



[1950 Bombay](#)



[1950 Colombo](#)



[1950 Madras](#)



[1950 New York](#)



[1950 Paris](#)



[1950 Seattle](#)



[1952 Ojai](#)



[1953 Bombay](#)



[1953 London](#)



[1953 Madras](#)



[1953 Ojai](#)



[1953 Poona](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[8th Public Talk](#)

[9th Public Talk](#)

[10th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[8th Public Talk](#)

[9th Public Talk](#)

[10th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[8th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[8th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 12TH FEBRUARY, 1950

Is it not important to find out how to listen? It seems to me that most of us do not listen at all. We listen through various screens of prejudice, examining what is being said, either as a Hindu, a Muslim, a Christian, or with a mind already made up. We do not listen freely, easily and silently. We listen with the intention to agree or to disagree, or we listen in a spirit of argumentation, we do not listen to find out; and it seems to me very important to know how to listen, how to read, to see, to observe. Most of us are incapable of listening truly, and it is only through right listening and hearing that we understand. Understanding comes, not through effort, not through any form of conformity or compulsion, but only when the mind is very quiet. In trying to find out what the other man is saying, there is no strain, no effort, but an easy flow, a swift delight; but we cannot find out what the other man is saying if we listen with any kind of prejudice. Perhaps I may have something new to say, and it will be most difficult for those who are prejudiced, in favour or against, to really understand. Because most of us are conditioned by social, economic, religious influences, and so on; we are copyists, we imitate, and therefore we disregard that which is new, we call it revolutionary or absurd and put it aside. But if we can examine, if we can look at it with freedom from all prejudices, from all limitations, then perhaps it is possible to understand and to commune with each other. There is communion only when there is no barrier; and an idea, a prejudice, is a barrier. When you love somebody, you commune, you have no idea about

the person whom you love. Similarly, if we can establish a relationship of real communion between us so that you and I understand the problem together, then there is a possibility of a radical revolution in the world. After all, the world does need, not mere reformation, not a superficial revolution, but a fundamental, radical revolution, a revolution which is not based on an idea. Revolution that is the outcome of an idea is not a fundamental transformation, but merely the continuance of a modified idea or pattern. So, let us see if during these talks we can establish between the speaker and the listener a communion that is beyond mere words. Words are necessary for communication, but if we merely remain on that level, surely there is no understanding.

Understanding comes when we go beyond the verbal level; but the highly cultivated mind lives on words, it is capable of examining only through the screen of words, and such examination is obviously not understanding; on the contrary, it merely leads to further arguments and disputations.

So, is it not possible for us to establish real communion, not merely on the verbal level, but at a deeper, more worthwhile level? Surely, that is possible; but to do it, you and I have to look at our problems anew - our problems being those of living, of relationship, of the strife between man and man, between groups of people, - we have to approach and examine them afresh, for only then is there a possibility of bringing about a fundamental change in our lives and therefore in the life of society. Our first basic problem is one of relationship, is it not; and that relationship is based on the morality of the past or of the future, that is, on traditional precepts, or on an idea of what ought to be. Our

morality, upon which our action is based, is the outcome of the past, of the traditional, or of the future which is the ideal; and when we base our action on the future or on the past, obviously there is no action at all. As long as we live by hope we cannot act, because hope is obviously the response of a future demand, and as long as we base our action on a hope, on an Utopia, on the ideal of perfection or a scheme of what ought to be, we are not living in the present. An idea is always of the future or of the past, and when relationship is considered in term; of the future or the past, naturally no action is possible - action being immediate, always in the present, in the now.

One of our enormous problems is, is it not?, to bring about a fundamental revolution in the present existing order. Seeing the disproportion and maldistribution, the whole economic structure of rich and poor, the conflict between those who have and those who have not, and so on, we try to solve the economic and social problems through a scheme, through an idea, through a pattern. There is the pattern, the system of the left and of the right, and these systems are invariably based on an idea. That is, the left starts out to resolve the problem by having a new system which is in conflict with the right; and as long as we are in conflict over ideas, on which all systems are based, obviously there is no solution. To put it differently, there are the problems of starvation, of unemployment, of wars, and we approach them, having already in mind a certain definite system for resolving each one of them. Can any system, whether of the left or of the right, resolve any problem? Both those who are committed to the left and those who are committed to the right consider that they have the perfect, the

final, the absolute system, and so both approach the problem of starvation, of unemployment and wars, with an idea, with a prejudice. The result is that the systems, the ideas, the beliefs, are in conflict with each other, and the problems remain. If you and I really want to start resolving a problem, surely we must examine the problem directly without the prejudice or screen of a system; for it is only when the mind is free from systems, whether of the left or of the right, that it is possible for us to face the problem itself.

Now, is it possible to have action without idea? - that is really the basic question. The idea is obviously a hope, it is based on the future or on the past; and can we live without hope? Obviously, to live without hope implies understanding the present directly, not in terms of the past or of the future. If we look into our own minds and examine the basis of our thought, we will see that we are thinking in terms of the ideal, of the future, of the hope of becoming something, of attaining a new state. Hope always leads to death, in hope there is no life; for life is in the present, not in the future. Life is neither in the future nor in the past, but in the process of living now. So, is it not possible to examine all our problems anew whatever they be - economic, individual or collective - , to look at them without the pattern, the hope of the future, and without the prejudice, the conditioning of the past? Surely, every challenge is new, otherwise it is not a challenge; and to meet that challenge, our minds must be fresh, new, not burdened with the past or with the hope of the future. And is it possible for the mind to meet a problem without either the conditioning of the past, or the escape, the hope of the future? Surely, it is possible

only when you and I, as individuals, are capable of understanding the problem, whatever it be, personal or collective, and responding to the challenge adequately, fully and completely; and it is only when the mind is not burdened with knowledge, with experience, that one can respond to the challenge adequately, naturally. That actually means, does it not?, that the mind must be capable of being very quiet; because it is only when we are not struggling, when we do not put forward an idea, when the mind is very quiet, that understanding comes. I do not know if you have noticed this in your own daily life. When you are agitated, worrying over a problem, surely you do not understand it; but when the mind is very quiet, free from the past and the future, then it is capable of meeting the challenge adequately. It is the inadequacy of our response to the challenge that creates the problem, and our response to the challenge must be inadequate as long as our actions are based on either the past or the future, on either tradition or hope. Therefore, a man who would really understand the problem of existence and so bring about a radical revolution, must be free from the past and the future, from hope and from tradition, from the ideal and from what has been. Such a state of mind is creative, and it is only the creative mind that can understand the present problems, not the mind that is riddled with ideas, inventing schemes and following ideals, not the mind that is merely copying, imitating; because, the challenge is always new, and if we want to understand, we must meet it anew.

So, reality, or whatever name you like to give it, is a state of being in which the mind is no longer swinging between the past and the future, but is perceiving and understanding what is from

moment to moment. The past and the future are not what is. The what is, is the new, it is unrelated to the past and the future; and to meet it, the mind itself must not be caught in the swing of the past and the future, the mind must not be a passage, a movement of the past to the future. The understanding of what is, is reality, and reality is not of time; and a mind that is the product of time cannot understand reality. So, the mind must be utterly still, not made still, not compelled, disciplined or controlled; and it is still only when it understands this whole process of becoming, this movement of time from the past through the present to the future. Several questions have been sent in, and before I answer them, may I suggest that you and I together try to find the right answers. It is very easy to ask a question and wait for an answer, that is merely a schoolboy trick; but it requires a mature, an intelligent, exploring mind, a mind that is free from prejudices, to take the journey of discovery. So, in considering these questions, we are going to take a journey together and find the truth - not an answer to suit you or me. Truth, surely, is not opinion, truth is not dependent on knowledge; and where there is knowledge, truth is not. Truth is not the result of experience; for experience is memory, and merely to live in memory is to deny truth. To discover truth, the mind must be free, swift and pliable. Therefore, there must be that art of listening, of hearing, which reveals the truth without effort; because, effort is obviously desire, and where there is desire there is conflict, and conflict is never creative. So, in considering these questions, please do not wait for an answer because there is no answer. Life has no such answer as a `yes' or a `no', it is much too vast, immeasurable; and to fathom the immeasurable, the mind

must be free, silent. Our quest is not to find an opinion, a conclusion with its admissions and denials, but to discover the right answer, the truth of the question. If I may suggest, you and I are going to see if we cannot discover the truth of the problem; because it is truth alone that frees you from the problem, not your or my opinion, however wise, however erudite. The man of knowledge, the man of opinion, the man of experience, will never find truth; for the mind must be very simple to find truth, and simplicity is not achieved through learning.

Question: Our lives are empty of any real impulse of kindness, and we seek to fill this void with organized charity and compulsive justice. Sex is our life. Can you throw any light on this weary subject?

Krishnamurti: To translate the question, our problem is, is it not?, that our lives are empty, and we know no love; we know sensations, we know advertising, we know sexual demands, but there is no love. And how is this emptiness to be transformed, how is one to find that flame without smoke? Surely, that is the question, is it not? So, let us find out the truth of the matter together.

Why are our lives empty? Though we are very active, though we write books and go to cinemas, though we play, love, and go to the office, yet our lives are empty, boring, mere routine. Why are our relationships so tawdry, empty, and without much significance? We know our own lives sufficiently well to be aware that our existence has very little meaning; we quote phrases and ideas which we have learnt - what so and so has said, what the mahatma, the latest saints or the ancient saints, have said. If it is

not a religious, it is a political or intellectual leader that we follow, either Marx, or Adler, or Christ. We are just gramophone records repeating, and we call this repetition 'knowledge'. We learn, we repeat, and our lives remain utterly tawdry, boring and ugly. Why? Why is it like that? If you and I really put that question to ourselves, won't we find the answer? Why is it that we have given so much significance to the things of the mind? Why has the mind become so important in our lives - mind being ideas, thought, the capacity to rationalize, to weigh, to balance, to calculate? Why have we given such extraordinary significance to the mind? - which does not mean that we must become emotional, sentimental and gushy. We know this emptiness, we know this extraordinary sense of frustration; and why is there in our lives this vast shallowness, this sense, of negation? Surely, we can understand it only when we approach it through awareness in relationship.

What is actually taking place in our relationships? Are not our relationships a self-isolation? Is not every activity of the mind a process of safeguarding, of seeking security, isolation? Is not that very thinking which we say is collective, a process of isolation? Is not every action of our life a self-enclosing process? You yourself can see it in your daily life, can't you? The family has become a self-isolating process; and being isolated, it must exist in opposition. So, all our actions are leading to self-isolation, which creates this sense of emptiness; and being empty, we proceed to fill the emptiness with radios, with noise, with chatter, with gossip, with reading, with the acquisition of knowledge, with respectability, money, social position, and so on and on. But these are all part of the isolating process, and therefore they merely give

strength to isolation. So, for most of us, life is a process of isolation, of denial, resistance, conformity to a pattern; and naturally in that process there is no life, and therefore there is a sense of emptiness, a sense of frustration. Surely, to love someone is to be in communion with that person, not on one particular level, but completely, integrally, profusely; but we do not know such love. We know love only as sensation - my children, my wife, my property, my knowledge, my achievement; and that again is an isolating process, is it not? Our life in all directions leads to exclusion, it is a self-enclosing momentum of thought and feeling and occasionally we have communion with another. That is why there is this enormous problem.

Now, that is the actual state of our lives - respectability, possession, and emptiness - , and the question is, how are we to go beyond it? How are we to go beyond this loneliness, this emptiness. this insufficiency, this inner poverty? I do not think most of us want to. Most of us are satisfied as we are; it is too tiresome to find out a new thing, so we prefer to remain as we are - and that is the real difficulty. We have so many securities, we have built walls around ourselves with which we are satisfied; and occasionally there is a whisper beyond the wall, occasionally there is an earthquake, a revolution, a disturbance which we soon smother. So, most of us really do not want to go beyond the self-enclosing process; all that we are seeking is a substitution, the same thing in a different form. Our dissatisfaction is so superficial; we want a new thing that will satisfy us, a new safety, a new way of protecting ourselves - which is again the process of isolation. We are actually seeking, not to go beyond isolation, but to

strengthen isolation so that it will be permanent and undisturbed. It is only the very few who want to break through and see what is beyond this thing that we call emptiness, loneliness. Those who are seeking a substitution for the old will be satisfied by discovering something that offers a new security; but there are obviously some who will want to go beyond that, so let us proceed with them.

Now, to go beyond loneliness, emptiness, one must understand the whole process of the mind, must one not? What is this thing we call loneliness, emptiness? How do we know it is empty, how do we know it is lonely? By what measure do you say it is 'this' and not 'that'? Do you understand the problem? When you say it is lonely, it is empty, what is the measure? How do you know it is empty? You can know it only according to the measurement of the old. You say it is empty, you give it a name, and you think you have understood it, Is not the very naming of the thing a hindrance to the understanding of it? Look, Sirs, most of us know what this loneliness is, don't we?, this loneliness from which we are trying to escape. Most of us are aware of this inner poverty, this inner insufficiency. It is not an abortive reaction, it is a fact, and by calling it some name, we cannot dissolve it - it is there. Now, how do we know its content, how do we know the nature of it? Do you know something by giving it a name? Do you know me by calling me by a name? You can know me only when you observe me, when you have communion with me; but calling me by a name, saying I am this or that, obviously puts an end to communion with me. Similarly, to know the nature of that thing which we call loneliness, there must be communion with it; and communion is not possible if you name it. To understand something, the naming

must cease first. If you want to understand your child at all, which I doubt, what do you do? You look at him, watch him in his play, observe him, study him, don't you? In other words, you love that which you want to understand. When you love something, naturally there is communion with it; but love is not a word, a name, a thought. You cannot love that which you call loneliness because you are not fully aware of it, you approach it with fear - not fear of it, but of something else. You have not thought about loneliness because you do not really know what it is. Sirs, don't smile, this is not a clever argument. Experience the thing while we are talking, then you will see the significance of it.

So, that thing which we call the empty is a process of isolation, which is the product of everyday relationship; because, in relationship, we are consciously or unconsciously seeking exclusion. You want to be the exclusive owner of your property, of your wife or husband, of your children, you want to name the thing or the person as 'mine', which obviously means exclusive acquisition. This process of exclusion must inevitably lead to a sense of isolation, and as nothing can live in isolation, there is conflict; and from that conflict we are trying to escape. All forms of escape of which we can possibly conceive - whether social activities, drink, the pursuit of God. Puja, the performance of ceremonial's, dancing and other amusements - are on the same level; and if we see in daily life this total process of escape from conflict and want to go beyond it, we must understand relationship. It is only when the mind is not escaping in any form that it is possible to be in direct communion with that thing which we call loneliness, the alone; and to have communion with that thing, there

must be affection, there must be love. In other words, you must love the thing to understand it. Love is the only revolution; and love is not a theory, not an idea, it does not follow any book or any pattern of social behaviour. So, the solution of the problem is not to be found in theories, which merely create further isolation; it is to be found only when the mind, which is thought, is not seeking an escape from loneliness. Escape is a process of isolation, and the truth of the matter is that there can be communion only when there is love; and it is only then that the problem of loneliness is resolved.

Question: India has an ancient tradition of simple living and few wants. At present, however, millions are held in the grip of involuntary poverty and privation, while at the other end of the scale this land is dominated by the rich upper classes who are already living a European mode of life. How can one discover the right relationship to possessions and comforts?

Krishnamurti: Sir, what do you mean by simplicity? Is it not important to find out first what is simplicity of life? Having but few clothes, a couple of loin cloths - is that a simple life? Is it a simple life to have few needs and be satisfied with one meal a day? The outward show of simplicity - is that simple? Or must simplicity begin at quite a different level, not at the periphery, but at the centre? So, let us find out what we mean by simplicity.

A mind that is complex, struggling to develop virtues, seeking power by trying to follow an ideal, to be nonviolent, disciplining itself, conforming to something, aiming at something, forcing itself in order to become something - is such a mind simple? Obviously not. But we want the outward show of simplicity, because that is

very profitable; that is the traditional, the ideal. A mind that pursues the ideal is not a simple mind - it is an escaping mind. A mind in conflict, a mind that is conforming to a pattern, whatever it be, is not a simple mind; but where there is simplicity at the centre, there will be simplicity also at the periphery.

Now, the questioner wants to know how to discover the right relationship to possessions and comforts. If we use possessions for psychological gratification, then obviously possessions lead to complexity. We use things, possessions, not as mere necessities, but to satisfy a psychological need, do we not? That is, property becomes a means of self-aggrandizement. Most of us are seeking titles, position, property, land, virtues, recognition; and all that implies, does it not?, a psychological need, an inward demand to be something. When our relationship to property is based on a psychological need, obviously we cannot lead a simple life, and therefore there must be conflict - which is so clear. That is, when I use property, people, or ideas as a means towards my psychological gratification, then I must possess - whatever it is, it is 'mine'. Therefore, I must protect it, I must fight for it, and hence the conflict begins.

So, it is important, is it not?, to understand our relationship to property; but obviously, you cannot understand that relationship if you approach it through any particular pattern. Understanding is not according to any plain, whether communist or socialist, whether of the right or of the left. As long as we use property as a means of self-aggrandizement, there must be conflict, there must be a society which is based on violence. It is not merely an economic problem, but much more a psychological problem; and

the economists who are trying to solve it on the economic level will always fail because the significance is much deeper. Aren't you using property, comforts, power, as a means of self-aggrandizement? To know that you have so much money in the bank, that you have a title, an estate - does it not give you importance, a sense of power? If it is not property you are after, then you want to be an official, a bureaucrat, a commissar, an ambassador, and God knows what else; and from that you get a sense of satisfaction, the feeling that you are somebody.

So, we base our relationship on self-aggrandizement; and as long as we use people, ideas and things for our self-aggrandizement, there must be violence. The problem cannot be solved through any pattern of economic or social action, but requires the understanding of our whole psychological being; therefore there must be an inward revolution, and not merely a revolution on the outside. It is very difficult to be as nothing, not to demand to be something, because most of us want to be successful, we are all after success in some form or other, are we not? In the business or social world, in politics, as a writer, as a poet, we want recognition, we want success in some form; so the problem is really much more inward and psychological than outward and objective. As long as we base our relationship on property, there must be this appalling division of those who have and those who have not, the rich and the poor; and we are trying to abolish that division through revolution based on an idea, which is a pattern of outside action determining how individuals shall behave in society without a fundamental, radical transformation at the centre, which is the psyche. That is why a revolution which merely substitutes

one pattern for another is no revolution at all. We think that by having an outward revolution we can bring about a new world based on what should be. On the contrary, revolution can only be at the centre, in the psyche, and then it will produce real outward revolution; but do what you will, mere outward revolution can never bring about an internal revolution.

So, our problem is, not how to bring about a new pattern or a new substitution, But how to awaken the radical revolution in ourselves. That is the real problem; because, what you are, the world is Your problem is the world's problem, you are not separate from the world; you and the world are an integrated process, the world is not without you. So, unless there is a revolution at the centre, revolution on the outside has very little meaning. Most of us do not want to change, or `we want to change only superficially, while maintaining certain things as they are in relation to our psychological demands', but it is only a radical inward revolution that will transform the world. It must begin with you as an individual, you cannot look to the mass; for it is only individuals, not the mass, that can bring about transformation. Therefore, you and I must radically transform ourselves, and in that there is tremendous beauty, in that there is creative thinking. A man who is happy, who loves, does not want possessions, he is not carried away by success, by power, position or authority. It is the unhappy, the sorrowful, who seek power and success as an escape from their own insufficiency. Superficial discontent only leads to gratification and further discontent; and as most of us are only superficially discontented, we do not want to be free from discontent. To be free from discontent is to bring about a fundamental revolution.

Contentment, which is not the opposite of discontent, is that state in which there is the understanding of what is; and the understanding of what is, is not a matter of time, it is not in the movement of the past to the future. The mind can be free only when it is simple, clean, and such a mind alone can be content. Only the mind that is free can establish right relationship to property. You will say, 'That will take a very long time, because it is only a few who can do it. In the meantime, the world is going to pieces, and therefore we must organize collectively'. That is a very facile and specious argument. Actually, even though you organize yourselves to bring about a collective revolution, that also will take time; and how do you know that you have the key to the future? What gives you the authority and the certainty that by your particular revolution you are going to create a marvellous Utopia?

