with my wife for thirty years, she has nagged me, bullied me, I have dominated her and we have built images about each other in our relationship. Can I look at her or him without an image? Then what is my relationship with my wife? Is it a relationship between two images which we call love, relationship? The image is the past and that image has been built through constant repetition - adding, adding - you know what takes place. That relationship, the image, is always based on the past therefore it is not a relationship at all.

Therefore, I see now that what is, can be understood only when one can look without the image, without the word, without the symbol. Then the mind meets the new with a freshness. The feeling of greed which arises is new but the thought says that it is greedy. The word establishes it in the past. Therefore I say I cannot do anything about greed. I say I can only suppress it, fight it and so on, but, when the mind can look at that greed without the word then the mind is a fresh mind, then it can deal with whatever there is.

I'll put the problem differently. There is a challenge in this world that there must be a different order of things because there is tremendous social injustice, there is brutality, such appalling violence. That's the challenge. You have to meet it. Challenges are always new. Obviously, otherwise it's not challenge; but, the mind

meets it with the old mind. So the response to the challenge is inadequate and therefore there is conflict. Whereas if the mind can look at the challenge without the response of the past there is a totally different kind of action.

Questioner: Isn't it making a problem when I say I have to look at something as it is now?

Krishnamurti: There is no problem if you are learning. There is no problem at all if the mind is in the act of learning. If I am learning about violence it's not a problem, but if I come to it with a decision that there must be no violence, or violence is justified, that brings a problem. But if I see human minds are violent - and I see human beings are violent, aggressive - I want to learn, I don't make a problem of it.

Questioner: What is a problem?

Krishnamurti: A thing that you cannot solve. You carry it over the next day, you carry the burden with you. Whereas, if you say I will learn what is involved, learning simply means to observe. Observation is not possible when there is any form of distortion. Follow it, Sir.

Distortion exists when there is a division between the observer and the observed. I must understand why this division arises. This division arises because of ideals, principles, ideas, conclusions - this should be, this should not be.

And so the mind which began out of confusion now becomes clear. It is learning, not following anybody, it is learning through observation. The mind becomes highly sensitive which means the body also becomes sensitive. The human mind is so heavily conditioned: believing in God, or, like the Communists, not

believing in God; it is the same, because they are both conditioned through propaganda. One says, don't talk such nonsense, there is no such thing as God and the other says, there is God.... believe, believe, beat the drum until you are deaf. And one or the other you accept. Now, to be aware of all that and to find out if there is such a thing as God, some reality, or if there is not, to find out, to learn, the mind must be totally free from all belief - which means the mind must be entirely free from all fear. Is it possible for a human mind which has lived on fear, to be free of fear, completely, not only at the conscious level but at the deeper level? Questioner: Could we consider the things you say in a radically different context, such as in adversity?

Krishnamurti: You are saying, here we are and for an hour we have talked, we have understood somewhat, we go outside and in 10 minutes we forget all about it and we are again caught in the trap. Is that it? What is one to do? What is the response? You listened here for an hour. Have you listened to the speaker or have you listened to yourself, to what is going on in yourself? Which is it? Have you listened to the speaker or have you listened to your own mutterings, to your own processes? Have you looked at the activity of yourself, or have you been forced to look, by the speaker, at the activity?

Questioner: It is the activity - but I have tried to participate in it.

Krishnamurti: Is the activity your own or imposed by another? Is the speaker imposing these things or are you watching your own activity? If you are watching your own activity when you go outside you will still be watching it, you will still be learning about it. But if you say: I've only been forced to listen to that speaker for

an hour, then it is not yours, then you are caught in the trap. If it is yours, not another's, then you cannot lose it, you become a light to yourself and not the light of somebody else.

TALKS AND DIALOGUES SYDNEY 1970 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 19TH NOVEMBER, 1970

WHAT SHALL WE talk over this morning together?

Questioner: I would like to talk about education, not education only for the young but for the old as well; and, about religion, not my religion or their religion but religion, God, the truth, and about the dignity of man, to be one with life, all life.

Krishnamurti: The questioner would like to talk over education, not only of the young but of the older generation, and also religion, not the organized religion, and so on. Is that what we all want to discuss?

Questioner: Could we bring self-knowledge into that?

Krishnamurti: I think we can begin with what is self-knowledge and go into this question of religion and education and so on. Would that be all right?

Questioner: Yes. Krishnamurti: You know, I believe the Greeks started, and before them the Asiatics, to find out what is knowledge and what is the self. When we are considering knowledge, what do we mean by that word to 'know'? To know implies a time sequence; that is, all knowledge is always in the past. You can add to it or take away from it but knowledge is in the field of the past. When I say 'I know you', I know you because I met you yesterday, so I have an image of you and that image is the past. And I meet you with that image today. I say I know you, but you might have changed, and I come to see you with the image of the past, so, I really don't meet you at all. Knowledge is, in a certain direction, absolutely necessary, as in the scientific technological field but

knowledge becomes a hindrance in relationship.