Surely, then, it is really important that the problem be viewed, not on a particular level, but profoundly, intimately, and with an integrated approach, for in that alone is there a solution. You cannot be integrated if you approach the problem with any sense of resistance, through any form of compulsion or conformity.

Therefore, the thing that brings about integration is love; but to love the problem, you cannot impose on it any particular theory or discipline. If you really want to solve this problem of right relationship to property, you must be able to understand the whole structure of your being. But you see, you want quick answers, you want an immediate response, an easy solution to this problem; and no one on earth can give it to you. There is no immediate solution to a very complex problem. The immediacy is in the response of the individual, not in the solution of the problem. You can change

immediately if you so desire - but you don't. It is when you have a crisis that you have to change. A crisis means that you approach the problem with extraordinary completeness, otherwise it is not a crisis. But you do not want crises in your lives; that is why you have lawyers, that is why you have priests, that is why you have official revolutionaries. You avoid crisis; but when you are up against it, then you will find the right answer.

Question: What is self-knowledge? The traditional approach to self-knowledge is the knowledge of Atman as distinct from the ego. Is that what you mean by self-knowledge?

Krishnamurti: Look Sirs you are all well-read, aren't you? You have read all the religious books, and that is how you know about the Atman; otherwise you do not know anything about it. You have read it in the books and you like the idea, so you accept it; but you don't really know whether it exists or does not exist. You want permanency, and the Atman guarantees it. Now, suppose you had not read a single religious book about the Atman, the Super - Atman, and all the rest of it, what would you do? You might invent; but if you had no previous knowledge, what would be your approach? And that is my approach - I have not read a single religious or psychological book, because I do not want them. Not that I am conceited; but since the whole business is inside you, you can discover it for yourself - but not by looking outside. Otherwise, how do you know that Sankaracharya, Buddha, or the very latest authority, is not wrong?

So, to discover truth, there must be freedom; freedom, not at the end, but at the very beginning. Freedom is not at the end, liberation is not an end product; it must be at the beginning, otherwise you

cannot discover. Therefore, there must be freedom, freedom from the past - and that is what you and I are going to find out. You want to know what is self knowledge. It is not of the ego, not of the Atman - you do not know what that means. All that you know is that you are here, an entity in relationship with another, with your wife and children, with the world - that is all you know. That is the actual fact. Whether the Atman exists or not is merely a theory, a speculation, and speculation is a waste of time; it is for the sluggish, the thoughtless.

Now, what am I? That is all that matters: what am I? I am going to find out what I am; I am going to see how far I can go in that direction and find out where it leads. Because, that is the fact - not the Atman, not the ego, not the super-super-super. I do not think about those things, even though Buddha and Christ and everybody may have talked about them. What I can know is my relationship with property, with people, with ideas. So, the beginning of self knowledge lies in the understanding of relationship, and that relationship plays on all levels, not on one particular level only. I have to find out what my relationship is with my wife, with my children, with property, with society, with ideas. Relationship is the mirror in which I see myself as I am, and to see myself as I am is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom is not something that you can buy in books or go to a guru to acquire; that is mere information, and wisdom is not information. Wisdom is the beginning of self-knowledge, and that wisdom comes when you understand relationship.

Now, to understand relationship, to see very clearly in relationship the fact of what you are, there must be no

condemnation or justification - you must look at the fact with freedom. How can you understand something if you condemn it, or wish it to be something other than it is? Through your understanding of relationship there comes the discovery from minute to minute of the ways of your thinking, the structure of your mind; and as long as the mind does not understand its total process, both the conscious and the unconscious, there can be no freedom. So, through the relationship of everyday contacts, of everyday action, you come to a point when you see that the thinker is not different from thought. When you say the Atman is different from the ego, it is still within the field of thought; and without understanding the process, the functioning of thought, it is utterly futile to talk of reality and the Atman, because they have no existence, they are merely the prejudices of thought. What we have to do is to understand the thought process, and that can be understood only in relationship. Self-knowledge begins with the understanding of relationship - which we shall discuss later.

Then there is the question of the thinker and the thought, the experiencer and the experienced, with which we are familiar. Is there a thinker as an entity separate from thought? Surely there is no separate entity; there is only thought, and it is thought that has created this separate entity called the thinker. Thought is the response of memory, both the conscious as well as the unconscious, the hidden and the open; memory is experience, and experience is response to a challenge, which becomes the experienced - that is the total process of our consciousness, is it not? There is memory, then experience, which is the response to challenge, then the naming process, which further cultivates

memory. Memory responds as thought in relationship, and this whole process of thought, this cycle of memory, challenge, response, experience and naming, which becomes further memory, is what we call consciousness. That is all I am, that is all I know. So, I see that my mind functions within the field of time, within the field of the known; and can it function beyond that field? I see now the whole process of my thinking, which leads me to the question, can the mind go beyond thought, which is the result of the known? Obviously not; because, when thought seeks to go beyond, it is pursuing its own projection. Thought cannot experience the unknown, it can only experience that which it has projected, which is the known. Thought is the mind, which is the result of time, the result of the past; and I want to know if the mind can go beyond itself. Obviously it cannot, because the 'beyond' is the unknown, it is not of time. So, the mind must come to an end - which means, the mind must be still, meditative. Meditation is not the becoming of something, but the understanding of the total process of relationship, which is self-knowledge. It is only when the mind is still, not compelled to be still, that there is a possibility of experiencing the unknown.

So, then, can the mind, which is the result of experience, which is memory - can such a mind experience the unknown? Do you understand the problem? Can the mind, which is memory, the product of time, experience the timeless? It is the function of the mind to remember; and is truth a matter of experience and remembrance? We will discuss all this further as we go along; but just listen to what is being said, go with it, play with it, do not resist it. The point is: the mind is the result of time, time being me-

mory, and memory says, 'I have experienced or have not experienced'. Is truth, the unknown, the immeasurable, a matter of experience, which means something to be remembered? If you remember some thing, it is already the known, is it not? So, is it not possible to experience something which is not in terms of time - which means experiencing in the sense of seeing the truth from moment to moment? If I remember truth, it is no longer truth; because memory is a matter of time, of continuity, and truth is not of time, truth is not a continuity. The truth of the Buddha is not the truth which you discover today. Truth is never the same, it has no continuity; it is only from moment to moment, it cannot be remembered. There is truth only when mind is completely silent. Truth is not something to be sought after, experienced, held and worshipped. There can be the experiencing of the timeless only when the mind is free from all conditioning. So, self-knowledge is the understanding of conditioning.

What is important is to understand the total process of the mind. We will discuss it later; but we will have to see that truth is not some thing to be remembered. That which is remembered is of time, it is a thing of the past, and truth can never be of the past or of the future; truth can only be in the present, in that state where there is no time. Time is the process of the mind, the mind is thought, and thought is the response of memory. Memory is the experience of challenge and response, and because the response is inadequate it creates the problem in relationship. So, the understanding of the total process of the self lies in the understanding of relationship in daily life; and that understanding frees the mind from time, and therefore it is capable of

experiencing reality from moment to moment, which is not a process of remembering - it can no longer be termed `experience', it is quite a different state altogether. That state of being is bliss, it is not something that you learn in books and repeat like gramophone records. Such a man is happy, he does not repeat, for him life has no problem. It is only the mind that creates problems.

February 12, 1950

BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 19TH FEBRUARY 1950

When there is so much confusion and contradiction, not only in our own lives, but also among the specialists and the learned, action becomes extremely difficult, and to know what to do, to find a right mode of conduct, a right way of living, is hazardous and uncertain. This confusion is on the increase at the present time, not only in ourselves, but also about us; and we have to find, have we not?, a way of action that will not bring more conflict, more misery, more strife and destruction. We see that whatever the experts, the political leaders and religious authorities assert, only leads to further misery, further chaos, further confusion. So, the problem of action - not only individual, but also collective action - is very important; and to find out how to live is much more significant than merely to follow a certain pattern of action.

Now, to act, obviously there must be true individuality; but, though we have separate bodies, we are actually not individuals at all, psychologically we are not separate. We are not individuals in the true sense of the word, but are made up of many layers of memory, of tradition, conflict, and patterns, both conscious and otherwise; and that is the whole structure of our being. So, if we examine the individual closely, we will see that in actuality there is no individuality at all, there is no uniqueness. After all, by individuality we mean the quality of uniqueness, the quality of creativeness, the quality of aloneness that is creative. Sirs, the action which does not contribute to further misery, to further chaos, to further destruction, is possible only when there is true

individuality, and individuality is possible only when we understand this whole process of conformity and imitation. For most of us, living is merely the pursuit of a pattern, the pattern that has been, or the pattern that will be. If we examine our daily conduct, our daily way of thinking, we will see that the process of our action is a continual imitation, a mere copying. All that we know and all that we have acquired is based on imitation. It is because we are imitative, copying, that we are not individuals at all. We quote what so and so has said, what Sankaracharya, Buddha or Christ has said, because it has become the pattern of our existence never to discover, never to find out the truth for ourselves, but to repeat what someone else has discovered, what someone else has experienced. When we use the experience of another, however true, as the pattern for our action, our action then is really founded on imitation, and that action is a lie. Please sit down, Sir - these meetings are not meant for those who are not serious. This is not a political meeting or a show, where you can show off your faces or get your photographs taken. (Laughter) You would not do this in a religious temple, would you? We are dealing with life, not with the mere outward show of things; and to understand life, we have to understand this complete process of living which is ourselves. To understand ourselves we must understand the whole content of the conscious and of the unconscious mind; and if you merely pay scant attention to what is being said, I am afraid you will not gather the full significance of it.

So, action which is based on imitation, on copying, on conformity, on the pursuit of a pattern, must inevitably lead to

confusion - which is actually what is happening in the world at the present time. Why is it that we conform, why is it that we imitate, copy, quote authorities, cling to the sanction of what has been or what will be? Why is it that we cannot discover how to live directly for ourselves, instead of copying somebody? Is it not because most of us are afraid to be without security? Most of us want a certain state which we call 'peace', but which is really a state in which one does not want to be disturbed. Most of us are not adventurous, and that is why we merely live by copying and are satisfied with imitation. It is only when we break through, when we understand the process of imitation, that there is a possibility of individual action, which is creation.

Especially in these times, when there is so much confusion in the world, when there are so many authorities, so many gurus, so many leaders, each asserting and denying, each giving a new pattern of action, is it not important to find out what is action independent of the pattern, independent of the copy? And you can find that out only when you understand the process and the significance of imitation - not only the imitation of an external example, but the imitation and the conformity brought about by the authority of your own experience. Authority comes into being, does it not?, when you want to be secure; and the more you desire security, the less you will have it - which is being shown by these endless wars. Each group consisting of so-called individuals wants to be secure, so each creates a system, a pattern for security based on its own authority in conflict with the authority of others. So, as long as you seek security in any form, psychological or physiological, there must be conflict, there must be destruction.

The desire for security implies conformity; and it is only when the mind is really in secure, completely uncertain, when it has no authority, either external or inward, when it is not imitating an example, an ideal, or clinging to the authority of what has been - it is only then that the mind is without any conformity and therefore free to discover; and only then is there creation.

So, our problem is not how to act, but how to bring about that state of creation which is true individuality. That state is obviously not based on an idea, because creation can never be an ideation. Ideation must cease for the creative to be. There cannot be creative action as long as there is a pattern, an idea; and as our life is based on idea, on conformity to the ideal, we are not creative - and that is the real problem, and not how to act. Anybody will tell you how to act, any politician, any clever system, will tell you what to do; but in doing it, you will create more mischief, more misery, more confusion, more strife, because your action is not the outcome of creation. That is why it is important to be free from conformity and to be a true individual. To do that, you must know what you are at every moment; and in the understanding of what you are, there is a possibility of bringing about a society which is not based on conflict, destruction and misery. Such an individual is a happy individual, and happiness does not demand the imitation of virtue; on the contrary, happiness creates virtue. A happy man is a virtuous man - it is the unhappy man who is not virtuous; and however much he may try to become virtuous, as long he is unhappy, for him there is no virtue. He may become respectable, that respectability only covers up unhappiness. So, what is important is to discover for ourselves the pattern of conformity and

to see the truth about that conformity; for only when we see that the pattern is created by fear of insecurity can there be a state of creation.

I have as usual been given many questions, and while considering them together may I suggest that you do not resist what is being said, but rather hear it just as you would listen to music. Just listen to me without disputation. To dispute and deny is the usual and easy way, but the disputatious mind can never be in a state of tranquillity, in which alone understanding comes. Also, if I may suggest, do not merely wait for explanations, do not look to me for a conclusion or an answer - which I shall not give. There is no categorical answer for the real problems of life, there is only understanding; and understanding is catching the full significance of the problem, seeing the whole content of it. So, please be good enough to listen to me with friendliness, and with the intention to find out the significance of the problem itself rather than merely wait for an answer.

Question: You assert that you have not read a single book, but do you really mean it? Don't you know that such loose statements cause resentment? You appear to know the latest jargon of politics, economics, psychology, and the sciences; and are you trying to suggest that you get all this information by some superhuman powers?

Krishnamurti: Sir, whether you like it or not, it is a fact that I have not read a single religious book, nor any books on psychology or science; and it is also a fact that when I was young I was not put through a rigorous course of learning in philosophy or psychology. Somehow or other I have been reluctant to read them - they bore

me, that is a fact. Obviously I meet large numbers of people of every type - scientists, philosophers, analysts, religious people, and so on - who come to discuss; and occasionally I read some weekly magazines on politics and world affairs. That is all I have in the way of general information. Now, why do you resent it? Is it not because you have read so much, and your own ignorance is shown up by someone who has not read? Sir, do you read in order to become wise? Is knowledge wisdom? Is wisdom not something entirely different from knowledge? But there are two problems in this: one is why there is resentment in you, and the other is how I gather all that I am talking about. So, let us first enquire into why you resent.

Is it not important to find out why you feel resentment? You read newspapers, magazines, sacred books, all the commentaries on philosophy, psychology and science, and you keep on reading. Why do you read, why do you keep your mind so constantly occupied? And why do you resent it when somebody who has not read points out something? Is it because you are frustrated and you dislike, you hate anyone who shows a different attitude towards life? What is the process of your own resentment? Surely it is important to find out whether wisdom, understanding, comes through books; and why is it that you read, why do you fill your minds with information, with what so and so has said? Does it not indicate a very sluggish mind, an un-enquiring mind? Does it not also indicate a mind that is not capable of really investigating, directly experiencing? Such a mind is living on other people's experience, and so it is satisfied, it is put to sleep, it is made dull; and can a mind that is filled with chatter, with information, ever be

receptive to wisdom?

The second problem is this: though I may talk, I have not read any book; and you ask, "Are you trying to suggest that you get all this information by some superhuman powers?" Now, if you do not read, you have to know how to listen, you have to see and understand more clearly, observe more delicately and acutely, do you not? You have to be much more subtly aware of everything about you, not only of the people you meet, the people who come to see you, but also of the people in the tram car, in the taxi, on the road. You have to watch everything, haven't you?, more acutely, more clearly; and you are prevented from doing it, if you are cluttered up with information. When you are living fully, with undivided attention, there is direct experience, you do not have authorities and sanctions; and besides, why do you want to look to others when you have the whole treasure in yourself? After all, you are the total result of all humanity, are you not?, both the collective and the so-called individual. You are the sum total of all the fathers and all the mothers; and if you know how to look into yourself, you do not have to read a single book on religion, on philosophy or psychology, because the book is yourself. You may have to read for scientific information, to learn mathematics, and so on; but all that can be kept in libraries. Why do you want to fill your mind with facts when you have a treasure in yourself which requires a great deal of attention, a great deal of watchfulness? You see, that is the whole gist of the matter. Though we come across people of every type, of every degree of learning, it is the understanding of oneself that brings infinite knowledge, infinite wisdom.

Sirs, I am sure that in the olden days, before books were

published, before there were followers, teachers and gurus, there were original discoverers who had never read any book. Because there was no Bhagavad Gita, no Bible, no book of any kind, they had to find out for themselves, had they not? How did they go about it? Obviously they neither had sanctions, nor did they stupidly quote the authority of some individual. They searched out the truth for themselves, they found it in the sacred places of their own minds and hearts. Surely we also can discover the truth for ourselves in the sacred places of our minds and hearts. But to discover, to see what is without condemnation or justification, is extraordinarily difficult. The mind is merely a process of the past using the present as a passage to the future; and how can such a mind see what is? To see what is, the mind must be free from all acquisition, from all accumulation - but that is a different problem. We are now trying to understand the problem of why we read, and why we have resentment against those who do not read; and is it possible for one who has read, who has accumulated so much information, to be free to see, to listen and to hear?

Now, it is no good being resentful, that is stupid, that is only a waste of time; but we are all indulging in action which has no meaning, and surely, Sirs and Ladies, if you want to find out what wisdom is, you have in yourselves the key and also the door which must be opened. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom; but self-knowledge begins very near, it is not at some supreme Atmic level - which is merely another invention of a clever mind seeking security. Self-knowledge is reflected in your relationship with your wife, with your children, with your neighbour, with your boss, with your property, with the trees, and with the world. To go very far,

you must begin very near. But most of us dislike to begin near because we are so ugly and so frightened of ourselves; so we imagine something marvellous in the distance and make that our goal, our motto, the pattern which we have to follow. Because we are not willing to see and understand what we are from moment to moment, we make of our life a contradiction, a misery, an utter mess. Sir, truth is here, not far; happiness is in the discovery of what is, and that is virtue.

Question: Is beauty to be cultivated or acquired? What does beauty mean to you?

Krishnamurti: Beauty, surely, is something which is not of the mind, therefore beauty is not sensation. Most of us seek sensation, which we call beauty. The fashion, the style which can be changed, adjusted or dropped; the expensive furniture which you buy or have copied for your particular home, if you have money; the beautiful woman, the beautiful child, the beautiful picture, the beautiful house - surely, all that is really the response of sensation, which is the response of the mind, is it not? And is beauty sensation, is beauty merely of external form and shape? Putting on a sari in the right way, having one's lips carefully curved by lipstick, walking in a particular manner - is that beauty? And is beauty the denial of the ugly? Is virtue the denial of evil? Is there beauty in any denial? Surely, there is denial, the pleasing and the not pleasing, only when there is sensation. Just listen to it, do not contradict, do not oppose; just listen and you will discover what we mean by beauty.

While the outward form must obviously be given certain respect and needs certain care, cleanliness, and all the rest of it, both as

part of necessity and for esthetics reasons, surely that is not beauty, is it? Beauty which is a sensation is of the mind, and the mind can make anything beautiful or ugly; therefore beauty that depends on the mind is not beauty, is it? So, what is beauty? The mind is sensation, and if the mind judges beauty and gives it a name as goodness or truth, is that beauty? If beauty is perceived through the mind, it is sensation, and sensation comes to an end; and can that ever be beautiful? Do you understand what I mean? Is it beauty that comes to an end as sensation? I see a tree in the evening lights, the sun dancing and sparkling on the palm leaves, and it is very beautiful. The mind, becoming attached to it, says, 'How beautiful it is', and holds to it, resuscitating and reviving that image. At the moment of perception it has great pleasure, a deep sense of satisfaction, which it calls the beautiful, but a second later it is over, it is only a memory; so the mind gives continuity to the sensation of what it calls beauty.

The mind, then, is continually picturing, imagining the beautiful, which is always of the past. But is beauty of time? If it is not of time, then beauty is something illimitable, is it not; it is not within the frame of the word 'beauty'. The mind can invent the beautiful, but the experience of the illimitable cannot be known by a mind that is pursuing the sensation of beauty. You and I can see beauty externally; but the mere appreciation of that expression is not beauty, is it? So, beauty is something beyond the mind, beyond sensation, beyond time-limits, beyond the time-binding quality of thought; and that measureless sense, in which all things are, is beauty - which is to be really infinitely sensitive. The man who denies evil, who denies the ugly, can never know what beauty is,

because the very denial is the cultivation of the ugly. The illimitable is not to be found in a dictionary, in any religious or philosophical book.