This is not a talk by me but a discussion where we are talking over together, so if we don't understand each other, let us interrupt and discuss, talk over together. When we say self-knowledge, is it that we understand something which we call the self - a self which is the permanent - or is it learning about the movement of the self? There are two things involved in this. One, to study something that is there, like the microphone; I can study it, I can learn about it and it is there. Now, is the self there, or is it a movement, is it a thing that is constantly in motion, therefore nothing permanent? One has to find out, is the self something that endures, that is permanent or is it something that is constantly in motion, constantly changing. So when we say self-knowledge, is it the knowledge of the self, which is the permanent, or the understanding of what the self is? I don't know if I am making the question clear. I don't know which it is to you. Is the self something static, permanent, enduring or is it something that has to be understood?

Questioner: What do you mean by self?

Krishnamurti: We are going to find out, not what I mean, we are going to find out together. You know, as we said yesterday, communication implies understanding together, learning together, sharing together, otherwise there is no communication. The very word in itself means that: to communicate, to look at something together, learn together, create together. It's not that I communicate something which I have to you, or you have to me. Together we are learning. That is what is implied in the very word to communicate. So, it is not what I mean, but let us find out together what we mean by the self.

What is the self? The self-centred activity, the self that is always asserting, the self that demands fulfilment, the self that perpetuates itself through identification, the self that is constantly in action and creating its own centre and therefore isolating itself. What is this self? When you say I, me, what is that 'me', the 'I'? Is it according to the Christians - the soul; according to the Hindus - the atman, and so on? When we talk about the self what do we mean by that word, the 'me'?

Questioner: Where do we actually look to find out? What do we watch to find out?

Krishnamurti: What is it that we watch, examine, to find out the truth of that word 'self'? Is that it? We can look that word up in the dictionary and there is a definition. We know the word is not the thing, the description is not the described. To find out what the self is one has to watch its activity, actually its action, in relationship, otherwise you cannot examine it. Living is relationship, otherwise there is no living. You can live in isolation but that isolation brings about constant conflict in relationship. One can find out what the self is only in relationship. We are doing it together, it's no fun if I do all the work and you just listen. So, what is relationship? What does it mean to be related?

Questioner: To be in communication with other people and the environment.

Krishnamurti: To be in communication with other people and with the environment: to be in contact, to be related, to respond to any kind of challenge, is part of relationship also.

Questioner: Involvement?

Krishnamurti: Involvement implies a different thing. Let us go

slowly. What is relationship? I am related to my wife, to my husband, to my family. There is a relationship, that is, I am in contact not only physically but also psychologically.

Questioner: Does relationship imply understanding?

Krishnamurti: Not yet, surely. Let us think together, not you think something and I think something, let's together walk; don't go ahead or behind me, but together walk and find out.

I'm related to my wife and my children and my neighbour, to the environment. Relationship means contact, being together. Am I related in contact? Apart from physical contact with my wife, with my husband, with my children, am I related? Are you? Contact, you understand what I mean?

Questioner: On rare occasions.

Krishnamurti: On rare occasions. Then you are not related to your wife or children or neighbours except on rare occasions. Is that so?

Questioner: Not always, sometimes it's bad and sometimes good.

Krishnamurti: We are not evaluating the bad and the good in relationship. We are asking if we are directly in contact not only physically but psychologically with the family, with the wife...

Questioner: We don't seem to be sensitive. We don't seem to get into their skin and feel what they feel.

Krishnamurti: Madam, let's be simple about all this. I am married - I'm not, thank the Lord - I'm married and I am supposed to be in relationship with my wife. Apart from the physical contact, sexual and so on, what is my relationship with her?

Questioner: Is it a question of attitudes?

Krishnamurti: We are not talking about attitudes. We haven't come to that yet, Madam. We are trying to find out what is relationship.

Questioner: We are related to everyone and everything simply by being among these things.

Krishnamurti: I am married. Am I related to my wife? Apart from the physical contact is there any relationship at all? Don't assert, don't say yes or no, find out.

Questioner: Is it a series of habits?

Questioner: Isn't the relationship just conditioning?

Krishnamurti: I go to the office, I am ambitious, competitive, and worshipping success. And my wife also pursues her own ambitions, her own greeds and all the rest of it. We may meet physically but psychologically we are isolated, aren't we? Except when I say: I love you. Then, what is the relationship, the actuality, not what you think it should be? The actual. Then we can do something about it. If you theorize then you will be lost. Look what happens. I have lived with my wife for twenty years or ten days. During that time I have built an image about her. She has responded in a certain way, nagged me, got angry, this or that and I have built an image about her and she has built an image about me.

These two images have relationship; not me and her, but the images.

Questioner: I don't know, because I don't know, myself

Krishnamurti: But, the fact is you have an image, isn't that so? Is not that image the `me'?

Questioner: It must be.

Krishnamurti: We are asking; please don't say should or should

not. I have an image about her and I have an image about myself.

Questioner: Is the image necessarily entirely wrong?

Krishnamurti: I don't say it is right or wrong. It is a fact.

Questioner: Is it incorrect?