So, beauty is not something of the mind; but unfortunately, modern civilization is making beauty a thing of the mind. All the picture magazines, all the cinemas, are doing it; most of our efforts go to making wonderful paintings, marvellous furniture, building beautiful houses, buying the most fashionable dresses, the latest lipstick, or whatever is displayed in the advertisements. We are caught in the things of the mind, and that is why our lives are so ugly, so empty, that is why we decorate ourselves - which does not mean that we should not decorate ourselves. But there is an inner beauty, and when you see it, then it gives significance to the outer; but merely decorating the outer while ignoring the inner is just like beating a drum - it is still empty. Beauty is a thing beyond the mind; and to find that which is beautiful - call it truth, God, or what you will - , there must be freedom from the thought process. But that is another problem which we can discuss some other time.

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

Krishnamurti: Let us first dispose of the obvious facts, and then go more deeply into the matter. The first fact is the impending war; and can we prevent it? Sir, what do you think? Men are bent on slaughtering each other; you are bent on slaughtering your

neighbour - not with swords, perhaps, but you are exploiting them, aren't you?, politically, religiously, and economically. There are social, communal, lingual divisions, and are you not making a great ado about all this? You do not want to prevent the impending war because some of you are going to make money. (Laughter.) The cunning are going to make money, and the stupid also will want to make more. For God's sake, see the ugliness, the ruthlessness of it. Sir, when you have a set purpose of gain at all costs, the result is inevitable, is it not? The third world war is arising from the second world war, the second world war arose from the first, and the first was the result of previous wars. Until you put an end to the cause, mere tinkering with the symptoms has no significance. One of the causes of war is nationalism, sovereign governments and all the ugliness that goes with them - power prestige, position and authority. Most of us do not want to put an end to war because our lives are incomplete; our whole existence is a battlefield, a ceaseless conflict, not only with one's wife, one's husband, one's neighbour, but with ourselves - the constant struggle to become something. That is our life, of which war and the hydrogen bomb are merely the violent and spectacular projections; and as long as we do not understand the whole significance of our existence and bring about a radical transformation, there can be no peace in the world.

Now, the second problem is much more difficult, much more demanding of your attention - which does not mean that the first one is not important. It is that most of us pay scant attention to the transformation of ourselves because we do not want to be transformed. We are contented and do not want to be disturbed.

We are satisfied to go along as we are, and that is why we are sending our children to war, why we must have military training. You all want to save your bank accounts, hold on to your property - all in the name of non-violence, in the name of God and peace, which is a lot of sanctimonious nonsense. What do we mean by peace? You say the U.N.O. is trying to establish peace by organizing its member nations, which means it is balancing power. Is that a pursuit of peace?

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

Now, is peace a thing of the mind? If you have a reason, a motive for peace, will that bring about peace? Do you understand what I mean? If I refrain from killing you because I think it is immoral, is that peaceful? If for economic reasons I do not destroy, if I do not join the army because I think it is unprofitable, is that peaceful? If I base my peace on a motive, on a reason, can that bring about peace? If I love you because you are beautiful, because you please me bodily, is that love? Sirs, please pay a little attention to it, because it is very important. Most of us have so cultivated our

minds, we are so intellectual, that we want to find reasons for not killing, the reasons being the appalling destructiveness of the atomic bomb, the moral and economic arguments for peace, and so on; and we think that the more reasons we have for not killing, the more there will be peace. But can you have peace through a reason, can peace be made into a cause? Is not the very cause part of the conflict? Is non-violence, is peace an ideal to be pursued and attained eventually through a gradual process of evolution? These are all reasons, rationalizations, are they not? So, if we are at all thoughtful, our question really is, is it not? whether peace is a result, the outcome of a cause, or whether peace is a state of being, not in the future or in the past, but now. If peace, if non-violence is an ideal, surely it indicates that actually you are violent, you are not peaceful. You wish to be peaceful, and you give reasons why you should be peaceful; and being satisfied with the reasons, you remain violent. Actually, a man who wants peace, who sees the necessity of being peaceful, has no ideal about peace. He does not make an effort to become peaceful, but sees the necessity, the truth of being peaceful. It is only the man who does not see the importance, the necessity, the truth of being peaceful, who makes non-violence an ideal - which is really only a postponement of peace. And that is what you are doing: you are all worshipping the ideal of peace, and in the meantime enjoying violence. (Laughter.)

Sirs, you laugh; you are easily amused, aren't you? It is another entertainment; and when you leave this meeting, you will go on exactly as before. Do you expect to have peace by your facile arguments, your casual talk? You will not have peace because you do not want peace, you are not interested in it, you do not see the

importance, the necessity of having peace now, not tomorrow. It is only when you have no reason for being peaceful that you will have peace.

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

So, then, is not peace a thing far beyond the mind and the inventions of the mind? Most of us, most religious people with their organizations, come to peace through reason, through discipline, through conformity, because there is no direct perception of the necessity, the truth of being peaceful. Peacefulness, that state of peace, is not stagnation; on the contrary, it is a most active state. But the mind can only know the activity of its own creation, which is thought; and thought can never be

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

Question: You repeat again and again that the mind must cease

for reality to come into existence. Why then do you attack prayer, worship and ceremonial's, which are really meant to still the mind?

Krishnamurti: By a trick the mind can be made quiet; you can take a drug or a drink, you can do ceremonial, worship, pray. There are many means by which you can make the mind still. But is the mind still when it is made still? Some of you pray, don't you? You repeat the Gayatri, you chant to still the mind, or you clasp your hands and mesmerize yourself into a state which you call peace. Self-hypnosis by the repetition of words is very simple. When you keep on repeating certain words, your mind becomes very still, quiet; by taking certain postures, breathing a certain way, forcing the mind, you can obviously reduce the activity of the mind. That is, through various tricks of discipline, compulsion, conformity, the mind is made still; but when the mind is made still, is it really still? it is dead, is it not? It is in a state of hypnosis. When you pray you repeat certain phrases, and that quietens the mind; and in that quietness there are certain responses, you hear voices which you of course attribute to the Highest. That 'Highest' always replies to your most urgent demand, and the reply gives you gratification. This is all a well-known psychological process. But when the mind is made still through prayer, through ceremonial's, through repetition, through chanting, through songs, is the mind really still, or merely dull? The mind has hypnotized itself into quietness, has it not? And most of you enjoy that hypnotized state, because in that state you have no problems, you are completely enclosed, isolated and insensitive. In that state you are obviously unconscious, the response of the conscious being blocked. When the mind is artificially made quiet, the upper layer of the mind is able to

receive intimations, not only from its own unconscious, but from the collective unconscious; and the intimations are translated according to the conditioned mind. Therefore a Hitler can say he is guided by God in what he does, and somebody else in India that God is all for something quite different. It is a very simple psychological process which you can discover for yourself if you watch your own mind in action and see how it can hypnotize itself into tranquillity. Therefore, when the mind is forced into stillness through concentration, through conformity, through any kind of discipline or self-hypnosis, it is obviously incapable of discovering reality. It can project itself and hear its own ugly voice, which we call the voice of God, but surely that is entirely different from the state of a mind that is really still. Now, the mind is active, it is constantly thinking of the things that have been and the things that will be; and how can such a mind be still - not be made still, which any fool can do? How is the mind to be really still? Surely, the mind is still only when it understands its own activity. As the waters of a pond become very quiet, very peaceful, when the breezes stop, so the mind is still when it is no longer creating problems. So, our question is, not how to make the mind still, but how to understand the creator of problems; because, the moment you understand the creator of problems, the mind is still. Do not close your eyes and go off because that word 'still' is mentioned. The understanding of the creator of problems brings tranquillity to the mind. So, you have to understand thought, because thought is the maker of problems. Thought creates the thinker, thought is always seeking a permanent state seeing its own state of transition, of flux, of impermanence, thought creates an entity which it calls

the thinker, the Atman, the Paramatman, the soul - a higher and higher security. That is, thought creates an entity which it calls the observer, the experiencer, the permanent thinker as distinct from the impermanent thought; and the wide distance between the two creates the conflict of time.

Now, the understanding of this whole process of thought creating the thinker, and the incarnation of thought as the thinker, brings about tranquillity of mind. This means that one has to understand what is thought. What is this thing which you call thinking? Until we understand that, whatever thought does only creates more confusion; until we know the whole significance and depth of thought, the conscious as well as the unconscious, the individual as well as the collective merely to indulge in further thinking, further speculation, only creates more misery. So, a mind which is ceaselessly active, chattering, always using the present as a passage from the past to the future, how can such a mind be still? Such a mind can never be still. A stupid mind is always stupid, it can never become intelligent; you may become what intelligent; you may become what you call clever, but that is only further stupidity. A mind that is wandering cannot be still, cannot be tranquil. It is only when the mind understands its own process, when it begins to be aware of itself, that you will see the end of thought. After all, what is our thinking, of which we are so proud? Our thinking, surely, is merely the response of memory, the response of experience, which we call knowledge; our thinking is merely the response of yesterday, is it not? And how can such thinking, which is of time, understand something which is beyond time?

Sir, is it not important for the mind to be aware of its own action - not as an entity apart from action, but aware of itself as action? And it can be aware only in relation to property, to people, to ideas. It is in understanding relationship that we understand thought; for there is no thinker apart from thought, of the thinker who thinks thoughts: there is only thought. When we see the truth of that, then the thinker is not; and when there is no thinker, the mind becomes very quiet. When there is no entity attempting to make the mind still, then the mind, which is only the result of time, of the past, becomes still of itself; and then only is it possible to understand truth, or for truth to come into being. Truth is not a thing of memory, truth is not of knowledge, of information. Truth is neither of the mind nor of emotion, it has nothing to do with sensations, it is not the projection of the self as the image, the voice of the Almighty. Truth is not of memory, therefore truth is not of time. As truth is not of the mind, it can come into being only when the mind is still, when thought is silent. Truth must be seen from moment to moment, and it is only truth that can resolve our problems, not the mind or the inventions of the mind.

February 19, 1950

BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 26TH FEBRUARY 1950

I would again like to lay emphasis on the importance of listening rightly. Most of us listen without understanding, we listen merely to words; but the word is not the thing, the word can never be the real. The word becomes real only when it has deep significance, but to catch the deep significance of the word one must know how to listen. This evening I want to talk about the question of virtue, and perhaps it may be something which is not along the old traditional lines, it may be something new; so I hope you will kindly listen to it without any resistance, without denial Listen to it with the intention of really grasping its significance. and then perhaps we shall be able to understand the extraordinary importance of virtue. The difficulty in grasping the significance of whatever is said will be, I am quite sure, to cross the barriers of our own prejudices and personal experiences.

Now, virtue is essential, and to understand it we have to go beyond the struggle to be virtuous, beyond the conventional meaning or definition of that word. Because we have made virtue into something very tiresome and tedious, something very ugly, there is no joy in being virtuous. It is a constant effort, it is a strain, a travail. Virtue is a fact, and to understand the fact one must be free to look at it as a fact. It is only the unhappy man who struggles to be virtuous, and the very struggle to be virtuous is the denial of virtue; but the man who is free from unhappiness, from strife, from struggle, such a person is virtuous without effort. The understanding of a fact is extraordinarily difficult, because the fact

is one thing, and the desire to change the fact is another. To understand the fact is to be virtuous. Anger is a fact, and to understand it without condemning it, without trying to defend it or find excuses for it, liberates one from the fact; and liberation from the fact is virtue. So, virtue is in the understanding of the fact, whatever it be, not in becoming something away from the fact.

With most of us, virtue is the ideal, which is a means of escape from the fact; and therefore we are never virtuous at any time. We are always becoming virtuous and therefore we are not virtuous. Surely, one must see the fact of what one is, whatever it be, without denial, acceptance or identification; because, when one identifies oneself with a fact, accepts or denies it, one does not understand the fact. Mere denial or acceptance is obviously not understanding. So, virtue is not an end to be pursued. The understanding of the fact is virtue, and without virtue there can be no freedom. It is the unvirtuous who are not free, and it is only in freedom that truth can be discovered. Freedom is virtue, and virtue is understanding the fact of what you are, which is not an ultimate process. You can see the fact immediately, so virtue is immediate, not in the future. If you will think about this, you will see the significance of it. Naturally we have not the time to go into all the details; but if you can see the fact of what you are as you would see any other fact, then you will discover there is a freedom from that fact; and it is only in that freedom that truth can be realized.

So, virtue is not a process, not an ultimate thing to be gained or to be practised. What is practised merely becomes habit, and habit can never be virtue. Habit is merely an automatic response. A fact is something that is constantly fresh, free; but a virtue that is

practised only leads to respectability, and a respectable man can never be happy. Happiness is not something that is gained by position, prestige, it is not arrived at through any means. We say we are happy because we have money, a position, or some means of sensation; but surely, that is not happiness. Happiness is a state of being in which there is no dependence; for where there is dependence there is fear, and a man who is fearful can never be happy, however much he may cover up his fear. There is happiness only in freedom, and there must be virtue for freedom. An unvirtuous man can never be free because his mind is confused. So, the understanding of the fact is freedom from that fact, and freedom from the fact is virtue. It is only when there is freedom that there is discovery, and freedom is not at the end, but at the beginning. Truth is not something distant: it must be discovered in the immediate, in the very first step. To discover the truth in the immediate there must be freedom, which means the understanding of the fact, which is virtue.

Now I shall answer some questions. It is always difficult to answer questions, and to be precise, because life is not a matter of 'yes' and 'no'. It is much too vast to be encompassed by a few words, it is too vital to be put in a frame. But if we can see the significance of the problem, then the answer is in the problem itself. It is open to anyone to discover the significance, the beauty, the truth of the problem, and that is possible only when you can see the fact and do not wander away from the fact.

Question: One watches the people near you for any visible sign of transformation. Now do you explain that, while you walk in light, your nearest followers remain dull and ugly in their life and

their behaviour?

Krishnamurti: First of all, the follower destroys the leader. To follow anyone is not to find truth. If one would understand what truth is, there can be neither the follower nor the teacher. There is no guru who will lead you to truth, and to follow anyone is to deny that freedom which virtue brings. This is not a mere rhetorical response. Just see the truth of it, that to follow of any kind is to deny intelligence. We follow because we ourselves are in confusion, and out of that confusion we choose the leader; therefore the leader also can only be confused. (Laughter.) Sir, please do not laugh it off. You choose the guru to have your appetite for security satisfied, and what you follow is your own projection, your own gratification, not the truth. When you follow somebody you are destroying that somebody, which is to destroy your self. I have no followers, nor am I a teacher to anybody; if I were, you would destroy me and I would destroy you. Then there would be no love between us, there would be mere following; for those who follow and those who lead have no love in their hearts.

Now, the questioner is very concerned with those who are about me. Why? Why is he concerned with whether others are beautiful or ugly? Surely, what is important is one's own condition, not that of an other. If my mind is petty, narrow, limited, then I will see the same in others. This desire to criticize others is really quite extraordinary. How can I know what another is when I do not know what I myself am? How can I judge another when my own measurement is at fault? What is the instrument, the balance by which I weigh another when I do not know the whole process of my- self? And when I do away with the `myself' in its totality,

there is no time to judge another, nor do I feel the inclination to judge another. It is the sluggish, agitated, worrying mind that judges, it is the restless mind that is forever criticizing others; and how can a restless mind that does not know itself ever look clearly at anything? It is only when you are capable of looking at things directly and clearly that you are free of those things.

The third point in this question is, is it not?, how do you know that I "walk in light"? You assume that I do, but how can you know anything about it? This extraordinary desire to accept and to take things for granted is one of the indications of a dull mind. On the contrary, you should be sceptical. Scepticism is not cynicism or denial; it is the state of a mind that does not agree quickly, that does not accept or take things for granted. A mind that accepts is seeking, not enlightenment or wisdom, but refuge. The important thing is, surely, not whether I walk in light. but whether you do. It is your life, not mine; it is your happiness, your strife, your misery. What is the good of thinking someone else walks in light? He may or may not; and of what value is it to. you when you are yourself in misery? If you merely believe in the light of another, you become a follower, a copyist, an imitator, which means you are a gramophone record playing some tune over and over again without a song in your own heart.

In this question there is also an other point: instead of criticizing, tackling me, you go for the so-called followers. It is like whipping a boy instead of the king; the king can do no wrong, so you go for the boy. Similarly, you go for those whom you regard as my followers. Fortunately there are no followers as far as I am concerned. As I said, to follow anyone is destruction, and that is

what is the matter with the world at the present time. We are mere copyists, imitators; we follow eagerly, both politically and religiously, and so we are led to destruction. This does not mean that we must become rampant individualists, which is the other extreme; but to be able to live happily, to see the truth for oneself, does not demand following another. A happy man does not follow. It is the miserable, the confused man who eagerly pursues an other, hoping for refuge; and he will find a refuge, but that refuge is his darkness, it is his undoing. It is only the man who tries to find out the fact of what he is in himself that will know freedom and therefore happiness.

Question: The more one listens to you, the more one feels that you are preaching withdrawal from life. I am a clerk in the Secretariat, I have four children, and I get only Rs. 125 a month. Will you please explain how I can fight the gloomy struggle for existence in the new way you are proposing? Do you really think that your message can mean anything significant to the starving and the stunted wage-earner? Have you lived among such people?

Krishnamurti: First of all, let us dispose of the question as to whether I have lived among such people. It implies, does it not?, that in order to understand life, you must go through every phase of life, every experience, you must live among the poor and the rich, you must starve and pass through every condition of existence. Now, to put the problem very briefly, must you go through drunkenness to know sobriety? Does not one experience fully, completely understood, reveal the whole process of life? Must you go through all the phases of life to understand life? Please see that this is not an avoidance of the question - on the contrary. We think

that to know wisdom we must go through every phase of life and experience, from the rich man to the poor man, from the beggar to the king. Now, is that so? Is wisdom the accumulation of many experiences? Or is wisdom to be found in the complete understanding of one experience? Because we never completely and fully understand one experience, we wander from experience to experience, hoping for some salvation, for some refuge, for some happiness. So, we have made our life a process of continuous accumulation of experiences, and therefore it is an endless struggle, a ceaseless battle to attain, to acquire. Surely, that is a tedious, an utterly stupid approach to life, is it not?

Is it not possible to gather the full significance of an experience and so understand the whole width and depth of life? I say it is possible, and that it is the only way to understand life. Whatever the experience, whatever the challenge and response to life, if one can understand it fully, then the pursuit of every experience has no meaning, it becomes merely a waste of time. Because we are incapable of doing that, we have invented the illusory idea that by accumulating experiences we shall ultimately arrive, God knows where.

Now, the questioner wants to know if I am preaching withdrawal from life. What do we mean by life? I am thinking out this problem aloud, so let us follow it together. What do we mean by life? Living is possible only in relationship, is it not? If there is no relationship, there is no life. To be, is to be related; life is a process of relationship, of being in communion with another, with two or ten, with society. Life is not a process of isolation, of withdrawal. But for most of us, living is a process of isolation, is it

not? We are struggling to isolate ourselves in action, in relationship. All our activities are self-enclosing, narrowing down, isolating, and in that very process there is friction, sorrow, pain. Living is relationship, and nothing can exist in isolation; therefore there can be no withdrawal from life. On the contrary, there must be the understanding of relationship - your relationship with your wife, your children, with society, with nature, with the beauty of this day, the sunlight on the waters, the flight of a bird, with the things that you possess and the ideals that control you. To understand all that, you do not withdraw from it. Truth is not found in withdrawal and isolation; on the contrary, in isolation, whether it is conscious or unconscious, there is only darkness and death.

So, I am not proposing a withdrawal from life, a suppression of life; on the contrary, we can understand life only in relationship. It is because we do not understand life that we are all the time making an effort to withdraw, to isolate; and having created a society based on violence, on corruption, God becomes the ultimate isolation.