Krishnamurti: I won't say it is incorrect or say it is right or wrong, good or beautiful. The fact is I have an image which I have built about myself, and she has built an image about herself. This image is the me; identified with the furniture, with the house, with various memories, experiences. And she does the same.

Questioner: Are you forgetting affinity? Krishnamurti: Affinity, love, tenderness, goodness, that is the outcome of this interaction between the two images. We don't go step by step taking facts as they are, so that we can then move further. If we refuse to face the fact then we wander off into a kind of abstraction.

Questioner: Isn't this on the personality level, whereas we can look at ourselves in terms of the higher self and the lower self?

Krishnamurti: Wait a minute, the higher self and the lower self the soul and the body, the atman, you know, the supreme and me, we'll come to that.

The `me' is a bundle of images, memories, which has been built through centuries. The `me'. The father says the `me'. The mother says the `me'. And the child also says the 'me'.

The `me' is a bundle of memories; the memories which respond to any challenge. The `me' is a bundle of memories from which thought responds, thought reacts. The reaction to that memory is thought. Right? Is that simple or not? I have memory, a bundle of memories as a Hindu, a Catholic, a Communist. Those memories have been built from childhood through tradition, through family

and so that response is thought. When we say 'self-knowledge' there is the learning about what the self is, how it has come into being, knowing the self, knowing oneself.

Questioner: Does the self perpetuate itself?

Krishnamurti: Does the self perpetuate? The self perpetuates through identification, doesn't it? My son, my wife, my house, my furniture.

Questioner: My troubles. Krishnamurti: My troubles, my anxieties, me, and all the rest of it. The identification with something perpetuates the 'me'. I identify myself with the furniture; because my furniture is very old, 14th century, I love it, I keep it very carefully, polish it, look after it, I value it because one day I will sell it and I will get lots of money. So, the furniture has become more important than the 'me'. Right? See the tricks which we are playing on ourselves and each other. Through identification with that, that becomes important, not the 'me' which identifies itself. I identify myself with my country, with my nationality, with my God. The country, the nationality, the God becomes all important. We never enquire why this identification takes place. Why do I want to identify? I am asking the question - you have to ask the question.

Questioner: Does this mean then that the search for truth equates with a constant review of the images? Krishnamurti: Obviously.

Questioner: We identify because we are afraid to look at that which we are, we feel safe in possessions.

Krishnamurti: We are learning about ourselves aren't we? Are you learning about yourself as you are talking, watching yourself,

watching how you respond, how you identify, why there is this division between me and you, we and they, why all this battle all through life?

Questioner: If we didn't have images there'd be no self.

Krishnamurti: No, Madam, it really isn't a question of not having an image. This is what is going on in our life, isn't it? Why does this happen, who is responsible for this? Questioner: What gives life to the image?

Krishnamurti: What do you think?

Questioner: It's all a process of the me, a device whereby if we have a success, we want to repeat it.

Krishnamurti: So, Sir, I want to understand myself. I don't know what I am; I really don't know. I must find out. I must learn. I must learn about myself not according to what others say, the experts, the psychologists, the analysts, the Freudians, the Jungians, all the rest of them. I must learn about myself, and not according to somebody else. Do please see the importance of that. Not according to the professionals; they may be wrong or they may be right. I am not concerned with them. I am concerned to learn about myself. To learn means I must observe, I must not come to it with any conclusion, with any prejudice, with any kind of hope. I must learn, find out what it is. Will you do that? Or, you have read what the self is. You are going to learn what the self is. I don't know. People have said so many things about it. I discard everything the others have said. Will you do that? Discard completely what others have said.

Questioner: Is it possible to discard what we have heard, when we have listened and found out?

Krishnamurti: I am not interested at all what others have said. I have never read books on what the others have said, fortunately. I want to find out, so I look, I observe, I can observe that only in relationship; how I react, anger, jealousy, hate, envy, violence, domination, suppression; you know, the whole movement, I watch. So, it is important to find out how I watch, not what I watch. The manner of watching, the art of observing is much more important than the thing you observe. The art of seeing is much more important than that which you look at. Now, how do you look? Please apply yourselves, don't just listen to what the speaker is saying. Find out how you look.

Questioner: Be open to what you see.

Krishnamurti: No, Sir, how do you look? Let's begin very simply. How do you look at a tree? Have you looked at a tree? You have, haven't you? How do you look at a tree?

Questioner: I am the tree without thinking. I don't think: isn't that beautiful. It just is.

Krishnamurti: Just find out. How do you observe a tree? Do you look at it with the word? Do you look at the tree with the word, that it is an oak tree, a eucalyptus tree, that it's beautiful?

Watch it. Go slowly. probably you are not interested in a tree. If you are interested you look at it with botanical knowledge, don't you?

Questioner: No, for enjoyment.

Krishnamurti: Wait Sir, go slow. We are coming to something much more complicated - you will see presently how complex it becomes. The tree doesn't affect you. Psychologically it doesn't touch you. You can observe it casually. You can observe it without

the word, without botanical knowledge, you can look at it without thought.

Questioner: I can't. When I look at a tree, I am part of that tree, because to me it is something alive and it is something that I am part of
Krishnamurti: You say you are part of that tree. Do you know what that means? What does that mean?