Then the questioner wants to know how, earning so little, he is to live what we are talking about. Now, first of all, the earning of a livelihood is not only the problem of the man who earns little, but it is also yours and mine, is it not? You may have a little more money, you may be well off, have a better job, a better position, a bigger bank account; but it is also your problem and mine, because this society is what all of us have created. Until we three - you, I and another - really understand relationship, we cannot bring about revolution in society. The man who has no food in his stomach obviously cannot find reality, he must first be fed; but the man

whose stomach is full, surely it is his immediate responsibility to see that there is a fundamental revolution in society, that things do not go on as they are. To think, to feel out all these problems is much more the responsibility of those who have time, who have leisure, than it is of the man who earns little and has such a struggle to make both ends meet, who has no time and is worn out by this rotten, exploiting society. So, it is you and I, those of us who have a little more time and leisure, who must go into these problems completely - which does not mean that we have to become professional talkers, offering one system as a substitute for another. It is for you and I who have time, who have leisure for thought, to seek out the way of a new society, a new culture.

Now, what happens to the poor man who is earning Rs. 125/-, or whatever it is? He has to carry the family with him, he has to accept the superstitions of his grandmother, his aunts, nephews, and so on; he has to marry according to a certain pattern, he has to do Puja, ceremonies, and fit in with all that superstitious nonsense. He is caught in it; and if he rebels, you, the respectable people, throttle him.

So, the question of right livelihood is your problem and mine, is it not? But most of us are not concerned with right livelihood at all, we are glad and thankful simply to have a job; and so we maintain a society, a culture, that renders right livelihood impossible. Sirs, do not treat it theoretically. If you find yourself in a wrong vocation and actually do something about it, do you not see what a revolution it will bring in your life and in the life of those around you? But if you listen casually and carry on as before because you have a good job and for you there is no problem, obviously you

will continue to cause misery in the world. For the man with too little money there is a problem; but he, like the rest of us, is only concerned with having more, and when he gets more the problem continues, because he wants still more.

Now, what is a right means of livelihood? Obviously, there are certain occupations that are detrimental to society. The army is detrimental to society, because it plans and encourages murder in the name of the country. Because you are a nationalist, holding to sovereign governments, you must have armed forces to protect your property; and property is much more important to you than life, the life of your son. That is why you have conscription, that is why your schools are being encouraged to have military training. So, in the name of your country you are destroying your children. Your country is yourself identified, your own projection, and when you worship your country you are sacrificing your children to the worship of yourself. That is why the army, which is the instrument of a separate and sovereign government, is a wrong means of livelihood. But it is made easy to enter the army, and it becomes a sure means of earning a little money. Just see this extraordinary fact in modern civilization. Surely, the army is a wrong way to earn one's livelihood, because it is based on planned and calculated destruction; and until you and I see the truth of this we are not going to bring about any different kind of society.

Similarly, you can see that a job in a police force is a wrong means of livelihood. Do not smile and pass it off. The police becomes a means of investigating private lives. We are not talking of the police as a means of helping, guiding, but as an instrument of the state, the secret police, and all the rest of it. Then the

individual becomes merely an instrument of society, the individual has no privacy, no freedom, no rights of his own; he is investigated, controlled, shaped by the government, which is society. Obviously, that is a wrong means of livelihood.

Then there is the profession of law. Is that not a wrong means of livelihood? I see some of you are smiling. Probably you are lawyers, and you know better than I do what that system is based on. Fundamentally, not superficially, it is based on maintaining things as they are, on dis- agreements, disputation, confusion, quarrels, encouraging disruption and disorder in the name of order.

There is also the wrong profession of the man who wants to become rich, the big business man, the man who is gathering, accumulating, storing up money through exploitation, through ruthlessness - though he may do it in the name of philanthropy or in the name of education.

Obviously, then, these are all wrong means of livelihood; and a complete change in the social structure, a revolution of the right kind, is possible only when it begins with you. Revolution cannot be based on an ideal or a system; but when you see all this as a fact, you are liberated from it, and therefore you are free to act. But, Sirs, you do not want to act; you are afraid of being disturbed, and you say, 'There is already sufficient confusion, please do not make any more'. If you do not make more confusion, others are there making it for you - and utilizing that confusion as a means of gaining political power. Surely, it is your responsibility as an individual to see the confusion within and without, and to do something about it - not merely accept it and wait for a miracle, a marvellous Utopia created by others into which you can step

without effort.

Sirs, this problem is your problem as well as the poor man's problem. The poor man depends on you and you depend on him; he is your clerk while you ride in a big car and get a fat salary, accumulating money at his expense. So, it is your problem as well as his, and until you and he alter radically in your relationship, there will be no real revolution; though there may be violence and bloodshed, you will maintain things essentially as they are.

Therefore, our problem is the transformation of relationship; and that transformation is not on the intellectual or verbal level, but it can take place only when you understand the fact of what you are. You cannot understand it if you theorize, verbalize, deny or justify, and that is why it is important to understand the whole process of the mind. A revolution which is merely the outcome of the mind, is no revolution at all; but revolution which is not of the mind, which is not of the word, of the system - that is the only revolution, the only solution to the problem. But unfortunately, we have cultivated our brains, our so-called intellects, to such an extent that we have lost all capacities except the merely intellectual and verbal capacity. It is only when we see life as a whole, in its entirety, in its totality, that there is a possibility of a revolution which will give both the poor man and the rich man his due.

Question: The conscious mind is ignorant and afraid of the unconscious mind. You are addressing mainly the conscious mind, and is that enough? Will your method bring about release of the unconscious? Please explain in detail how one can tackle the unconscious mind fully.

Krishnamurti: This is quite a complex and difficult problem, it

requires a great deal of penetration, and I hope you will pay attention, not merely verbally, but by really listening and by seeing the truth of it.

Now, we are aware that there is the conscious and the unconscious mind, but most of us function only on the conscious level, in the upper layer of the mind, and our whole life is practically limited to that. We live in the so-called conscious mind and we never pay attention to the deeper unconscious mind, from which there is occasionally an intimation, a hint; but that hint is disregarded, perverted, or translated according to our particular conscious demands at the moment. Now, the questioner asks, "You are addressing mainly the conscious mind, and is that enough?" Let us see what we mean by the conscious mind. Is the conscious mind different from the unconscious mind? We have divided the conscious from the unconscious; and is this justified? Is this true? Is there such a division between the conscious and the unconscious? Is there a definite barrier, a line where the conscious ends and the unconscious begins? We are aware that the upper layer, the conscious mind, is active; but is that the only instrument that is active throughout the day? So, if I were addressing merely the upper layer of the mind, then surely what I am saying would be valueless, it would have no meaning. And yet most of us cling to what the conscious mind has accepted, because the conscious mind finds it convenient to adjust to certain obvious facts; but the unconscious may rebel, and often does, and so there is conflict between the so-called conscious and the unconscious.

So, our problem is this, is it not? there is in fact only one state, not two states such as the conscious and the unconscious; there is

only a state of being, which is consciousness, though you may divide it as the conscious and the unconscious. But that consciousness is always of the past, never of the present; you are conscious only of things that are over. You are conscious of hearing the second it is over, are you made; you understand it a moment of truth. You are never conscious or aware of the now. Watch your own hearts and minds and you will see that consciousness is functioning between the past and the future, and that the present is merely a passage the past to the future. So, consciousness is a movement of the past to the future. Please follow this. It is a little too abstract to give examples, similes; and to think in similes is not to think at all, because similes are limited. You must think abstractly or negatively, which is the highest form of thinking.

If you watch your own mind at work, you will see that the movement to the past and to the future is a process in which the present is not. Either the past is a means of escape from the present, which may be unpleasant, or the future is a hope away from the present. So, the mind is occupied with the past or with the future and sloughs off the present. That is, the mind is conditioned by the past, conditioned as an Indian, a Brahmin or a non-Brahmin, a Christian, a Buddhist, and so on, and that conditioned mind projects itself into the future; therefore it is never capable of looking directly and impartially at any fact. It either condemns and rejects the fact, or accepts and identifies itself with the fact. Such a mind is obviously not capable of seeing any fact as a fact. That is our state of consciousness, which is conditioned by the past, and our thought is the conditioned response to the challenge of a fact;

and the more you respond according to the conditioning of belief, of the past, the more there is the strengthening of the past. That strengthening of the past is obviously the continuity of itself, which it calls the future. So, that is the state of our mind, of our consciousness - a pendulum swinging backwards and forwards between the past and the future. That is our consciousness, which is made up not only of the upper layers of the mind, but of the deeper layers as well. Such consciousness obviously cannot function at a different level, because it only knows those two movements of backwards and forwards.

Now, if you watch very carefully you will see that it is not a constant movement, but that there is an interval between two thoughts; though it may be but an infinitesimal fraction of a second, there is an interval that has significance in the swinging backwards and forwards of the pendulum. So, we see the fact that our thinking is conditioned by the past, which is projected into the future; and the moment you admit the past, you must also admit the future; because, there are not two states as the past and the future, but one state which includes both the conscious and the unconscious, both the collective past and the individual past. The collective and the individual past, in response to the present, give out certain responses which create the individual consciousness; therefore, consciousness is of the past, and that is the whole background of our existence. And the moment you have the past, you inevitably have the future, because the future is merely the continuity of the modified past; but it is still the past. So, our problem is how to bring about a transformation in this process of the past without creating another conditioning, another past. I hope

you are following all this. If it is not clear, perhaps we will discuss it on Tuesday or Thursday.

To put it differently, the problem is this: Most of us reject one particular form of conditioning and find another form, a wider, more significant or more pleasant conditioning. You give up one religion and take on another, reject one form of belief and accept another. Such substitution is obviously not understanding life, life being relationship. So, our problem is how to be free from all conditioning. Either you say it is impossible, that no human mind can ever be free from conditioning; or you begin to experiment, to enquire, to discover. If you assert that it is impossible, obviously you are out of the running. Your assertion may be based on limited or wide experience, or on the mere acceptance of a belief; but such assertion is the denial of search, of research, of enquiry, of discovery. To find out if it is possible for the mind to be completely free from all conditioning, you must be free to enquire and to discover.

Now, I say it is definitely possible for the mind to be free from all conditioning - not that you should accept my authority. If you accept it on authority, you will never discover it will be another substitution, and that will have no significance. When I say it is possible, I say it because for me it is a fact, and I will show it to you verbally; but if you are to find the truth of it for yourself, you must experiment with it and follow it swiftly.

The understanding of the whole process of conditioning does not come to you through analysis or introspection; because, the moment you have the analyzer, that very analyzer himself is part of the background, and therefore his analysis is of no significance.

That is a fact, and you must put it aside. The analyzer who examines, who analyzes the thing which he is looking at, is himself part of the conditioned state, and therefore whatever his interpretation, his understanding, his analysis may be, it is still part of the background. So that way there is no escape; and to break the background is essential, because to meet the challenge of the new, the mind must be new; to discover God, truth, or what you will, the mind must be fresh, uncontaminated by the past. To analyze the past, to arrive at conclusions through a series of experimentations, to make assertions and denials, and all the rest of it, implies in its very essence, the continuance of the background in different forms and when you see the truth of the fact, then you will discover that the analyzer has come to an end. The background is still there, but the analyzer has come to an end. Then there is no entity apart from the background: there is only thought as the background, thought being the response of memory, both conscious and unconscious, individual and collective.

So, the mind is the result of the past, which is the process of conditioning; and how is it possible for the mind to be free? To be free, the mind must not only see and understand its pendulum-like swing between the past and the future, but also be aware of the interval between thoughts. That interval is spontaneous, it is not brought about through any causation, through any wish, through any compulsion. Just experiment with me this evening and see your own mind in operation as I go slowly into the matter. Don't worry, I am not mesmerizing you. (Laughter.) I am not interested in mesmerizing or influencing you, because to be mesmerized, to be influenced, consciously or unconsciously, is to become a

follower; and to become a follower is to destroy yourself and him whom you follow, and therefore there is no love between us. When there is love, there is no mesmerism, there is neither the follower nor the teacher, neither the man nor the woman, there is only that flame of love; and it is that love which brings communion between us.

Now, although it is difficult with a large audience, this evening I am going to try to show how the mind actually works; and you can experiment and see it for yourself. We know thinking is a response of the background. You think as a Hindu, as a Parsee, as a Buddhist, or as God knows what else, not only in your conscious thinking, but also in your unconscious thinking. You are the background, you are not separate, there is no thinker apart from the background; and the response of that background is what you call thinking. That background, whether it is cultured or uncultured, learned or ignorant, is constantly responding to any challenge, to any stimulant, and that response creates not only the so-called present, but also the future; and that is our process of thinking.

Now, if you watch very carefully, you will see that though the response, the movement of thought, seems so swift, there are gaps, there are intervals between thoughts. Between two thoughts there is a period of silence which is not related to the thought process. If you observe you will see that, that period of silence, that interval, is not of time; and the discovery of that interval, the full experiencing of that interval, liberates you from conditioning - or rather, it does not liberate `you', but there is liberation from conditioning. So, the understanding of the process of thinking is meditation - which we will discuss another time. We are now not

only discussing the structure and the process of thought, which is the background of memory, of experience of knowledge, but we are also trying to find out if the mind can liberate itself from the background. It is only when the mind is not giving continuity to thought, when it is still with a stillness that is not induced, that is without any causation - it is only then that there can be freedom from the background. I hope I have explained this question sufficiently.

Question: Why does the human mind cling so persistently to the idea of God in many different ways? Can you deny that belief in God has brought consolation and meaning to lonely and desolate people all over the world? Why are you depriving man of this consolation by preaching a new type of nihilism?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, this is as important a question as the previous one, because all vital human questions are important. So please do not resist, but try to understand what I am talking about, and you will see.

Now, belief is a denial of truth, belief hinders truth; to believe in God is not to find God. Neither the believer nor the non-believer will find God; because, reality is the unknown, and your belief or non-belief in the unknown is merely a self-projection and therefore not real. So, if I may suggest, do not resist, but let us go into it together. I know you believe, and I know it has very little meaning in your life. There are many people who believe, millions believe in God and take consolation. First of all, why do you believe? You believe because it gives you satisfaction, consolation, hope, and you say it gives significance to life. But actually your belief has very little significance, because you believe and exploit, you

believe and kill, you believe in a universal God and murder each other. The rich man also believes in God; he exploits ruthlessly, accumulates money, and then builds a temple or becomes a philanthropist. Is that belief in God? And the man who drops an atomic bomb says that God is his copilot on the airplane.

(Laughter.) Do not laugh, Sirs. Your turn is coming also. The man who plans murder on a vast scale calls on the Almighty; the man who is cruel to his wife, to his children, to his neighbour, he also sings, sits down, kneels, clasps his hands and calls on the name of God.

So, you all believe in different ways, but your belief has no reality whatsoever. Reality is what you are, what you do, what you think, and your belief in God is merely an escape from your monotonous, stupid and cruel life. Furthermore, belief invariably divides people: there is the Parsee, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian, the communist, the socialist, the capitalist, and so on. Belief, idea, divides; it never brings people together. You may bring a few people together in a group, but that group is opposed to another group. So ideas and beliefs are never unifying; on the contrary, they are separative, disintegrating and destructive. Therefore your belief in God is really spreading misery in the world; though it may have brought you momentary consolation, in actuality it has brought you more misery and destruction in the form of wars, famines, class divisions, and the ruthless action of separate individuals. So, your belief has no validity at all. If you really believed in God, if it were a real experience to you, then your face would have a smile, then you would not be destroying human beings. I am not being rhetorical; but please look at the

facts first.

You do not really believe in God, because if you did you would not be rich, you would have no temples, you would have no poor people, you would not be a philanthropist with a big title after exploiting people. So, your belief in God is worthless; and though it may give you temporary consolation, compensate for and hide you from your own misery, give you a respectable escape which mankind recognizes as making you a religious person, it is all without validity, it has no significance whatsoever. What is significant is your life, the way you live, the way you treat your servant, the way you look at another human being.

So, what I am preaching is not negation. I am saying that you spread misery by clinging to illusions which help you to avoid looking at things as they are. To face a fact is freedom from the fact, and belief is a hindrance to the perception of what is. After all, your belief is the result of your conditioning. You can be conditioned to believe in God, and another can be conditioned not to believe, to deny that there is God. Obviously, then, belief impedes the realization of what is; and to see the truth of this fact is to be free from belief. Then only can the mind enquire and find out if there is that thing which is called God.

Now, what is reality, what is God? God is not the word, the word is not the thing. To know that which is immeasurable, which is not of time, the mind must be free of time, which means the mind be free from all thought, from all ideas about God. Because, what do you know about God or truth? You do not really know anything about that reality. All that you know are words, the experiences of others, or some moments of rather vague experience

of your own. Surely, that is not God, that is not reality, that is not beyond the field of time. So, to know that which is beyond time, the process of time must be understood, time being thought, the process of becoming, the accumulation of knowledge. That is the whole background of the mind; the mind itself is the background, both the conscious and the unconscious, the collective and the individual. So, the mind must be free of the known, which means the mind must be completely silent, not made silent. The mind that achieves silence as a result, as the outcome of determined action, of practice, of discipline, is not a silent mind. The mind that is forced, controlled, shaped, put into a frame and kept quiet, is not a still mind. You may succeed for a period of time in forcing the mind to be superficially silent, but such a mind is not a still mind. Stillness comes only when you understand the whole process of thought; because, to understand the process is to end the process, and the ending of the process of thought is the beginning of silence. Only when the mind is completely silent, not only on the upper level, but fundamentally, right through, on both the superficial and the deeper levels of consciousness - only then can the unknown come into being. The unknown is not something to be experienced by the mind; silence alone can be experienced, nothing but silence. If the mind experiences anything but silence, it is merely projecting its own desires, and such a mind is not silent; and as long as the mind is not silent, as long as thought in any form, conscious or unconscious, is in movement, there can be no silence. Silence is freedom from the past, from knowledge, from both conscious and unconscious memory; and when the mind is completely silent, not in use, when there is the silence which is not

a product of effort, then only does the timeless, the eternal come into being. That state is not a state of remembering - there is no entity that remembers, that experiences. So, God or truth, or what you will, is a thing that comes into being from moment to moment, and it happens only in a state of freedom and spontaneity, not when the mind is disciplined according to a pattern. God is not a thing of the mind, it does not come through self-projection, it comes only when there is virtue, which is freedom. Virtue is facing the fact of what is, and the facing of the fact is a state of bliss. Only when the mind is blissful, quiet, without any movement of its own, without the projection of thought, conscious or unconscious - only then does the eternal come into being.

February 26, 1950

BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 5TH MARCH 1950

Unless we understand the whole problem of effort, the question of action will not be completely understood. Most of us live by a series of efforts, striving to achieve a result, striving either for the general welfare, for general upliftment, or to achieve personal advancement. Effort is ultimately, is it not?, a process of ambition, whether collective or individual; and it is ambition that seems to drive most of us into political activity or into work for social and religious advancement. For most of us, ambition seems to be the goal, the way of living; and when the pursuits of that ambition are thwarted, there is frustration, there is sorrow, leading to a series of escapes. Surely, effort ultimately implies, not only the ambition for personal advancement, but also the ambition for social and political advancement; and if we do not succeed in worldly matters, we turn our ambition to so-called spiritual matters. If I do not become somebody in this world, I want to become somebody in the next world, and that is considered to be spiritual, more worthy, more significant; but ambition in any direction, by whatever name we may call it, is still ambition. The acquiring of capacity, of technique and efficiency, the desire for the power to do good, for the power to speak, to write, to think clearly, the desire for power in any form, implies ambition, does it not? And does the search for power bring about creation or creativeness? Does creativeness come into being through effort, through advancement, personal or collective? Does creativeness come into being through the cultivation of capacity and efficiency, which is ultimately power? Until we understand the state of being which is creation, until there

is that ingrained sense of creativeness, conflict is inevitable. If we can understand that question of creation, then perhaps we shall be able to act without multiplying the problems through action; and to understand the state of creativeness, surely we must understand the process of effort.