Questioner: How can I describe that which is a state of being wondrous?

Krishnamurti: I will show you. We will share together. When you look at something, at a tree or a cloud, a mountain or water, you look at it with space, space between you and it. There is not only physical space but space divided by thought. That tree is in my garden. There is this division. Can you look at that tree without that division? This doesn't mean you identify yourself with the tree, you don't become the tree. You observe it and in that observation if there is no space between the observer and the observed it is not identification but a totally different kind of relationship. You do it sometime. To look at an object, it doesn't matter what it is, without the intervening space then there is a direct contact. You can do that with a tree fairly easily. But, to do it with your husband, with your friend, with your wife then it becomes very difficult. Can you look at your wife, husband, neighbour, your politicians; can you look with eyes that have not this intervening space as created by the image? Can you look at yourself without condemning or justifying? The justification and condemnation is the censor. The censor is the conditioned entity. The conditioned entity is the 'me', the 'me' that says I must be more successful, the 'me' that says I must have more pleasure. So can you look at yourself without any

distraction of thought? Are you following all of this? Have you done it?

Questioner: It is something quite new.

Krishnamurti: It is not a question of something new, Madam, but to do it. Questioner: I mean it is new in the doing.

Krishnamurti: There is nothing new in doing. Doing is action, not you think out and then act.

Questioner: Is this the case when someone is totally absorbed in something?

Krishnamurti: What does that mean? A child is absorbed in a toy, totally absorbed, if you give him a new toy he plays with it for the rest of the day and there is no mischief. He is completely absorbed in it till the toy breaks and he becomes mischievous or whatever he does. Most of us do the same, we want to be absorbed in something whether the absorption is in the country, in an idea, in a belief, in a series of actions; which is commitment; to be absorbed as the religious person is supposed to be when he is absorbed in the idea of Jesus, Saviour, Christ, God. He is absorbed but he doesn't know anything about himself, and that is a very easy trick, to be absorbed in something so as to forget yourself.

Questioner: Isn't that good to forget yourself?

Krishnamurti: Can you forget yourself, though you have identified yourself with something? That very identification is the continuance of the self. I identify myself with India. Myself has become the idea of India. And if you say anything about India I get hurt; as long as you flatter it I am pleased. I identify myself with a belief and I will fight to the death any attempt to destroy that identification, because the moment I don't identify with something

I am forced to look at myself. I don't want to look at myself because I am frightened to look at myself. Questioner: I meant by absorption, not to have thought coming in when I look at a tree.

Krishnamurti: You see, Sir, a whole question is involved in that. When the observer separates himself from the thing observed that division brings conflict. People have tried centuries ago taking drugs, a form of drug that destroys the time and the distance - space - so that there is immediate perception. Now they are taking LSD and various forms of psychedelic drugs. You know all about it? You do? You read about it? I am glad! I haven't touched it because it's not necessary. We have discussed this question with a great many people who have taken it; doctors, psychologists, prominent ones, not crazy ones. What happens in that, is that a chemical change takes place in the whole organism, that makes for clarity. I see things, then, very clearly. Every colour becomes extraordinarily clear. The ordinary leaf that I look at as I pass by becomes a leaf with such colour, such potency, such beauty, such vitality, and that's tremendously absorbing because the division between the observer and the observed disappears. You are directly in contact. That same thing can happen but with much greater reality when you understand this whole process of building images.

Self-knowledge is necessary because without understanding the whole movement of thought with all its reason, fallacy, deception; without understanding it, how it is constructed, what is its nature, we cannot go very far. So it is absolutely necessary, if you are really serious to find out. Thought is the response of memory. Obviously, if you had no memory at all you wouldn't be able to think.

Questioner: Could you think without memory?

Krishnamurti: You cannot Sir. Amnesia. You couldn't go home if you didn't think, if you had no memory. You would just be wandering about.

Questioner: If you say one plus one equals two, which is a thought, you have still got to remember the one to put the other one to it.

Krishnamurti: Sir, thought is the response of memory. Thought is never new. So, thought is never free, obviously. And every challenge is new, and thought responds to the challenge and thought is old. Therefore there is inadequacy between the response and the challenge, therefore conflict.

Questioner: Can there be consciousness without thought?

Krishnamurti: What is consciousness? Is it made up of the content or is it independent of the content? My consciousness, your consciousness: is it the content, the thoughts, the anxieties, the miseries, the suffering, the ambition, the violence, that makes up consciousness or is consciousness empty of all that? The content makes the consciousness, obviously. Let's leave that for now.

Thought is the response of memory. And thought is always old. It is a hard pill to swallow, because we think thought can solve all our problems. It can't. If you go into it I will show you something.

Thought being old cannot respond to the new, and life is new. All this which is happening around us is totally new, and thought is always responding in terms of the past. Look Sir, revolution is necessary. Not physical revolution, because that doesn't solve anything. Physical revolution brings about dictatorship, bureaucratic tyranny or the tyranny of the few. Psychological

revolution is absolutely necessary, because we have to change, we have to bring about a totally different way of living. And thought says I'll find out, how to live differently. Thought, which is old, which is memory, which is the result of experience, knowledge, which is the past; thought, the past tries to understand the present. The past tries to solve all these problems and has never succeeded. Go into this seriously to find out how to act, without the past. Scientifically, objectively, technologically, I must have knowledge to function; to go to the moon requires tremendous scientific knowledge. The mind also sees that to act when there is challenge, thought must be quiet. Otherwise it cannot respond completely to the challenge. So that is the problem: to push it ultimately. I hope you are following all this. It's up to you. That's our crisis.

The intellectuals throughout the world are responding to the crisis in terms of the old, in terms of thought, and their answers must inevitably be coloured by the past, however intellectual they are. And so-called religious people are also like that.

One has to find a way of acting which at the same time demands absolute objective, rational, sane, technological action in one direction, and, in the other, for the mind to function without the impediment of thought.

You don't know the beauty of all this. So the question then is - and now we are coming to quite a different problem - what is meditation? Are you interested in all this? It is deadly serious.

Questioner: I'd like you to go back to thought as being a barrier.

Krishnamurti: Right. Memory is in the very cells of the brain. You can watch it in yourself. Memory remains in the brain. It is part of the brain cells. The brain cells can function only in

complete security. Where there is insecurity there is distortion, neurosis. So the brain demands that it functions all the time in complete security. That is why you have invented all the modern culture. You follow? Wars, battleships, to be safe, and that very desire for safety is destroying safety; nationality, division, each country having its own army, all the rest of it. The brain cells themselves are the residue of memory. And memory is necessary otherwise you can't get home, drive a car, you can't speak. But, that very memory becomes an impediment to acting completely in the present. Action implies the doing now, not tomorrow or yesterday. But when action is shaped by thought, by the past, then action becomes incomplete and therefore it has to be repeated over and over again. Therefore, incompleteness continues. Can that brain function at its highest level technologically, objectively, sanely, and at the same time can that brain function without all the impediment of the past, which is the psyche, which is the me?

This is where the so-called meditation comes in. You know this word is a dangerous word. From India a great many people have come to this country and other parts of the world talking and teaching meditation, which is all tricks. Meditation is something entirely different, a quality of mind that sees the whole totality of life, not fragments of life, the whole totality. There is no division between the artist and the business man, between the politician and the crook - probably they are the same! So you see this, a complete understanding of life.

Can the brain be completely still? I won't go into all that because you have never gone into this question at all and probably you don't know what it implies. Let's stick to something we can

actually do. Which is, can you be free of your image? You can only be free of your image if you understand what the machinery is that builds the image. Now, what is the machinery that builds images?

Questioner: Thought? Memory? Krishnamurti: Thought, memory; how does that operate? Let's be simple. You tell me what a marvellous person I am. I like it. I have already built an image and you are my friend. You say something which I don't like, I have formed another image. So, the image pattern is built through pleasure and pain; of liking you because you say something pleasant and of not liking you because you are not nice to me, which is based on the pleasure principle. Watch it in yourself. I have built an image because you have said something pleasurable or not pleasurable. I carry that image when I meet you next. I am that image. Next time I meet you, you are my friend and so on. Can this machinery stop? That is, when you insult me, to be completely attentive at that moment, attentive in the sense that I listen to you totally, without any reaction, neither accepting nor rejecting your insult, just listening completely, which means complete attention. And the same when you flatter me, to listen so fully that nothing leaves a mark on the mind, so that the machinery that builds the image has no vitality, no juice. The mind listening to the insult and to the flattery doesn't leave a mark, therefore no image, and therefore it is a mind that is so sensitive, alert, watchful that the me doesn't exist, because the me is the image.

Questioner: We have used the word conflict. Does this necessarily mean a negative state or can it be a positive one?

Krishnamurti: Can conflict be positive or negative?

I don't quite understand what those two words mean; but conflict means conflict. Don't you have conflicts, hundreds of them? Have you ever gone into this question of conflict? And why it exists in human beings? Why does it exist? In the office, at home, when you are playing golf, when you are doing anything there is this battle going on, and from that battle, neurosis; you know, the whole pattern of modern existence; quarrels between husband and wife, the constant striving, struggling, conflict, battle - why? First of all, one has accepted it as a natural thing. You have lived with it for so long that you have accepted it. You don't say to yourself I must find out, why? Why should I live this way? I will show you why you do it, the mechanism of it. Please bear in mind, the description is not the described. The word is not the thing. Therefore, when we talk about it you are watching yourself not listening to the speaker. Conflict exists because there is duality. That is simple isn't it? Duality is contradiction. I must be. I must not be. Conflict exists because you have an ideal, the possibility of what you will be and the fear of what you might be. Conflict exists because of contradiction, ideals, conformity, obedience, the desire to be something better, comparative. We are always comparing with somebody who has a bigger car, bigger house, better jewels. All our life is comparing. So there it is: comparison, ideals, principles, formulas. All these create a duality. So you never see actually what is. I see I am stupid, I don't say I must become clever. Through comparison I have found I am stupid and then I struggle not to be stupid. Am I stupid if there is no comparison at all? I am what I am. I don't call it stupid. I don't call it clever, or beautiful, or ugly. It is there. Then I can do something about it.