Now, where there is effort to achieve something, obviously there cannot be understanding. Understanding comes only when there is the cessation of the whole process, the whole mechanism of striving to be or not to be, to advance or not to advance. It is really only the imitator who makes an effort to become something and the man who has disciplined his mind according to a certain pattern is obviously an imitator, a copyist. He must make an effort to conform to the pattern, and conformity to the pattern he calls living. However subtle, however hidden and widely extended, any effort in which there is imitation, copy, is obviously not creation. Because most of us are caught in imitation, we have lost the feeling for creation, and having lost it, we get entangled in technique, in making effort more and more perfect, more and more efficient, that is, we develop more and more technical capacity without having the flame; and the search for efficiency in action without the flame is the curse of the present age. Most of us who are concerned with action which we hope will bring about a revolution are caught in action based on an idea, which is merely copy, and therefore it is invalid. Surely, our problem - sociological, religious, individual, collective, or what you will - can be solved only when we understand the whole process, the mechanism of effort; and the understanding of effort is meditation.

So, until we understand and are utterly free from the whole

process of ambition, which is the search for power, for efficiency, for domination, there cannot be creative action; and it is only the creative man who can solve these problems, not the man who is merely copying a pattern, however efficient, however worthy. The search for a pattern is not the search for creation, the search for a pattern is not the search for true revolution. As long as we do not understand the process of effort, in which is implied power, imitation, ambition, there cannot be creation. It is only the creative man who is happy, and only the happy man is virtuous; and the happy, virtuous man is a really creative social entity who will bring about revolution.

There are several questions. To most of us, the problems of life are not very serious, and we want ready made answers. We do not want to delve into the problem, we do not want to think it out completely, fully, and understand the whole significance of it; we want to be told the answer, and the more gratifying the answer, the quicker we accept it. When we are made to think about a problem, when we have to go into it, our minds rebel, because we are not used to enquiring into problems. In considering these questions, if you merely wait for a ready made answer from me, I am afraid you will be disappointed; but if we can go into the question together, think it out anew, not according to old patterns, then perhaps we shall be able to solve the many problems which confront us, and which we are usually so unwilling to look at. We have to look at them, that is, there must be the capacity to face the fact; and we cannot face the fact, whatever it be, as long as we have explanations, as long as words fill our minds. It is words, explanations, memories, that cloud the understanding of the fact.

The fact is always new, because the fact is a challenge; but the fact ceases to be a challenge, it is not new, when we consider it merely as the old and discard it. So, in considering these questions, I hope you and I will think out the problem together. I am not laying down the answer, but we are going to think out each problem together and discover the truth of it.

Question: You seem to be preaching something very akin to the teachings of the 'Upanishads', why then are you upset if someone quotes from sacred books? Do you mean to suggest that you are expounding something no one has ever said before? Does quotation from another person interfere with the peculiar technique of hypnotism which you are employing?

Krishnamurti: Why do you quote and why do you compare? Either you quote because you say, 'By quoting I can compare and understand', or you quote because in your mind you are nothing else but quotation. (Laughter.) Do not laugh, Sirs, just see the truth of the matter. A gramophone record repeats what someone else has said. Has that any validity in the search of truth? Do you understand by quoting the Upanishads or any other book? No book is sacred, I assure you; like the newspaper, it is only words printed on paper, and there is nothing sacred in either. Now, you quote because you think that by quoting and comparing you will understand what I am talking about. Do we understand anything through comparison, or does understanding come only when you deal directly with whatever is said? When you say that the Upanishads have said it, or someone else has said it, what is actually taking place in your psychological process? By saying that someone else has said it, you do not have to think any more about

it, do you? You think you have understood the Upanishads; and when you compare what the Upanishads say with what I am saying, you say it is alike, and you give no further thought to the problem. That is, by comparing you are really seeking a state in which you will not be disturbed. After all, when you have read the Upanishads or the Bhagavad Gita and think you have understood it, you can settle back and keep on repeating it, and it will have no effect on your daily life; you can keep on reading and quoting and be undisturbed, perfectly safe. Then you are very respectable, and you can carry on with your daily life, which is monstrously ugly and stupid; and when someone else comes along and points out something, you immediately compare it with what you have read and you think you have understood. Actually, you are avoiding disturbance; that is why you compare, and that is what I object to.

I do not know whether what I am saying is new or old, I am not interested in whether someone else has said it or not; but what I am really interested in is to find out the truth of every problem - not according to the Upanishads, the Bhagavad Gita, the Bible, or Sankara. When you are seeking the truth of a problem, it is stupid to quote what others have said. Sir, this is not a political meeting, and the question fundamentally is, do you understand anything by comparison? Do you understand life by having your mind full of the sayings of others, by following the experience, the knowledge of others? Or does understanding come only when the mind is still - not made still, which is dullness? Through enquiry, through search, through exploration, inevitably the mind becomes quiet, and then the problem gives its full significance; and it is only when the mind is quiet that there is understanding of the significance of

the problem, not when you are constantly comparing, quoting, judging, weighing. Surely, Sir, the man of knowledge, the scholar, can never know truth; on the contrary, knowledge and erudition must come to an end. The mind must be simple to understand truth, not filled with the knowledge of others or with its own restlessness. Look, if you had no books of any kind, no so-called religious or sacred books, what would you do to find truth? If you were interested in it at all, you would have to search your own heart, you would have to seek out the sacred places of your mind, would you not? You would have to look to yourself, you would have to understand the way your mind is working; because, the mind is the only instrument you have, and if you do not understand that instrument, how can you go beyond the mind? Surely, Sir, those who first wrote the sacred books could not have been copyists, could they? They didn't quote somebody else. But we are quoting because our hearts are empty, we are dry, we have nothing in us. We make a lot of noise, and that we call wisdom; and with that knowledge we want to transform the world, and thereby we make more noise. That is why it is important for the mind which really wants to bring about a fundamental revolution to be free from copy, from imitation, from patterns.

Now, the questioner asks, "Does quotation from another person interfere with the peculiar technique of hypnotism which you are employing?" Am I hypnotizing you? Don't answer me - because the hypnotized man does not know he is being hypnotized. The problem is not whether I am hypnotizing you, but why you are listening to me. If you are listening merely to find a substitute, another leader, another picture to worship and put flowers before,

then what I am saying will be utterly useless. Your walls are already filled with pictures, you have innumerable images, and if you are listening to find further gratification, you will be hypnotized no matter what is said. As long as you are seeking gratification you will find the means that will gratify you, and therefore you will be hypnotized - as most of you are. Those who believe in nationalism are hypnotized; those who believe in certain dogmas about God, about reincarnation, or what you will, are hypnotized by words, by ideas. And you like to be hypnotized, mesmerized, either by another or by yourselves, because in that state you can remain undisturbed; and as long as you are seeking a state in which you will have no disturbance, which you call peace of mind, you will always find the means, the guru - anyone or anything that will give you what you want. That state is hypnosis. Surely, that is not what is taking place here, is it? Actually, I am not giving you anything. On the contrary, I say: wake up from your hypnosis; whether you are hypnotized by your Upanishads, or by the latest guru - be free of them. Look at your own problems; see the truth of the nearest problems, not the farthest, and understand your relationship with society. Surely, that is not to hypnotize you; on the contrary, it is to bring you down to facts, to make you see the facts. The avoidance of the fact, the escape from the fact, is the process of hypnosis, and that is helped along by the newspapers, the cinema, the sacred books, the gurus, the temples, the repetition of words and chants. The fact is not something very extraordinary, the fact is that you are exploiting that you are responsible for the mess in the world; it is you who are responsible, not some economic maladjustment. That is the fact, which you are

unwilling to look at; and as long as you do not want to look at the fact, you will be hypnotized, not by me, but by your own desire, which seeks a way of not being disturbed, of walking along the usual path and becoming respectable. Sir, the respectable man, the so-called religious man, is the hypnotized man, because his ultimate escape is his belief; and that belief is invariably gratifying, it is never disturbing otherwise he would not believe in it.

So, either the desire for comfort, for security, for gratification, for a state of non-disturbance, creates the outside entity who hypnotizes you, or you are inwardly hypnotized by your own desire for security; but to understand truth, the mind must be free. Freedom is not something to be achieved ultimately, it must be at the beginning; but we do not want to be free at the beginning, because to be free at the beginning means inward revolution, a drastic perception of the facts all the time, which demands constant awareness, alertness of mind. Because we do not want to be awake to the facts, we find the usual ways of escape, either in social activities or personal ambition, and the mind which is caught in social activity and ambition is much more hypnotized than the mind which is merely self-enclosed in its personal misery; but both are hypnotized by their own want, by their own desires. You can be free from your own self-hypnosis only when you understand the whole, total process of yourself; therefore, self-knowledge is the beginning of freedom, and without self-knowledge you are perpetually in a state of hypnosis.

Question: You are preaching a kind of philosophical anarchism, which is the favourite escape of the highbrow intellectuals. Will not a community always need some form of regulation and

authority? What social order could express the values you are upholding?

Krishnamurti: Sir, when life is very difficult, when problems are increasing, we escape either through the intellect or through mysticism. We know the escape through the intellect; rationalization, more and more cunning devices, more and more technique, more and more economic responses to life, all very subtle and intellectual. And there is the escape through mysticism, through the sacred books, through worshipping an established idea - idea being an image, a symbol, a superior entity, or what you will - , thinking that it is not of the mind; but both the intellectual and the mystic are products of the mind. One we call the intellectual highbrow, and the other we despise, because it is the fashion now to despise the mystic, to kick him out; but both function through the mind. The intellectual may be able to talk, to express himself more clearly, but he too withdraws himself into his own ideas and lives there quietly disregarding society and pursuing his illusions, which are born of the mind; so I do not think there is any difference between the two. They are both pursuing illusions of the mind, and neither the highbrow nor the lowbrow, neither the mystic, the yogi who escapes, withdraws from the world, nor the commissar, has the answer. It is you and I, ordinary common people, who have to solve this problem without being highbrow or mystical, without escaping either through rationalization, or through vague terms and getting hypnotized by words, by methods of our own self-projection. What you are the world is, and unless you understand yourself, what you create will always increase confusion and misery; but the understanding of yourself is not a

process through which you have to go in order to act. It is not that you must first understand yourself and then act; on the contrary the understanding of yourself is in the very action of relationship. Action is relationship in which you understand yourself, in which you see yourself clearly; but if you wait to become perfect or to understand yourself, that waiting is dying. Most of us have been active, and that activity has left us empty, dry; and once we have been bitten, we wait and do not act further, because we say, 'I won't act until I understand'. Waiting to understand is a process of death; but if you understand the whole problem of action, of living from moment to moment, which does not demand waiting, then understanding is in what you are doing, it is in action itself, it is not separate from living. Living is action, living is relationship, and because we do not understand relationship, because we avoid relationship, we are caught in words; and words have mesmerized us into action that leads to further chaos and misery.

"Will not a community always need some form of regulation and authority?" Obviously there must be authority as long as a community is based on violence. Is not our present social structure based on violence, on intolerance? The community is you and another in relationship; and is not your relationship based on violence? Are you not ultimately out for yourself, either as a commissar or as a yogi? The yogi wants his salvation first, and so does the commissar, only you call it by different names. Is not our present relationship based on violence - violence being the process of self-enclosure, isolation? Is not our daily action a process of isolation? And since each one is isolating himself, there must be authority to bring about cohesion, either the authority of the state,

or the authority of organized religion. To the extent that we have been held together at all, we have been held so far through fear of religion or through fear of government; but a man who understands relationship, whose life is not based on violence, has no need for authority. The man who needs authority is the stupid man, the violent man, the unhappy man - which is yourself. You seek authority because you think that without it you are lost; that is why you have all these religions, illusions, and beliefs, that is why you have innumerable leaders, political as well as religious. In moments of confusion you produce the leader, and that leader you follow; and since he is the outcome of your own confusion, obviously the leader himself must be confused. So, authority is necessary as long as you are producing conflict, misery and violence in your relationships.

"What social order could express the values you are upholding?" Sir, do you understand what values I am upholding? Am I upholding any thing - at least, for those few who have listened with serious intention? I am not giving you a new set of values for an old set of values, I am not giving you a substitution; but I say, look at the very things that you hold, examine them, search out their truth, and the values that you then establish will create the new society. It is not for somebody else to draw up a blueprint which you can follow blindly without knowing what it is all about, but it is for you to find out for yourself the value, the truth of each problem. What I am saying is very clear and simple if you will follow it. Society is your own product, it is your projection. The world's problem is your problem, and to understand that problem you have to understand yourself; and you can

understand yourself only in relationship, not in escapes. Because you escape through them, your religion, your knowledge, have no validity, no significance. You are unwilling to alter fundamentally your relationship with another because that means trouble, that means disturbance, revolution; so you talk about the highbrow intellectual, the mystic, and all the rest of that nonsense. Sir, a new society, a new order, cannot be established by another; it must be established by you. A revolution based on an idea is not a revolution at all. Real revolution comes from within, and that revolution is not brought about through escape, but comes only when you understand your relationships, your daily activities, the way you are acting, the way you are thinking, the way you are talking, your attitude to your neighbour, to your wife, to your husband, to your children. Without understanding yourself, whatever you do, however far you may escape, will only produce more misery, more wars, more destruction.

Question: Prayer is the only expression of every human heart, it is the cry of the heart for unity. All schools of Bhaktimarga are based on the instinctive bent for devotion, Why do you brush it aside as a thing of the mind?

Krishnamurti: Most people pray, you all do, either in a temple, in your private room, or quietly in your own heart. When do you pray? Surely, you pray when you are in trouble. do you not? When you are faced with a serious problem, when you are in sorrow, when there is no one to help you in your difficulty, when you are unhappy, confused, disturbed, and you want someone to help you out - then you pray. That is, prayer is the cry of every human being who seeks someone to help him out of his misery; so prayer is

generally a petition, is it not? It is a supplication to someone outside of yourself, to a separate entity, to help you, and you want to be united with that entity.

Now, Sirs, most of you pray in one way or another, so try to understand what I am talking about; do not resist it, but first find out. I am not mesmerizing you, I am trying to tell you that to resist something new is not to understand it. Do not say that I am condemning prayer, that I think it is futile; because there may be a different approach to the whole problem. Unless you follow this rather closely, I am afraid you won't understand what is going to come out of it. Prayer is a supplication, a petition, an appeal to something out side of ourselves. Is there anything beyond ourselves? Do not quote the Upanishads or Marx, because quotation has no meaning. The Upanishads may say that there is something beyond yourself, and the Marxist may say there is nothing beyond yourself, but both of them may be wrong. You have to find out the truth of it, and to find out the truth of it you have to examine the process of yourself in prayer, you have to understand why you pray. For the moment we are not considering whether there is an answer to prayer, or how the answer comes; we will go into that presently. When you pray, it is taken for granted that you pray to another, to an entity who is superior; who is beyond yourself; but before we go into that, surely we must find out why you pray. What is the process of prayer? First, obviously, we pray because we are confused. A happy man does not pray, does he? A man with joy, with delight, does not pray. It is the man who is in sorrow, the man who is faced with a difficulty, who is in confusion, in pain - it is he who prays; and his prayer is either for

the clarification of his confusion, or it is a supplication for some other need in which there is urgency. So, the man who prays is confused, in misery, in travail; and what happens when he prays? Have you ever observed yourself praying? You either kneel or sit quietly, you take a certain physical posture, don't you? Or, while you are walking, your mind is praying. Now, what happens in that process? Please follow it and you will see. When you pray your mind is repeating certain words, certain Christian or Sanskrit phrases; and the repetition of these phrases makes the mind quiet, does it not? Try it and you will see that if you keep on repeating certain words, certain phrases, the superficial, upper layers of the mind are made quiet - which is not real stillness, but a form of hypnosis. Now, when the upper, the superficial mind is made quiet, what happens? Obviously, the deeper layers of the mind give their intimation, do they not? All the deeper levels of consciousness, the racial accumulations, the individual experiences, the past memories and knowledge - it is all there; but our daily life, our daily activities, are merely on the surface of the mind, and most of us are not concerned at all about the deeper levels. We are concerned with them only when we are disturbed, or occasionally when there is a remembrance, a dream. But obviously the deeper layers of consciousness are always there, and they are ceaselessly acting, waiting, watching; and when the superficial mind, which is ordinarily so completely occupied with its own troubles, necessities, and worries, becomes somewhat quiet, or is made quiet, naturally the inward memories give their intimations; and these intimations we call the Voice of God. But is it the Voice of God? Is it something beyond yourself? When these intimations

come obviously they must be the result of collective and individual experience, of racial memory, which is a little more alert, a little wiser than the superficial mind; but the response is still from yourself, it is not from outside. The collective memories, the collective instincts, the collective idiosyncrasies and responses - all these project the hint into the quiet mind, but it is still from the limited entity, from the conditioned consciousness, it is not from beyond that consciousness. That is how your prayers are answered. You are part of the collective, and your prayers are answered from the collective in yourself; and the response to prayer must be satisfactory to the conscious mind, otherwise you will never accept it. You believe and you pray because you want a way out of your difficulty; and the way out of your difficulty is always satisfying, somehow your prayers are always answered according to your gratifications. So, our prayers, which are supplications, have an answer from our deeper selves, not from beyond our selves.

The next question is: is there something beyond ourselves? To find that out requires quite a different way of thinking, not through prayer, not through meditation, not through quotation, but through understanding the whole process of consciousness. The mind can project ideas about God or reality, but what the mind projects is not beyond the field of thought; and as long as the mind is active in the projection of its own conceptions, it obviously can not find out if there is something beyond itself. To find out if there is something beyond itself, the mind must cease to project, because what ever it can think of is still within the field of thought, whether conscious or unconscious. What the mind can project is not outside the field of it self, and to find out if there is some thing beyond the mind,

the mind as thought must come to an end. Any activity, any movement on the part of the mind, is still its own projection, and as long as thought continues, it can never find what is beyond itself. That which is beyond the mind can be discovered only when the mind is still; and the stilling of the mind is not a process of will, of determined action. The mind that is made still through the action of will is obviously not a still mind, so the problem is how thought can come to an end without willing it to come to an end; because, if I discipline the mind to be still, then it is a dead mind, it is an enclosed mind, it is not a free mind. It is only the free mind that can discover what is beyond itself, and that freedom cannot be imposed on the mind. Imposition is not freedom, discipline is not freedom, conformity is not freedom; but when the mind sees that conformity is not freedom, then it is free. Seeing the fact is the beginning of freedom, which is seeing the false as the false and the true as the true, not at a distant future, but from moment to moment; then only is there that freedom in which the mind can be simple and still, and such a still mind can know what is beyond itself.

Question: Do you accept the law of reincarnation and karma as valid, or do you envisage a state of complete annihilation?

Krishnamurti: Now, most of you probably believe in reincarnation and karma, so please do not resist what I am going to say. Through resistance we do not understand, through exclusion there is no communion; to understand something, we must love it, which means we must be in communion with it and not be afraid of it.

First of all, belief in any form is the denial of truth; a believing

mind is not an exploring mind, a believing mind can never be in a state of experiencing. Belief is merely a tether created by a particular desire. A man who believes in reincarnation cannot know the truth of it, because his belief is merely a comfort, an escape from death, from the fear of non-continuity; such a man cannot find the truth of reincarnation, because what he wants is comfort, not truth, Truth may give him comfort or it may be a disturbing factor; but if he starts with the desire to find comfort, he cannot see the truth. Now, if you are serious, you and I are going to find out the truth of the matter, and what is important is how we approach the problem. How do you and I approach the problem of reincarnation? Are you approaching it through fear, through curiosity, through the desire for continuity? Or, do you want to know what is? I am not avoiding the question. A mind that wants to know the truth, whatever it is, is surely in a different state from the mind which is afraid of death and is seeking comfort, continuity, and therefore clings to reincarnation. Such a mind is obviously not in a state of discovery. So, the approach to the problem matters; and I am taking it for granted that you are approaching the problem rightly, not through any desire for comfort, but to find out the truth of the matter.