Then I can go beyond it. I cannot go beyond it if I am trying to become clever.

But once the mind is free from all comparison, which means imitation, conformity, obedience to a principle, to an idea and so on, then the mind observes actually what is. To observe actually what is... am I looking at it through a word? Am I looking at myself with the image which the word has created, that I am dull? Am I looking at myself with a series of associations, a series of words, a series of conclusions, or am I looking at myself without any of these? All this demands tremendous attention which is discipline. The word discipline means to learn, not to conform, not to obey, not to imitate. Discipline, the word in Latin means: to learn. Therefore, the mind that is learning has no imposed discipline. It has order, not conformity. Learning becomes all important to a mind that is enquiring into this whole question of relationship between human beings. The relationship between human beings is society. That relationship between human beings has created the structure which we call society, with its Gods, with its laws, with its ambitions and all the rest of it. Society is the me. I am the society. To change society I must change myself. And we don't want to do that. We will do anything to alter the structure of society and we hope thereby we shall be happy. We shan't. The Communists have tried it. They have said environment is all important, give the right environment and you'll produce the right monkey. They haven't done it, on the contrary. The religious people have also played with this. To bring about a radical revolution we must begin here, not out there, because out there is here.

Are there any more questions or shall we stop?

Questioner: Are impulsive feelings a direct response to living?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by impulsive? You mean spontaneous? Are we ever spontaneous or are we always responding to our conditioning, though we may call it spontaneity? The other day I met somebody who came to see me, and that person said: I am free at last, I have gone into this question of freedom greatly, studied it, and I am free, and therefore I have become a Catholic. (Laughter) No. You may laugh, but that person was very serious and he is spreading what he thinks is truth. He thinks that it is spontaneous because he is free. So to understand what is freedom, and therefore action in freedom, one has to go into this question of the conditioning of the mind, the whole conditioned mind, how the mind is conditioned by propaganda of ten thousand years: the religious, the political, the propaganda of the family. we are slaves to propaganda. Can the mind observe all this propaganda and be free of it? Then only, can you talk about freedom in action.

Questioner: Listening is the hardest thing, I've found.

Krishnamurti: I wonder why. Do you ever listen? Or do you listen partially? There are two things involved aren't there? There is hearing and listening. When you hear you either agree or disagree, you say - I agree with him, because I like it or I don't like it, he is convincing or he is not convincing. But when you are actually listening, that means giving your complete attention, what takes place? What takes place when you are giving your whole attention, attention being your mind, your heart, your nerves, your body, everything... listening? Your mind is completely quiet isn't it? Not

arguing, agreeing, disagreeing, opposing or forming any opinion. It is an act of complete listening. In that act of listening there is actual communion, isn't there? Communion, in the sense of complete relationship. There is no misunderstanding. And we never do this. We never give our whole attention to anything. We only have learnt what it is to concentrate. To concentrate means exclusion. Therefore, concentration is not attention. In attention there are no borders.

**TALKS AND DIALOGUES SYDNEY,
AUSTRALIA A.B.C. TELEVISION INTERVIEW
20TH NOVEMBER, 1970**

THE INTERVIEW BEGAN with the reading of a passage from a Krishnamurti publication, 'The Penguin Reader'.

Interviewer: 'Our problem then, as I see it, is that we are bound, weighed down by belief, by knowledge. And is it possible for a mind to be free from yesterday and from the beliefs that have been acquired through the process of yesterday? Is it possible for me, as an individual, and you as an individual to live in this society and yet be free from the belief in which we have been brought up? Is it possible for the mind to be free from all that knowledge, all that authority?'

Krishnamurti: Are you saying here that it is wrong to believe in what you have found to be true? Krishnamurti: Sir, is belief necessary at all? Why do we have beliefs? Probably you believe in something because you don't actually see what is. If you see actually what is - what is, in the sense, what is actually going on, both outwardly in the outward phenomenon and inwardly - then what is the necessity for a belief at all? You don't believe the sun is rising. It is there, you have seen it. The whole problem of beliefs seems to be so utterly erroneous. It has no place for a person who is actually observing the whole structure and the nature of thinking, living, suffering, the agony of existence, the sorrow and all the rest of it. Belief appears as a means of escape from the reality of what is. To understand what is, one has to be rid of all these extraneous beliefs and fears and hopes, and be able to look actually, not

theoretically, not abstractly, but actually to look at what is taking place: first in the world outside with all the racial conflicts, with wars, the division between religions, the Catholic and Protestant, the Hindu, the Moslem, all the divisions that have created such havoc in the world. And by observing all that one sees actually how this has come about; because, in oneself, one is conditioned by society, by the culture one lives in. If you live in India you become a Hindu or a Moslem, if you live in Europe you're a Catholic or a Protestant.