Now, what do you mean by reincarnation? What is it that reincarnates? You know there is death, and do what you will, you cannot avoid it. You may postpone death, but this is a fact, which we will go into presently. What is it that reincarnates? It is either one of two things, is it not? Either it is a spiritual entity, or it is a thing which is merely an accumulation of experience, of knowledge, of memory, not only individual but collective, which

takes form again in another life. So, let us examine those two things. What do we mean by a 'spiritual entity'? Is there a spiritual entity in you, something which is not of the mind, which is beyond sensation, something which is not of time, something immortal? You will say, 'Yes' - all religious people do. You say that there is a spiritual entity which is beyond time, beyond the mind, beyond death. Please do not resist, let us think it out. If you say there is a spiritual entity in you, it is obviously the product of thought, is it not? You have been told about it, it is not your experience. As a man is conditioned by being brought up with the idea that there is no spiritual entity, but only the coming together of various social, economic and environmental influences, so you are conditioned to the idea of a spiritual entity, are you not? Even if it is your own discovery that there is a spiritual entity, surely it is still within the field of thought; and thought is the result of time, thought is the product of the past, thought is accumulation, memory. That is, if you can think about the spiritual entity, surely that entity is still within the field of thought, therefore it is the product of thought, the projection of thought; and therefore it is not a spiritual entity. What you can think about is still within the field of thought, so it cannot be something beyond thought.

Now, if there is no spiritual entity, then what is it that reincarnates? And if there is a spiritual entity, can it reincarnate? Is it a thing of time, is it a thing of memory that comes and goes at your convenience, at your desire? If it is born, if it is a process in time, if it has progress, surely it is not a spiritual entity; and if it is not of time, then there can be no question of reincarnating, taking on a new life. So, if the spiritual entity is not, then the 'you' is

merely a bundle of accumulated memories, the `you' is your property, your wife, your husband, your children, your name, your qualities. The accumulation of the experiences of the past in conjunction with the present is the `you', both the conscious and the unconscious, the collective as well as the individual - that whole bundle is the `you; and that bundle asks, `Shall I reincarnate, shall I have continuity, what happens after death?' If there is a spiritual entity, it is beyond thought, it cannot be caught in the net of the mind; and to discover that entity, that spiritual state, the mind must be quiet, it cannot be agitated with the functioning of thought. Now you are asking whether the `you' has continuity - the `you' being the name, the property, the furniture, the memories, the idiosyncrasies, the experiences, the accumulated knowledge. Has that continuity? That is, has conditioned thought a continuity? Obviously, thought has continuity, for that you do not have to enquire far. You have continuity in your children, in your property, in your name; obviously, that continues in one form or another. But you are not satisfied with that continuity, are you? You want to continue as a spiritual entity, not merely as thought, a bundle of reactions - there is no fun in that. But are you anything more than that? Are you anything more than your religion, your beliefs, your caste divisions, your superstitions, traditions and future hopes? Are you anything more than that? You would like to think you are more than that, but the fact is you are that and nothing else. There may be something beyond; but to discover something beyond, all this has to come to an end. So, when you enquire into the problem of reincarnation, you are concerned, not with what is beyond, but with the continuity of thought identified as the `you; and obviously,

there is continuity.

Now, another question involved in this is the problem of death, What is death? Is death merely the ending of the body? And why is it that we are so afraid of death? Because we cling to continuity and we see that there is an ending of continuity when we die, we want assurance of continuity on the other side, and that is why we believe in life after death; but any amount of guarantees of continuity, all the research societies, all the books and information, will never satisfy you. Death is always the unknown; you may have all the information about it, but the known is afraid of the unknown, and will always be. So, one of the problems in this question is this: Is continuity creative? Can that which is continuous discover anything beyond itself? Sir, can that which has continuity know something beyond its own field? That is the problem, and it is a problem which you are unwilling to face - and that is why you are afraid of death. That which continues can never be creative; it is only in ending that there is the new. Only when the known comes to an end is there creation, the new, the unknown; but as long as we cling to the desire for continuity, which is thought identified as the 'me', that thought will continue, and that which continues has in it the seed of death and decay, it is not creative. It is only that which ends that can see the new, the fresh, the whole, the unknown. Sir, this is simple and very clear. As long as you are continuing in the habit of a particular thought, surely you cannot know the new, can you? As long as you cling to your traditions, to your name, to your properties, you cannot know anything new, can you? It is only when you let all that go completely that the new comes. But you dare not let go of the old

because you are afraid of the new; that is why you are afraid of death, and that is why you have all the innumerable escapes. More books are written on death than on life, because life you want to avoid. Living is to you a continuity, and that which continues withers, has no life; it is always afraid of coming to an end - and that is why you want immortality. You have your immortality in your name, in your property, in your furniture, in your son, your clothes, your house; all that is your immortality - you have it, but you want something more. You want immortality on the other side - and you have that too, which is your thought, identified as yourself, continuing; 'yourself' being your furniture, your hats, your substitutions, your beliefs. But should you not find out whether that which continues can ever know the timeless? That which continues implies a process of time, the past, the present and the future. That is, continuance is the past in conjunction with the present breeding the tomorrow, the future, which again breeds another future; and so there is continuity. But does that continuity bring about, can that continuity discover the unknown, the unknowable, the eternal? And if it cannot, what is the point of having that thought, identified as the 'me', continue? The 'me', which is identified thought, must be in a state of ceaseless conflict, constant suffering, perpetual worry over problems, and so on; and that is the lot of continuity. It is only when the mind comes to an end, when it is not identified as the 'me', that you will know that which is beyond time; but merely to speculate what is beyond is a waste of energy, it is the action of a sluggard. So, that which has continuance can never know the real, but that which has an ending shall know the real. Death alone can show the way to reality - not

the death of old age or of disease, but the death of every day, dying every minute, so that you see the new.

In this question is also involved the problem of karma.¹ I wonder if you would rather I discussed this another time? It is already half past seven. Do you want me to go into it?

Comment from the Audience: Yes, Sir.

Krishnamurti: Have you understood what I have said about reincarnation? Have you, Sirs? Why this strange silence? (Interruption.) This is not a discussion, Sir. We will discuss next Tuesday the question of time, and on Thursday evening we will discuss meditation; but if you really think about what has just been said, you will see the extraordinary depth of ending, of dying. The mind that can die every minute shall know the eternal; but the mind that has continuance can never know that which is beyond the mind. Sir that is not a thing to be quoted, discussed; you must live it, and then only you will know the beauty of it, you will know the depth and the significance of dying each minute. Dying is merely the ending of the past, which is memory - not the memory, the recognition of facts, but the ending of the psychological accumulation as the 'me' and the 'mine', and in that ending of identified thought, there is the new.

Now you want me to answer the question on karma. Please approach it with freedom, not with resistance not with superstition, not with your beliefs. Obviously, there is cause and effect. The mind is the result of a cause, you are the result, the product of yesterday, and of many, many thousands of yesterdays; cause and effect are an obvious fact. The seedling has in it both cause and effect. It is specialized; a particular seed cannot become something

different. The seed of wheat is specialized, but we human beings are different, are we not? That which specializes can be destroyed, anything that specializes comes to an end, biologically as well as psychologically; but with us it is different, is it not? We see that cause becomes effect, and what was effect becomes a further cause - it is very simple effect, and what was effect becomes a further cause - it is very simple. Today is the result of yesterday, and tomorrow is the result of today; yesterday was the cause of today, and today is the cause of tomorrow. What was effect becomes cause, so it is a process without an end. There is no cause apart from effect, there is no division between cause and effect, because cause and effect flow into each other; and if one can see the process of cause and effect as it actually operates, one can be free of it. As long as we are concerned with the mere reconciliation of effects, cause takes patterns, and the patterns then become the issue, the motive of action; but is there at any time a line of demarcation where cause ends and effect begins? Surely not, because cause and effect are in constant movement. In fact, there is no cause and no effect, but only a movement of the 'what has been' through the present to the future; and for a mind that is caught in this process of the 'what has been' using the present as a passage to the 'what will be', there is only a result. That is, such a mind is only concerned with results, with the reconciliation of effects, and hence for such a mind there is no escape beyond its own projections. So, as long as thought is caught in the process of cause and effect, the mind can proceed only in its own enclosure, and therefore there is no freedom. There is freedom only when we see that the process of cause and effect is not stationary, static, but in movement; when

understood, that movement comes to an end - and then one can go beyond.

So, as long as the mind is merely responding to stimuli from the past, whatever it does is merely furthering its own misery; but when it sees and understands the fact of this whole process of cause and effect, of this whole process of time, that very understanding of the fact is freedom from the fact. Then only can the mind know that which is not a result or a cause. Truth is not a result, truth is not a cause, it is something which has no cause at all. That which has a cause is of the mind, that which has an effect is of the mind; and to know the causeless, the eternal, that which is beyond time, the mind, which is the effect of time, must come to an end. Thought, which is the effect as well as the cause, must come to an end, and only then can that which is beyond time be known.

March 5, 1950

BOMBAY 5TH PUBLIC TALK 12TH MARCH 1950

This is the last talk that will be held here. I believe there is a talk on Tuesday the 14th at Dadar at 9 o'clock; probably you are already informed about it.

I think it is important, is it not?, to understand the meaning of words, not only superficially, according to the dictionary, but also to see their significance beyond the mere superficial level; because, we are mesmerized by words, and we think that by understanding a word we understand the whole content of that word. The word becomes significant only when we go beyond the superficial level, the ordinary or common usage, and see the deeper meaning of it. We have been mesmerized by certain words like 'God', 'love', 'the simple life'; and, especially in these times when there is so much confusion, when there are so many leaders, books, theories and opinions, we tend to be easily mesmerized by the word 'activity' or 'action'. So, I think it would be worthwhile to go into the problem of what we mean by action, and not merely be hypnotized by that word. We think we are very much alive and active when we keep going, when we are constantly in movement, when we are doing something, either at the club, in politics, in the family, or what you will. We think activity is life; and is it life? Living in the mechanical responses of everyday existence - is that life? Since mere activity takes most of our energy, is it not important to understand and not be mesmerized by the words 'action' and 'activity'? Action is obviously necessary, action is life; but at what level? We act according to opinion, according to memory, we are a whole series of conditioned responses, memories and traditions.

Our action and our morality are based on what has been or what will be, and our thinking, which is obviously the basis of our action, is almost mechanical; most of us are like machines in what we do. You give a machine certain information, and it gives you certain responses; similarly, we receive certain information through our senses, and then respond. So, our thinking and our activities are almost mechanical, and this mechanical thinking with its responses and activity we call 'living'. We are satisfied to live on that level, and we are mesmerized by our leaders, by ourselves, by our environmental influences, to continue living in that state. Now, can we go beyond and find out what is action? To most of us action is mere mechanical response to a challenge. I ask you something, and you reply. There is constant impingement of stimuli, and there is a constant response, conscious or unconscious; and this process of the background, the tradition of what has been, mechanically responding to challenge, to stimuli, is our whole existence, it is our thinking and our activity. Religiously as well as politically, we are always responding to a challenge, and that response we call activity. But is that response, action? Can it ever be action? Surely, it is not action, it is only reaction; and is it possible to go beyond reaction, to go beyond the mechanical process of the mind? We know the structure of the mind, which is merely accumulated information, accumulated experience, the conditioning of the past; and this conditioned mind is always responding, reacting, and this reaction we call action. But action based on reaction must obviously lead to confusion, because there is no newness, there is no freshness, no vitality, no clarity; it is a mechanical response. It is like a motorcar: you put in oil and fuel, start it, keep it going, and

occasionally overhaul it. That is exactly what our life is: a series of mechanical responses to stimuli, to challenge, and this we call living. Obviously, such an approach to any problem can solve it only according to reaction, and a problem that is solved according to reaction is not solved at all.

So, is it possible to go beyond the mechanical responses, and find out what is action? Action is obviously not a response, not a reaction; and it is only when we see that action itself is challenge, that there is a quality of newness. To come to that, one must understand the whole process of thinking, the whole process of responding, reacting; and that is why it is so important to understand oneself. The self is obviously reaction, and to go beyond reaction, there must be complete understanding of the self, of the `me', on all levels, not only on the physical, but also on the psychological. As long as there is reaction, there must be the self, and the understanding of the self is the ending of reaction.

Thinking in terms of reaction with regard to any problem will only multiply the problems, the complexities, the miseries of life; and the ending of reaction, of response, is the understanding of the self, the `me'. The `me' is at all levels; it is still the `me', whether you place it at the highest level, calling it the Atman, the Paramatman or soul, or whether it is the `me' that owns property, that is seeking power, virtue. The `me' is merely reaction, and therefore the ending of reaction is the ending of the self. That is why it is important to understand the whole process of the self, which means, obviously the process of thinking. Because our thinking is based on reaction, it is mechanical. The self is mechanical, and therefore it can respond mechanically; and to go beyond, there must be complete

self-knowledge. The self is reaction, and when there is the understanding of the self, then we will find out what is action, because then action is challenge, then action is not a response, a reaction, it is from the centre which is without a point. Now we always act from a centre with a point, which is the 'me' - my fears, my hopes, my frustrations, my ambitions, my sociological, environmental or religious conditioning; that is the centre from which we react, and as long as that centre is not completely understood, however much we may try to solve our problems, they will only multiply, and the misery, the struggle, the catastrophe, will only increase. To understand that centre with a point is to put an end to reaction and to bring about a centre without a point; and when there is that centre without a point, then there is action, and action is itself challenge.

The understanding of the mind is possible only in relationship, in your relationship to property, to people, and to ideas. At present that relationship is reaction, and a problem that is created by reaction cannot be solved by another reaction; it can be solved only when the whole process of reaction is understood, which is the self, the 'me'. Then you will find there is an action which is not reaction, which is the challenge itself, which is creative; but that state is not realized by closing your eyes and going into deep, peculiar meditation, fancies, and what not. Therefore, religion is self-knowledge, the beginning of the understanding of reaction; and without self-knowledge, there is no basis for thinking, there is only a basis for reaction. The process of reaction is not thinking. Thinking is action without a centre - but then it is no longer thinking, because then there is no verbalization, there is no

accumulation of memory, of experience. We can solve our problems only when we approach them anew, when there is creativeness, and there can be no creativeness if there is mechanical response. A machine is not creative, however marvellously put together; and we have a mind which is marvellously put together, which is mechanical, and which creates problems. To resolve those problems, occasionally we give it a shock, and then more and more shocks; but the shock method is not the solution of a problem. The solution of problems comes only when there is action which is not a reaction, and that is possible only when we understand the whole process of the mind in its relationships in daily life.

So, religion is the understanding of daily life, not a theory or a process of isolation. A religious man who repeats certain words while ruthlessly exploiting others is obviously an escapist; his morality, his respectability, is without any meaning. The understanding of the self is the beginning of wisdom, and wisdom is not reaction. It is only when the whole process of reaction, which is conditioning, is understood, that there is a centre without a point, which is wisdom.

Apparently it is easy to ask questions, for many have been sent in. Out of all those questions, resumes have been made of the more representative ones, and here they are; so if your particular question is not answered exactly as you put it, it is only being answered differently, but the problems are the same. As I answer these questions please do not merely follow on the verbal level what is being said, but experience it as we go along. Let us take the journey together and observe, as it were, every shadow, every

flower, every stone, every dead animal on the road, all the dirt and beauty that lie along the wayside. That is the only way we can solve any of our problems: by clearly, definitely and closely observing everything that we see and feel.

Question: Will you please explain the process of your mind when you are actually speaking here. If you have not gathered knowledge, and if you have no store of experience and memory, from where do you get your wisdom? How do you manage to cultivate it? (Pause.)

Krishnamurti: I am hesitating because I have not seen the questions before. I shall answer spontaneously, so you also will have to follow spontaneously and not think along traditional lines. The question then, is how my mind works, and how I have gathered wisdom. "If you have no store of experience and memory, from where do you get your wisdom? How do you manage to cultivate it?" First of all, how do you know that what I am saying is wisdom? (Laughter.) Sirs, do not laugh. It is easy to laugh and pass it by. How do you know that what I am saying is true? By what measurement, by what yardstick do you measure? Is there a measurement for wisdom? Can you say this is wisdom and that is not? Is sensation wisdom, or is the response to sensation wisdom? Sir, you do not know what wisdom is, therefore you cannot say I am speaking wisdom. Wisdom is not that which you experience, nor is it to be found in a book. Wisdom is not something that you can experience at all, that you can gather, accumulate. On the contrary, wisdom is a state of being in which there is no accumulation of any kind, you cannot gather wisdom.

The questioner wants to know how my mind works. If I may go

into it a little, I will show you. There is no centre from which it is acting there is no memory from which it is responding. There is memory of the road which I took just now, of the road where I live, there is the recognition of people, of incidents; but there is no accumulating process, no mechanical process of gradual gathering, from which comes response. If I did not know the usage of English or some other language, I would not be able to speak.

Communication on the verbal level is necessary in order to understand each other; but it is what is said, how it is said, from where it is said, that is important. Now, when a question is put, if the answer is the response of a mind which has accumulated experiences and memories, then it is merely reaction, and therefore it is not reasoning; but when there is no accumulation, which means no response, then there is no frustration, no effort, no struggle. The accumulating process, the accumulating centre, is like a deep rooted tree in a stream which gathers debris around itself; and thought, sitting on the top of that tree, imagines it is thinking, living. Such a mind is only accumulating, and the mind which accumulates, whether knowledge, money, or experience, is obviously not living. It is only when the mind moves, flows, that there is living.

The questioner wants to know how wisdom is come by, and how to cultivate it. You cannot cultivate wisdom; you can cultivate knowledge, information, but you cannot cultivate wisdom, because wisdom is not a thing that can be accumulated. The moment you begin to accumulate, it becomes mere information, knowledge, which is not wisdom. The entity that cultivates wisdom is still part of thought, and thought is merely a response, a reaction to

challenge. Therefore, thought is merely the accumulation of memory, of experience, of knowledge, and so thought can never find wisdom. Only when there is a cessation of thinking is there wisdom; and there can be cessation of thinking only when there is an end to the process of accumulation - which is the recognition of the 'me' and the 'mine'. While the mind functions within the field of the 'me' and the 'mine', which is merely reaction, there cannot be wisdom. Wisdom is a state of spontaneity which has no centre, which has no accumulating entity. As I am talking I am aware of the words I am using, but I am not reacting from a centre to the question. To find out the truth of a question, of a problem, the process of thinking, which is mechanical and which we know, must come to an end. Therefore, it means there must be complete inward silence, and then only will you know that creativeness which is not mechanical, which is not merely reaction. So, silence is the beginning of wisdom.

Look, Sirs, it is fairly simple. When you have a problem, your first response is to think about it, to resist it, to deny it, to accept it, or to explain it away, is it not? Watch yourself and you will see. Take any problem that arises, and you will see that the immediate response is to resist or to accept it; or, if you do not do either of those things, you justify it, or you explain it away. So, when a question is asked, your mind is immediately set into motion; like a machine, it immediately responds. But if you will solve the problem, the immediate response is silence, not thinking. When this question was asked, my response was silence, complete silence; and being silent, I saw immediately that where there is accumulation there cannot be wisdom. Wisdom is spontaneity, and

there can be no spontaneity or freedom as long as there is accumulation as knowledge, memory. So, a man of experience can never be a wise man, nor a simple man; but the man who is free from the process of accumulation is wise, he knows what silence is; and whatever comes from that silence is true. That silence is not a thing to be cultivated; it has no means, there is no path to it, there is no 'how'. To ask 'how' means cultivating, it is merely a reaction, a response of the desire to accumulate silence. But when you understand the whole process of accumulating, which is the process of thinking, then you will know that silence from which springs action which is not reaction; and one can live in that silence all the time, it is not a gift, a capacity - it has nothing to do with capacity. It comes into being only when you closely observe every reaction, every thought, every feeling, when you are aware of the fact without explanation, without resistance, without acceptance or justification; and when you see the fact very clearly without intervening blocks and screens, then the very perception of the fact dissolves the fact, and the mind is quiet. It is only when the mind is very quiet, not making an effort to be quiet, that it is free. Sir, it is only the free mind that is wise. and to be free the mind must be silent.

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

Krishnamurti: Sir why do you call inaction a crime? There are only two ways of dealing with this, according to you, which is

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

are recognized means of activity, and when you act along either of those two lines, with all their implications, you are satisfied, you feel that at least you are doing something about the war, and people recognize that you are doing it. You feel satisfied and they feel satisfied; and the more carrying of guns, the better.

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

So, the man who carries a gun does not solve the problem, he only increases the problem; for each war produces another war, it is an historical fact. The first world war produced the second world war, the second will produce the third, and so the chain keeps going. Now, when you see that, you react against it and say, 'I am

a pacifist, I won't carry a gun and I will go to prison, I will suffer for it; I have a cause for which I am acting'. The suffering, the martyrdom, is still a reaction, and so it cannot solve the problem either. But the man who is not reacting to war in any way is the challenge itself, he is in himself the breaker of old traditions, and such a man is the only entity that can resolve this problem. That is why it is important to understand yourself, your conditioning, your upbringing, the way you are educated; because, the government, the whole system, is your own projection. The world is you, the world is not separate from you; the world with its problems is projected out of your responses, out of your reactions, so the solution does not lie in creating further reactions. There can be a solution only when there is action which is not reaction, and that can come into being only when you understand the whole process of response to stimuli both from outside and inside, which means that you understand the structure of your own being from which society is created.

Question: We know sex as an inescapable physical and psychological necessity, and it seems to be a root cause of chaos in the personal life of our generation. It is a horror to young women who are victims of man's lust. Suppression and indulgence are equally ineffective. How can we deal with this problem?

Krishnamurti: Why is it that whatever we touch we turn into a problem? We have made God a problem, we have made love a problem, we have made relationship, living a problem, and we have made sex a problem. Why? Why is everything we do a problem, a horror? Why are we suffering? Why has sex become a problem? Why do we submit to living with problems, why do we

not put an end to them? Why do we not die to our problems instead of carrying them day after day, year after year? Surely, sex is a relevant question, which I shall answer presently; but there is the primary question, why do we make life into a problem? Working, sex, earning money, thinking, feeling, experiencing, you know, the whole business of living - why is it a problem? Is it not essentially because we always think from a particular point of view, from a fixed point of view? We are always thinking from a centre towards the periphery; but the periphery is the centre for most of us, and so anything we touch is superficial. But life is not superficial, it demands living completely, and because we are living only superficially, we know only superficial reaction. Whatever we do on the periphery must inevitably create a problem, and that is our life: we live in the superficial and we are content to live there with all the problems of the superficial. So, problems exist as long as we live in the superficial, on the periphery, the periphery being the 'me' and its sensations, which can be externalize or made subjective, which can be identified with the universe, with the country, or with some other thing made up by the mind. So, as long as we live within the field of the mind there must be complications, there must be problems; and that is all we know. Mind is sensation, mind is the result of accumulated sensations and reactions, and anything it touches is bound to create misery, confusion, an endless problem. The mind is the real cause of our problems, the mind that is working mechanically night and day, consciously and unconsciously. The mind is a most superficial thing, and we have spent generations, we spend our whole lives cultivating the mind, making it more and more clever, more and more subtle, more and

more cunning, more and more dishonest and crooked, all of which is apparent in every activity of our life. The very nature of our mind is to be dishonest, crooked, incapable of facing facts, and that is the thing which creates problems, that is the thing which is the problem itself.

Now, what do we mean by the problem of sex? Is it the act, or is it a thought about the act? Surely, it is not the act. The sexual act is no problem to you, any more than eating is a problem to you; but if you think about eating or anything else all day long because you have nothing else to think about, it becomes a problem to you.

(Laughter.) Do not laugh and look at somebody else, it is your life.

So, is the sexual act the problem, or is it the thought about the act?

And why do you think about it? Why do you build it up, which you are obviously doing? The cinemas, the magazines, the stories, the way women dress, everything is building up your thought of sex.

And why does the mind build it up, why does the mind think about sex at all? Why, Sirs and Ladies? It is your problem. Why? Why has it become a central issue in your life? When there are so many things calling, demanding your attention, you give complete

attention to the thought of sex. What happens, why are your minds so occupied with it? Because that is a way of ultimate escape, is it not? It is a way of complete self-forgetfulness. For the time being,

at least for that moment, you can forget yourself - and there is no other way of forgetting yourself. Everything else you do in life

gives emphasis to the 'me', to the self. Your business, your

religion, your gods, your leaders, your political and economic

actions, your escapes, your social activities, your joining one party and rejecting another - all that is emphasizing and giving strength

to the `me'. That is, Sirs, there is only one act in which there is no emphasis on the `me', so it becomes a problem, does it not? When there is only one thing in your life which is an avenue to ultimate escape, to complete forgetfulness of yourself if only for a few seconds, you cling to it because that is the only moment you are happy. Every other issue you touch becomes a nightmare, a source of suffering and pain, so you cling to the one thing that gives complete self-forgetfulness, which you call happiness. But when you cling to it, it too becomes a nightmare, because then you want to be free from it, you do not want to be a slave to it. So you invent, again from the mind, the idea of chastity, of celibacy, and you try to be celibate, to be chaste, through suppression, denial, meditation, through all kinds of religious practices, all of which are operations of the mind to cut itself off from the fact. This again gives particular emphasis to the `me', who is trying to become something, so again you are caught in travail, in trouble, in effort, in pain.

So, sex becomes an extraordinarily difficult and complex problem as long as you do not understand the mind which thinks about the problem. The act itself can never be a problem, but the thought about the act creates the problem. The act you safeguard, you live loosely or indulge yourself in marriage, thereby making your wife into a prostitute, which is all apparently very respectable; and you are satisfied to leave it at that. Surely, the problem can be solved only when you understand the whole process and structure of the `me' and the `mine: my wife, my child, my property, my car, my achievement, my success; and until you understand and resolve all that, sex as a problem will remain. As long as you are

ambitious, politically, religiously, or in any way, as long as you are emphasizing the self, the thinker, the experiencer, by feeding him on ambition whether in the name of yourself as an individual, or in the name of the country, of the party, or of an idea which you call religion - as long as there is this activity of self-expansion, you will have a sexual problem. Surely, you are creating, feeding, expanding yourself on the one hand, and on the other you are trying to forget yourself, to lose yourself if only for a moment. How can the two exist together? So, your life is a contradiction; emphasis on the `me', and forgetting the `me'. Sex is not a problem, the problem is this contradiction in your life; and the contradiction cannot be bridged over by the mind, because the mind itself is a contradiction. The contradiction can be understood only when you understand fully the whole process of your daily existence. Going to the cinemas and watching women on the screen, reading books which stimulate the thought, the magazines with their half-naked pictures, your way of looking at women, the surreptitious eyes that catch you - all these things are encouraging the mind through devious ways to emphasize the self; and at the same time you try to be kind, loving, tender. The two cannot go together. The man who is ambitious, spiritually or otherwise, can never be without a problem, because problems cease only when the self is forgotten, when the `me' is non-existent; and that state of the non-existence of the self is not an act of will, it is not a mere reaction. Sex becomes a reaction; and when the mind tries to solve the problem, it only makes the problem more confused, more troublesome, more painful. So, the act is not the problem, but the mind is the problem, the mind which says it must be chaste. Chastity is not of the mind.

The mind can only suppress its own activities, and suppression is not chastity. Chastity is not a virtue, chastity cannot be cultivated. The man who is cultivating humility is surely not a humble man; he may call his pride humility, but he is a proud man, and that is why he seeks to become humble. Pride can never become humble, and chastity is not a thing of the mind - you cannot become chaste. You will know chastity only when there is love, and love is not of the mind nor a thing of the mind.

So, the problem of sex which tortures so many people all over the world cannot be resolved till the mind is understood. We cannot put an end to thinking; but thought comes to an end when the thinker ceases, and the thinker ceases only when there is an understanding of the whole process. Fear comes into being when there is division between the thinker and his thought; when there is no thinker, then only is there no conflict in thought. What is implicit needs no effort to understand. The thinker comes into being through thought; then the thinker exerts himself to shape, to control his thoughts, or to put an end to them. The thinker is a fictitious entity, an illusion of the mind. When there is a realization of thought as a fact, then there is no need to think about the fact. If there is simple, choiceless awareness, then that which is implicit in the fact begins to reveal itself. Therefore, thought as fact ends. Then you will see that the problems which are eating at our hearts and minds, the problems of our social structure, can be resolved. Then sex is no longer a problem, it has its proper place, it is neither an impure thing nor a pure thing. Sex has its place, but when the mind gives it the predominant place, then it becomes a problem. The mind gives sex a predominant place because it cannot live

without some happiness, and so sex becomes a problem; but when the mind understands its whole process and so comes to an end, that is, when thinking ceases, then there is creation, and it is that creation which makes us happy. To be in that state of creation is bliss, because it is self-forgetfulness in which there is no reaction as from the self. This is not an abstract answer to the daily problem of sex - it is the only answer. The mind denies love, and without love there is no chastity; and it is because there is no love that you make sex into a problem.

Question: Love, as we know and experience it, is a fusion between two people, or between the members of a group; it is exclusive, and in it there is both pain and joy. When you say love is the only solvent of life's problems, you are giving a connotation to the word which we have hardly experienced. Can a common man like me ever know love in your sense?

Krishnamurti: Sir, everybody can know love; but you can know it only when you are capable of looking at facts very clearly, without resistance, without justification, without explaining them away - just look at things closely, observe them very clearly and minutely. Now, what is the thing that we call love? The questioner says that it is exclusive, and that in it we know pain and joy. Is love exclusive? We shall find out when we examine what we call love, what the so-called common man calls love. There is no common man. There is only man, which is you and I. The common man is a fictitious entity invented by the politicians. There is only man, which is you and I who are in sorrow, in pain, in anxiety and fear. Now, what is our life? To find out what love is, let us begin with what we know. What is our love? In the midst of pain and pleasure

we know it is exclusive, personal: my wife, my children, my country, my God. We know it as a flame in the midst of smoke, we know it through jealousy, we know it through domination, we know it through possession, we know it through loss, when the other is gone. So, we know love as sensation, do we not? When we say we love, we know jealousy, we know fear, we know anxiety. When you say you love someone, all that is implied: envy, the desire to possess, the desire to own, to dominate, the fear of loss, and so on. All this we call love, and we do not know love without fear, without envy, without possession; we merely verbalize that state of love which is without fear, we call it impersonal, pure, divine, or God knows what else; but the fact is that we are jealous, we are dominating, possessive. We shall know that state of love only when jealousy, envy, possessiveness, domination, come to an end; and as long as we possess, we shall never love. Envy, possession, hatred, the desire to dominate the person or the thing called 'mine', the desire to possess and to be possessed - all that is a process of thought, is it not? And is love a process of thought? Is love a thing of the mind? Actually, for most of us, it is. Do not say it is not - it is nonsense to say that. Do not deny the fact that your love is a thing of the mind. Surely it is, is it not? Otherwise you would not possess, you would not dominate, you would not say, 'It is mine'. And as you do say it, your love is a thing of the mind; so love, for you, is a process of thought. You can think about the person whom you love; but thinking about the person whom you love - is that love? When do you think about the person whom you love? You think about her when she is gone, when she is away, when she has left you. But when she no longer disturbs you, when

you can say, 'She is mine', then you do not have to think about her. You do not have to think about your furniture, it is part of you - which is a process of identification so as not to be disturbed, to avoid trouble, anxiety, sorrow. So, you miss the person whom you say you love only when you are disturbed, when you are in suffering; and as long as you possess that person, you do not have to think about that person, because in possession there is no disturbance. But when possession is disturbed, you begin to think, and then you say, 'I love that person'. So your love is merely a reaction of the mind, is it not? - which means your love is merely a sensation, and sensation is surely not love. Do you think about the person when you are close to him, Sirs and Ladies? When you possess, hold, dominate, control, when you can say, 'She is mine', or, 'He is mine', there is no problem. As long as you are certain in your possession, there is no problem, is there? And society, everything you have built around you, helps you to possess so as not to be disturbed, so as not to think about it. Thinking comes when you are disturbed - and you are bound to be disturbed as long as your thinking is what you call 'love'. Surely, love is not a thing of the mind; and because the things of the mind have filled our hearts, we have no love. The things of the mind are jealousy, envy, ambition, the desire to be somebody, to achieve success. These things of the mind fill your hearts, and then you say you love; but how can you love when you have all these confusing elements in you? When there is smoke, how can there be a pure flame? Love is not a thing of the mind; and love is the only solution to our problems. Love is not of the mind, and the man who has accumulated money or knowledge can never know love, because

he lives with the things of the mind; his activities are of the mind, and whatever he touches he makes into a problem, a confusion, a misery.

So, what we call our love is a thing of the mind. Look at yourselves, Sirs, and Ladies, and you will see that what I am saying is obviously true; otherwise, our lives, our marriage, our relationships, would be entirely different, we would have a new society. We bind ourselves to another, not through fusion, but through contract, which is called love, marriage. Love does not fuse, adjust - it is neither personal nor impersonal, it is a state of being. The man who desires to fuse with something greater, to unite himself with another, is avoiding misery, confusion; but the mind is still in separation, which is disintegration. Love knows neither fusion nor diffusion, it is neither personal nor impersonal, it is a state of being which the mind can not find; it can describe it, give it a term, a name, but the word, the description, is not love. It is only when the mind is quiet that it shall know love, and that state of quietness is not a thing to be cultivated. Cultivation is still the action of the mind, discipline is still a product of the mind, and a mind that is disciplined, controlled, subjugated, a mind that is resisting, explaining, cannot know love. You may read, you may listen to what is being said about love, but that is not love. Only when you put away the things of the mind, only when your hearts are empty of the things of the mind, is there love. Then you will know what it is to love without separation, without distance, without time, without fear - and that is not reserved to the few. Love knows no hierarchy, there is only love. There are the many and the one, an exclusiveness, only when you do not love. When

you love, Sir, there is neither the `you' nor the `me', in that state there is only a flame without smoke. It is already half past seven, and there is one more question. Do you want me to answer it? You are not tired?

Question: The question of what is truth is an ancient one, and no one has answered it finally. You speak of truth, but we do not see your experiments or efforts to achieve it, as we saw in the lives of people like Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Besant. Your pleasant personality, your disarming smile and soft love, is all that we see. Will you explain why there is such a difference between your life and the lives of other seekers of truth. Are there two truths?

Krishnamurti: Do you want proof? And by what standard shall truth be judged? There are those who say that effort and experiment are necessary for truth; but is truth to be gotten through effort, through experiment, through trial and error? There are those who struggle and make valiant efforts, who strive spectacularly, either publicly or quietly in caves; and shall they find truth? Is truth a thing to be discovered through effort? Is there a path to truth, your path and my path, the path of the one who makes an effort, and the path of the one who does not? Are there two truths, or has truth many aspects?

Now, this is your problem, it is not my problem; and your problem is this, is it not? You say, `Certain people - two, or several, or hundreds - have made efforts, have struggled, have sought truth, whereas you do not make an effort, you lead a pleasant, unassuming life'. So, you want to compare, that is, you have a standard, you have the picture of your leaders who have struggled to achieve truth; and when someone else comes along

who does not fit into your frame, you are baffled, and so you ask. 'Which is truth?' You are baffled - that is the important thing, Sir, not whether I have truth or someone else has truth. What is important is to find out if you can discover reality through effort, will, struggle, striving. Does that bring understanding? Surely, truth is not something distant, truth is in the little things of everyday life, in every word, in every smile, in every relationship, only we do not know how to see it; and the man who tries, who struggles valiantly, who disciplines himself, controls himself, - will he see truth? The mind that is disciplined, controlled, narrowed down through effort - shall it see truth? Obviously not. It is only the silent mind that shall see the truth, not the mind that makes an effort to see. Sir, if you are making an effort to hear what I am saying, will you hear? It is only when you are quiet, when you are really silent, that you understand. If you observe closely, listen quietly, then you will hear; but if you strain, struggle to catch everything that is being said, your energy will be dissipated in the strain, in the effort. So, you will not find truth through effort, it does not matter who says it, whether the ancient books, the ancient saints, or the modern ones. Effort is the very denial of understanding; and it is only the quiet mind, the simple mind, the mind that is still, that is not overtaxed by its own efforts - only such a mind shall understand, shall see truth. Truth is not something in the distance, there is no path to it, there is neither your path nor my path; there is no devotional path, there is no path of knowledge or path of action, because truth has no path to it. The moment you have a path to truth, you divide it, because the path is exclusive; and what is exclusive at the very beginning, will end in

exclusiveness. The man who is following a path can never know truth because he is living in exclusiveness; his means are exclusive, and the means are the end, the means are not separate from the end. If the means are exclusive, the end is also exclusive.

So, there is no path to truth, and there are not two truths. Truth is not of the past or of the present, it is timeless; and the man who quotes the truth of the Buddha, of Sankara, of the Christ, or who merely repeats what I am saying, will not find truth, because repetition is not truth. Repetition is a lie. Truth is a state of being which arises when the mind - which seeks to divide, to be exclusive, which can think only in terms of results, of achievement - has come to an end. Only then will there be truth. The mind that is making effort, disciplining itself in order to achieve an end, cannot know truth, because the end is its own projection, and the pursuit of that projection, however noble, is a form of self worship. Such a being is worshipping himself, and therefore he cannot know truth. Truth is to be known only when we understand the whole process of the mind, that is, when there is no strife. Truth is a fact, and the fact can be understood only when the various things that have been placed between the mind and the fact are removed. The fact is your relationship to property, to your wife, to human beings, to nature, to ideas; and as long as you do not understand the fact of relationship, your seeking God merely increases the confusion because it is a substitution, an escape, and therefore it has no meaning. As long as you dominate your wife or she dominates you, as long as you possess and are possessed, you cannot know love; as long as you are suppressing, substituting as long as you are ambitious, you cannot know truth. It is not the denial of ambition

that makes the mind calm, and virtue is not the denial of evil. Virtue is a state of freedom, of order, which evil cannot give; and the understanding of evil is the establishment of virtue. The man who builds churches or temples in the name of God with the money which he has gathered through exploitation, through deceit, through cunning and foul play, shall not know truth; he may be mild of tongue, but his tongue is bitter with the taste of exploitation, the taste of sorrow. He alone shall know truth who is not seeking, who is not striving, who is not trying to achieve a result. The mind itself is a result, and whatever it produces is still a result; but the man who is content with what is shall know truth. Contentment does not mean being satisfied with the status quo, maintaining things as they are - that is not contentment. It is in seeing a fact truly and being free of it, that there is contentment which is virtue. Truth is not continuous, it has no abiding place, it can be seen only from moment to moment. Truth is always new, therefore timeless. What was truth yesterday is not truth today, what is truth today is not truth tomorrow. Truth has no continuity. It is the mind which wants to make the experience which it calls truth continuous, and such a mind shall not know truth. Truth is always new; it is to see the same smile, and see that smile newly, to see the same person, and see that person anew, to see the waving palms anew, to meet life anew. Truth is not to be had through books, through devotion, or through self-immolation, but it is known when the mind is free, quiet; and that freedom, that quietness of the mind comes only when the facts of its relationships are understood. Without understanding its relationships, whatever it does only creates further problems. But

when the mind is free from all its projections, there is a state of quietness in which problems cease, and then only the timeless, the eternal comes into being. Then truth is not a matter of knowledge, it is not a thing to be remembered, it is not something to be repeated, to be printed and spread abroad. Truth is that which is, it is nameless and so the mind cannot approach it.