It's the environment that conditions, the culture that shapes the mind; the culture being the knowledge, the tradition, the various beliefs. And surely a mind that is conditioned as a Communist or as a Catholic, as a Hindu or what you will, is incapable of being free to observe. The mind must be free to observe the extraordinarily complex structure of society and also the still more complex psychological structure of oneself; because oneself is the world. We have created the world, and the world is me and you. We cannot separate the two, and so, to understand the world one has to understand oneself. To change the social structure which obviously needs colossal change, one has to change oneself because one is part of this society.

The change must begin with the human being, not with the outward structure. The human being is confused, the human being is conditioned. He believes, and therefore there is a contradiction in himself. He is really, deeply confused and if he wants to change the social structure, the change from confusion only breeds more confusion. Whereas, if he could bring about clarity within himself, and from that clarity act, then such an action is really a deep

psychological revolution. That revolution is absolutely necessary.
Interviewer: This means, doesn't it, a completely different view of education? For, after all, education is implanting belief.

Krishnamurti: Obviously. Education as it now is, is really the cultivation of a corner of a vast field. We are concerned with that little corner, with its technological knowledge, conditioning the mind with information and neglecting the whole field; and therefore there is an imbalance. Technologically we have gone very far, and psychologically we are very primitive. We are still at the stage of tribal conflict with our beliefs, with our gods, our separate nationalities, and armies and all the rest of it, which is really a continuation of the tribal existence. Apparently we don't see in education that it's immensely important to cultivate, to understand the whole field and not just one corner of it.

Interviewer: The other thing about this, Krishnamurti, is how can an individual who is part of the system get outside the system in order to observe it and himself?

Krishnamurti: You know, Sir, the word 'individuality', the individual, means indivisible, an entity who is in himself indivisible; which means non-contradictory in himself. But the individual human being is contradictory in himself, he is not an individual, he is broken up, he is fragmented. And being contradictory, being divided in himself, his activity, his social structure, his morality, is obviously fragmentary, contradictory. Therefore he becomes a hypocrite.

So, the problem is how to change the individual? Can the human being, who is part of this vast structure, which he himself has created, can that human being radically, psychologically

change? Not change the society; the society is the relationship between individuals. Can the human mind, which is so conditioned after so many centuries, can it uncondition itself completely? Be free from being a Catholic, a Hindu, a Communist, a Socialist, and see that he is part of this human structure, part of the world, and not the Catholic world or the Communist world.

Interviewer: How can we do this, If we can see this, how can we do it?

Krishnamurti: That's the problem. How can one see? First of all one has to be aware of what is going on both outwardly and inwardly; aware, not theoretically, not intellectually, or aware according to some philosopher or psychologist; then he is aware according to their ideas, to their conditioning. One has to be aware of what he is, actually: his problems, his misery, his sufferings, his extraordinary sense of brutality, and violence: to be aware of all that; and from that awareness comes clarity. That means he must be tremendously interested in life, not in some awful, absurd theories; whether it be the theory of the Catholics or the Hindus.

Interviewer: Well then, how do you get people to be aware in your sense?

Krishnamurti: I don't think you can get people to be aware. If they are interested they will be. But if you force them to be interested, through propaganda, then propaganda becomes all-important, not the people. After all, all religions have done that. They are instruments of propaganda. Christianity, with its belief with its Saviour, with its Virgin and Saints is the result of 2000 years of propaganda, dinning into people every day believe, believe, believe. You are saved, you are this, you are that. The

other day when I was in Rome, I speak Italian, the priest was absolutely mesmerizing the people, by repeating, repeating, repeating; it went on for a half an hour. Naturally the people are mesmerized into belief.

All that has to be set aside, which means facing the fear, fear to stand alone. Fear to discard all this absurdity, all this, if I may use the word, circus which has become religion. To discard all that implies that a man must be aware, and so be - very sensitive and very alert, and therefore intelligent. It is that intelligence that is going to change society, not his throwing a bomb at it. The response to a challenge as violence is a most primitive form of response.

Therefore, the question really is whether the human mind as it is, living in this world, with wars, with the economic inequalities, with the immorality of society - and society is immoral - whether it can, whether he can be totally good; good in the sense, being free from violence, free of aggression. And violence is a form, is an outward expression of fear. I don't know if you have noticed that when whole cities are crowded as they are now, overpopulated, the lack of space makes people violent. The very lack of space is making everything violent.

I think one has to really go into all this, not as an idea, not as a belief, but one has to search, to understand all this in oneself; one must have tremendous passion to find out. For self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and wisdom you can't buy in a book, or from another.

Interviewer: In your travels round the world, Krishnamurti, have you found that the younger generation have got this kind of

thirst for awareness and self-knowledge?

Krishnamurti: I think, from what one has observed in America and Europe and India there is a sense of a revolt, which most young people have. It is a revolt because... what has society to offer them, actually, except going to business, or joining the army, or going to the moon or where you will? But actually, what has society, the culture to offer? Nothing, if you look at it. Therefore the more intelligent, the more sensitive, the more alert say, 'This is all wrong. We must change the very fabric of education.' The vested interests won't have it. The vested interest says, 'We must go slow.'... You know the old business. Therefore there is this conflict. After all, the human mind does seek more than bread and butter. It wants something beyond, which has meaning, which has significance, which has depth, and passion and interest. But society, the culture says you need to become a businessman, or a professor, or become a soldier. And therefore the revolt, all through the world. The young may not express it at such depth, but there are indications. But unfortunately they want to change society by throwing bombs and violence. Any physical revolution, as one has observed, must lead inevitably to tyranny, to dictatorship, either of the few or of the bureaucracy. So, this psychological revolution of which we are talking is the most important thing, that will bring about a change in the world.

Interviewer: You've been rather critical of religions. You yourself must have a religious view of life. Could you tell me your own particular outlook on religion?

Krishnamurti: Sir, what is religion? Actually, what is religion? First of all to find out what is religion we must negate what it is

not. What it is not; then it is. It's like seeing what is not love. Love is not hate, love is not jealousy, love is not ambition, love is not violence. When you negate all that, the other is, which is compassion. In the same way if you negate what is not religion then you find out what is true religion; that is, what is the truly religious mind. Belief is not religion, and the authority which the churches, the organized religions assume, is not religion. In that there is all the sense of obedience, conformity, acceptance, the hierarchical approach to life. The division between the Protestant, the Catholic, the Hindu, the Moslem, that's not religion. When you negate all that, which means you are no longer a Hindu, no longer a Catholic, no longer belonging to any sectarian outlook, then your mind questions, asks what is true religion? This is free from their ritual, without their masters, without their Saviour; all that is not religion. When the mind discards that, intelligently, because it has seen that it's not religion, then it can ask what is religion. Religion is not what I think, but religion is the sense of comprehension of the totality of existence, in which there is no division between you and me. Then if there is that quality of goodness which is virtue, real virtue not the phony virtue of society, but real virtue, then the mind can go beyond and find out, through meditation, through a deep, quiet silence, if there is such a thing as reality. Therefore a religious mind is a mind that is constantly aware, sensitive, attentive, so that it goes beyond itself into a dimension where there is no time at all.

Interviewer: What you are saying, Krishnamurti, seems to be that man has no need of any power outside of himself

Krishnamurti: Obviously not, Sir. The power of the outside

agency is self-created. I can't live properly in this world

and I hope somebody outside is going to help me. But as a human being I have created the social structure, the misery, the confusion, the enormous suffering. We have created this, and unless we change it, no outside agency is going to change it, either the Communist outside agency, the Politbureau, or the Hindu centre, or the Catholic centre. One has to have the clarity to observe all this. Interviewer: And what do you make of death?

Krishnamurti: Sir, that is an immense question. You see, we have made life - living - into a hideous thing. Life has become a battle, which is an obvious fact, the constant fight, fight, fight. And we have divorced that living from death. We separate death as something horrible, something to be frightened about. And this living, which is misery, we accept. If we don't accept this existence as misery then life and death are the same movement. Like love, death and living are one. One must totally die to find what love is. To go into this question of what is death, what lies beyond death, whether there is reincarnation, whether there is resurrection; all that becomes rather meaningless if you don't know how to live. If the human being knows how to live in this world without conflict, then death has quite a different meaning. To understand death really, one has to go into the question: what is it that dies? The physical organism obviously is going to end. We have misused it, we have really destroyed the intelligence of the organism itself. And to us death is something to be avoided. But, as it exists we believe in something beyond.

There is something beyond far greater than any of our beliefs. There is something tremendously great which the mind, which is in

such chaos, which is in such contradiction, cannot possibly grasp.

Interviewer: Krishnamurti, way back in 1919, that's forty odd years ago now, you dissolved the Order of the Star of the East and I would like to read the words, some of the words, you said at that time. You said, 'I maintain that truth is a pathless land and you cannot approach it by any path whatsoever, by any religion, by any sect. I do not want followers' you said, 'I mean this. If there are only five people who will listen, who will live, who have their faces turned towards eternity it will be sufficient. Or what use is it to have thousands who do not understand, who are fully embalmed in prejudice, who do not want the new but would rather translate the new to suit their own sterile, stagnant souls?' You said, 'I desire those who seek to understand me to be free, not to follow me, not to make out of me a cage which will become a religion, a sect, but rather they should be free from all fears, from the fear of religion, from the fear of salvation, from the fear of spirituality, from the fear of love, from the fear of death, from the fear of life itself

Forty-one years later how would you summarize your aims.

Krishnamurti: I think that's true! Human beings, whether they live in India or America or in the West are really unhappy beings. They are frustrated, they feel life has very little meaning. The more intellectual you are the more you see it has no meaning at all. Therefore they begin to invent meanings. Whereas if one really understood oneself which is so conditioned, oneself which is so small, petty, bourgeois, then out of that understanding flowers goodness.

Interviewer: So you're not setting yourself up as a great teacher.

Krishnamurti: No, no, Sir. On the contrary, I say: be your own

teacher. Be your own light. Don't look to somebody else.

Interviewer: And where do you find truth?

Krishnamurti: Only when a mind, and not only a mind, a life is completely harmonious, not contradictory. It's only such a mind which is religious that can find truth, can observe truth. Truth isn't something abstract, it's there.