March 12, 1950

BOMBAY 6TH PUBLIC TALK 14TH MARCH 1950

This is going to be rather difficult, and I hope those who understand English will have the patience to listen to Marathi. It must be fairly obvious to most of us that a different kind of thinking and action must be brought about in the world, and that requires very careful observation of ourselves, not mere analysis, but deep penetration into the activities of each one of us. The problems of our daily existence are numerous, and we have not the means or the capacity to deal with them; and as our lives are so drab, dull and stupid, we try to escape from them, either intellectually or mystically. Intellectually we become cynical, clever and very learned, or mystically we try to develop some powers or follow some guru, hoping to make our hearts more lovely and give our life more zest. Or, seeing the drabness of our life and the implication of our problems, and seeing that the problems are always on the increase, always multiplying, we think that to bring about a fundamental change we cannot act as individuals, but must act in a mass, collectively. I think it is a great mistake to say that our problems are to be solved through collective or mass action. We believe that individual action is of very little importance and has no place when the problems are so vast, so complex, so demanding; therefore we turn to collective or mass action. We think that if you and I acted individually, it would have very little result, so we join mass movements and take part in collective action. But if we examine collective action very closely, we will see that it is really based on you and me. We seem to regard mass action as the only effective action because it can

produce a result; but we forget that individual action is much more effective, because the mass is composed of many individuals, the mass is not an independent entity, it is not different or separate from you and me.

So, what is important is to understand that any creative, any definitely effective action can be brought about only by individuals, that is, by you and me. Mass action is really an invention of the politician, is it not? It is a fictitious action in which there is no independent thought and action on the part of the individual. If you look at history, all great movements which resulted in collective action began with individuals like you and me, individuals who are capable of thinking very clearly and seeing things as they are; those individuals, through their understanding, invite others, and then there is collective action. After all, the collective is composed of individuals, and it is only the response of the individual, of you and me, that can bring about a fundamental alteration in the world; but when the individual does not see his responsibility, he throws the responsibility onto the collective, and the collective is then used by the clever politician, or by the clever religious leader. Whereas, if you see that you and I are responsible for the alteration of the conditions in the world, then the individual becomes extraordinarily important, and not merely an instrument, a tool in the hands of another.

So, you, the individual, are part of society, you are not separate from society; what you are, society is. Though society may be an entity apart from you, you have created it, and therefore you alone can change it. But instead of realizing our responsibility as individuals in the collective, we as individuals become cynical,

intellectual or mystical, we avoid our responsibility towards definite action which must be revolutionary in the fundamental sense; and as long as the individual, which is you and I, does not take responsibility for the complete transformation of society, society will remain as it is.

We seem to forget that the world problem is the individual problem, that the problems of the world are created by you and me as individuals. The problems of war, starvation, exploitation, and all the other innumerable problems that confront each one of us, are created by you and me; and as long as we do not understand ourselves at every level, we will maintain the rottenness of the present society. So, before you can alter society, you have to understand what your whole structure is, the manner of your thinking, the manner of your action, the ways of your relationship with people, ideas and things. Revolution in society must begin with revolution in your own thinking and acting. The understanding of yourself is of primary importance if you would bring about a radical transformation in society; and the understanding of yourself is self-knowledge. Now, we have made self-knowledge into something extra ordinarily difficult and remote. Religions have made self-knowledge very mystical, abstract and far away; but if you look at it more closely, you will see that self-knowledge is very simple and demands simple attention in relationship, and it is essential if there is to be a fundamental revolution in the structure of society. If you, the individual, do not understand the ways of your own thought and activities, merely to bring about a superficial revolution in the outer structure of society is to create further confusion and misery.

If you do not know yourself, if you follow another without knowing the whole process of your own thinking and feeling, you will obviously be led to further confusion, to further disaster.

After all, life is relationship, and without relationship there is no possibility of life. There is no living in isolation, because living is a process of relationship; and relationship is not with abstractions, it is your relationship to property, to people and to ideas. In relationship you see your self as you are, whatever you are, ugly or beautiful, subtle or gross; in the mirror of relationship you see precisely every new problem, the whole structure of yourself as you are. Because you think that you cannot alter your relationship fundamentally, you try to escape intellectually or mystically, and this escape only creates more problems, more confusion and more disaster. But if, instead of escaping, you look at your life in relationship and understand the whole structure of that relationship, then there is a possibility of going beyond that which is very close. Surely, to go very far you must begin very near; but to begin near is very difficult for most of us, because we want to escape from what is, from the fact of what we are. Without understanding our selves, we cannot go far; and we are in constant relationship, there is no existence at all without relationship. So, relationship is the immediate, and to go beyond the immediate, there must be the understanding of relationship. But we would much rather examine that which is very far away, that which we call God or truth, than bring about a fundamental revolution in our relationship; and this escape to God or to truth is utterly fictitious, unreal. Relationship is the only thing that we have, and without understanding that relationship we can never find out what reality

is or God is. So, to bring about a complete change in the social structure, in society, the individual must cleanse his relationship, and the cleansing of relationship is the beginning of his own transformation.

I am going to answer some questions which have been handed to me. Now, in considering these questions, I shall not give any definite conclusion or final answer, because what is important is to find out the truth of the problem; and the truth is not in the answer, but in the problem itself. Most of us are accustomed to repeat what we have been told, to recite something that we have learnt from a book; and so, in putting questions, we expect answers which will fit into our particular ways of thinking. We think we understand the problems of life by quoting some sacred book, which merely makes us into gramophone records; and if the song is not the same, we get lost. The so-called religious person and the so-called non-believer are both repeating machines. They are neither religious nor revolutionary, they merely repeat a formula, and repetition does not make one a religious or a revolutionary person. So, in considering these questions, let us travel together and go into the problem fully and extensively, not merely look at it from outside.

Question: Political freedom has not yet brought a new faith and joy. We find every where cynicism, communal and linguistic antagonism, and class hatred. What is your diagnosis and remedy for this tragic situation?

Krishnamurti: Sir, this is not a problem only in India, but a problem all over the world. It is a world problem, not merely an Indian problem. Now, one of the factors of disintegration is when people divide themselves into communal, linguistic or sectional

groups. We seem to think that through nationalism we shall be able to solve our problems; but nationalism, however widely extended, is an exclusion, it is still separatism, and where there is separatism there is disintegration. Though full of promise at the beginning, full of hope, joy and expectation, nationalism becomes a poison, as you can see in this country - and that is exactly what is happening in every country. How can there be unity when there is exclusion? Unity implies no separation into Hindu and Mussulman. Unity is destroyed when it becomes exclusive, when it is limited to a particular group. Unity is not the opposite of exclusion; it is the inner integration of the whole being of the individual in himself, not mere identification with a particular group or society. Why are you nationalist, why do you belong to a particular class? Why this emphasis on a name? Let us examine this process of identification with a country, with a people, with a linguistic group, and so on. Why is it that you call yourself a Hindu? Why is it that you call yourself an Indian, a Gujerathi, or by some other name? Is it not because through identification with something greater, you feel yourself to be greater? In yourself you are nobody, you are dry, empty, hollow; and by identifying yourself with something greater called India, England or some other country, you think you become important. So, your calling yourself a nationalist, your identifying yourself with a particular country, obviously indicates that in yourself you are empty, dull, dry, ugly; and in identifying yourself with something greater you are merely escaping from what you are. Now, such identification must lead to disintegration; because you as an individual are the basis of all society, and if you are dishonest in your own thinking, the society you produce or project

outside of yourself will be founded on dishonesty, without any fundamental reality. And the clever politicians or religious leaders use nationalism as a means of producing a result which is merely artificial, because it is without the understanding of the whole structure of human thought and feeling. We seem to think that by gaining independence we have achieved freedom. Freedom is not achieved, it does not come through mere political independence. Freedom comes when there is happiness. By merely exchanging a white bureaucracy for a brown bureaucracy you are not free, are you? You are still the exploiter and the exploited, you are still saddled with the clever politicians and the innumerable leaders who are trying to lead you to God knows what. Nationalism is like a poison that is working subtly - and before you know what is happening you are in the middle of a war. Sovereign governments with their nationalism and armed forces must lead to war; and to avoid war is not to become a mere pacifist or to join an anti-war movement, but to understand the whole structure of ourselves as human entities, as individuals in relationship with each other, which is society.

So, to understand yourself is much more important than to call yourself by a name. A name is readily exploited; but if you understand yourself, no one can exploit you. Nationalism always produces war, and the problem is not to be solved by bringing about further nationalism, which is only an avoidance of the fact and an extension of the same poison, but by being free of nationalism, of the sense of belonging to a particular group, to a particular class or society.

Question: Can the starving and ignorant people of this land

understand your message? How can it have any meaning or significance for them?

Krishnamurti: The problem of starvation and unemployment is not only in this country, though it is much more aggravated here, but it exists all over the world. It has definite causes, and until we understand those causes merely to scratch on the surface will have no result. Nationalism is one of the causes, separate sovereign governments is another. There is enough scientific knowledge to bring about conditions so that people all over the world can have food, clothing and shelter. Why is it not done? Is it not because we are quarrelling over systems? Realizing that there is starvation and unemployment in the world, we turn to systems and formulae which promise a better future; and have you ever noticed that those who have a system for the solution of unemployment and starvation are always fighting another system? So, systems become much more important than the solution of the problem of starvation itself. The fact of starvation can never be solved by an idea, because ideas will only produce more conflict, more opposition; but facts can never produce opposition. There is starvation and unemployment in this country and throughout the world; and seeing the problem, we approach it with an idea about the problem. So, idea, theory, system, becomes much more important than the fact. That is, we turn from the fact to a theory, an idea, a belief about the fact, and around the belief groups are being formed, and these groups battle and liquidate each other, and the fact remains. (Laughter.) What is important is the understanding of the fact, not an idea about the fact; and that understanding does not depend on idea. Idea is merely a fabrication of the mind, but understanding is

not a result of the mind. We have enough intelligence and capacity and knowledge to solve the fact of starvation and unemployment; but what prevents us from solving it is our idea about the solution. The fact is there, and we have created several approaches to the fact: there is the approach of the yogi, of the communist, of the capitalist, of the socialist, and so on. Now, can the fact be grasped through a particular approach? A particular approach must obviously prevent the understanding of the fact. So, the fact of starvation and unemployment can be solved only when idea, belief, does not interfere with the understanding of the fact. That means, does it not?, that you, who are part of society, must be free of nationalism, free of belief in a particular religion, free of identification with a particular idea or group. So, the solution of this problem is not in the hands of the commissar or the yogi, but in your hands, because it is what you are that prevents the solution of all these problems. If you are a nationalist, if you belong to a particular class or caste, if you have narrow religious traditions, obviously you are hindering the welfare of man.

Question: Are you not against institutional marriage?

Krishnamurti: Please listen carefully and hear intelligently, do not merely oppose or resist. It is so easy to be against something, it is so stupid to resist without understanding. Now, the family is exclusive, is it not? The family is a process of identification with the particular; and when society is based on this idea of family as an exclusive unit in opposition to other exclusive units, such a society must inevitably produce violence. We use family as a means of security for ourselves, for the individual, and where there is search for individual security, for individual happiness, there

must be exclusion. This exclusion is called `love; and in that so-called family or married state, is there really love? Now, let us examine what the family actually is, and not cling to a theory about it. We are not considering the ideal of what it should be, but let us examine exactly what the family is as you know it. You mean by family, your wife and children, do you not? It is a unit in opposition to other units; and in that unit it is you who are important - not your wife, not your children or society, but you who are seeking security, name, position, power, both in the family and outside the family. You dominate your wife, she is subservient to you; you are the maker and the dispenser of money, and she is your cook and the bearer of your children. (Laughter). So, you create the family which is an exclusive unit in opposition to other units; you multiply by millions and produce a society in which the family is an exclusive, self-isolating, separative entity, antagonistic and opposed to another. All revolutions try to do away with the family, but invariably they fail because the individual is constantly seeking his own security through isolation, exclusion, ambition and domination. So, the family, which you have created as a separative unit, becomes a danger to the collective, which is also the result of the individual; therefore there can be no reform in the collective as long as you, the individual, are exclusive and self-isolating in every action, narrowing down your interest to yourself.

Now, this process of exclusion is surely not love. Love is not a creation of the mind. Love is not personal, impersonal, or universal - those words are merely of the mind. Love is something that cannot be understood as long as thought, which is exclusive, remains. Thought, which is the reaction of the mind, can never

understand what love is; thought is invariably exclusive, separative, and when thought tries to describe love, it must of necessity enclose it in words which are also exclusive. The family as we know it is the invention of the mind, and therefore it is exclusive, it is a process of the enlargement of the self, of the 'me', which is the result of thought; and in the family to which we cling so constantly, so desperately, surely there is no love, is there? We use that word 'love', we think we love, but actually we do not, do we? We say that we love truth, that we love the wife, the husband, the children; but that word is surrounded by the smoke of jealousy, envy, oppression, domination and constant battle. So, family becomes a nightmare, it becomes a battle field between the two sexes, and therefore family invariably becomes opposed to society. The solution lies, not in legislation to destroy the family, but in your own understanding of the problem; and the problem is understood and therefore comes to an end only when there is real love. When the things of the mind do not fill the heart, when individual ambition, personal success and achievement do not predominate, when they have no place in your heart, then you will know love.

Question: Why are you trying to shake our belief in God and religion? Is not some faith necessary for spiritual endeavour, both individual and collective?

Krishnamurti: Why do we need faith, why do we need belief? If you observe, is not belief one of the factors that separate man from man? You believe in God, and another does not believe in God, so your beliefs separate you from each other. Belief throughout the world is organized as Hinduism, Buddhism, or Christianity, and so

it divides man from man. We are confused, and we think that through belief we shall clear the confusion; that is, belief is superimposed on the confusion, and we hope that confusion will thereby be cleared away. But belief is merely an escape from the fact of confusion; it does not help us to face and to understand the fact, but to run away from the confusion in which we are. To understand the confusion, belief is not necessary, and belief only acts as a screen between ourselves and our problems. So, religion, which is organized belief, becomes a means of escape from what is, from the fact of confusion. The man who believes in God, the man who believes in the hereafter, or who has any other form of belief, is escaping from the fact of what he is. Do you not know those who believe in God, who do Puja, who repeat certain chants and words, and who in their daily life are dominating, cruel, ambitious, cheating, dishonest? Shall they find God? Are they really seeking God? Is God to be found through repetition of words, through belief? But such people believe in God, they worship God, they go to the temple every day, they do everything to avoid the fact of what they are - and such people you consider respectable, because they are yourself.

So, your religion, your belief in God, is an escape from actuality, and therefore it is no religion at all. The rich man who accumulates money through cruelty, through dishonesty, through cunning exploitation, believes in God; and you also believe in God, you also are cunning, cruel, suspicious, envious. Is God to be found through dishonesty, through deceit, through cunning tricks of the mind? Because you collect all the sacred books and the various symbols of God, does that indicate that you are a religious

person? So, religion is not escape from the fact; religion is the understanding of the fact of what you are in your everyday relationships, religion is the manner of your speech, the way you talk, the way you address your servants, the way you treat your wife, your children and neighbours. As long as you do not understand your relationship with your neighbour, with society, with your wife and children, there must be confusion; and whatever it does, the mind that is confused will only create more confusion, more problems and conflict. A mind that escapes from the actual, from the facts of relationship, shall never find God, a mind that is agitated by belief shall not know truth. But the mind that understands its relationship with property, with people, with ideas, the mind which no longer struggles with the problems which relationship creates, and for which the solution is not withdrawal, but the understanding of love - such a mind alone can understand reality. Truth cannot be known by a mind that is confused in relationship, or that escapes from relationship into isolation, but by the mind that understands itself in action; and only such a mind shall know the truth. A quiet mind, a silent mind, cannot come into being through any form of compulsion, through any form of discipline, because the mind is quiet only when it understands its relationship to property, to people and to ideas, and, do what it will, the mind is not quiet when it is disturbed by the fact of its relationship to these. The mind that is made quiet without understanding its relationship, is a dead mind; but the mind that has no belief, that is quiet because it understands relationship, such a mind is silent, creative, and it shall know reality.

March 14, 1950

COLOMBO CEYLON 1ST PUBLIC TALK 25TH DECEMBER, 1949

I think it is important to know how to listen. Most of us do not really listen at all; we are so accustomed to putting away the things we don't want to hear, that we have almost become deaf to the problems that concern us. It is important, is it not?, how we listen to everything that is going on about us; how we listen, not only to the song of the birds, the sounds in nature, but to each other's voices - that is, how extensively we are aware of the problems of the day at different levels. Because, it is only in hearing rightly, and not as we want to hear, that we begin to understand the many problems, whether economic, social or religious. Life itself is a complex problem which cannot be solved at any one particular level. So we must be able to listen completely and fully, particularly to what is being said. This evening, at least, we might try to listen so that we understand each other as fully as we can. The difficulty is that most of us listen with prejudice to what is being said; we come to a conclusion about what is being said based on our own ideas, and our minds are already made up. We compare what is being said with the words of some other teacher, and naturally our reaction is conditioned and not a direct response to what is being said. So, if I may suggest it this evening, please listen fully without any prejudice, without any conclusion, without comparing; listen to find out what is actually being said. Because, the world is in a very terrible state; and whether you have riches, own several cars, a comfortable house, a good bank account, or have barely enough to live; whether you belong to a particular

religious or political party, or to none, these problems have to be understood. I shall be dealing with these problems during the next five weeks, not only here, but also at the discussions to be held on Tuesdays and Thursdays; and we must first learn the art of listening - which is quite a difficult task - so that we get the full significance of what is being said. You cannot get the full significance of what is being said if you listen through the screen of your own prejudice; and the art of listening consists in removing that prejudice, if only for the time being and trying to understand the problem completely. Thus we shall be able to deal with the problems that arise every day in our lives.

Now, we all have problems, have we not?, and we cannot shut our eyes to them or approach them with a pattern of action, either of the left or of the right, with a prejudice which we have formed out of our own knowledge or the knowledge of experts. Surely, the problem is always new; any problem is always new at any level; and if we approach the problem with a pattern of action, whether of the left, the right or the centre, then our response is obviously conditioned, which creates a barrier in understanding the problem itself. That is our difficulty. Life is a process of challenge and response - otherwise there is no life. Life is a response, a reaction to a demand, to a challenge, to a stimulus; and if our response is conditioned, obviously that creates conflict, which is a problem. Consciously or unconsciously, whether we are aware of it or not, most of us are in conflict, in turmoil; and to understand this inward confusion which has brought about confusion outwardly, whether political, religious or economic, we must know how to approach the problem, how to approach this enormous and increasing

confusion and misery. There is no decrease, no lessening of sorrow, politically, religiously, socially, or in any other way.

Whatever we do, whatever religious or political leaders we follow, creates further disaster; and our problem is how to act so that very action does not create a new problem, does not produce a further catastrophe; so that reformation does not need further reform. That is the situation each one of us has to face.

Surely, this increasing confusion arises because we approach the problem with a pattern of action, with an ideology, whether political or religious. Organized religion obviously prevents the understanding of the problem because the mind is conditioned by dogma and belief. Our difficulty is how to understand the problem directly, not through any particular religious or political conditioning; how to understand the problem so that the conflict may cease, not temporarily but completely, so that man can live fully, without the misery of tomorrow or the burden of yesterday. Surely, that is what we must find out: how to meet the problem anew; because, every problem, whether political, economic, religious, social, or personal, is ever new, and it cannot be met with the old. Perhaps this is putting it in a way different from that to which you are accustomed, but it is actually the issue. After all, life is a constantly changing environment. We would like to sit back and be comfortable, we would like to shelter ourselves in religion and belief, or in knowledge based on particular facts. We would like to be comfortable, we would like to be gratified, we would like not to be disturbed; but life, which is ever changing, ever new, is always disturbing to the old. So, our question is, how to meet the challenge afresh. We are the result of the past, our thought is the

outcome of yesterday; and with yesterday we obviously cannot meet today, because today is new. When we approach the new with yesterday, we are continuing the conditioning of yesterday in understanding today. So our problem in approaching the new is how to understand the old, and therefore be free of the old. The old cannot understand the new - you cannot put new wine in old bottles. So, it is important to understand the old, which is the past, which is the mind based on thinking. Thought, idea, is the outcome of the past; whether it is historical or scientific knowledge, or mere prejudice and superstition, idea is obviously the outcome of the past. We would not be able to think if we had no memory; memory is the residue of experience, memory is the response of thought. To understand the challenge, which is new, we have to understand the total process of the self which is the outcome of our past, the outcome of our conditioning, environmentally, socially, climatically, politically, economically - the whole structure of ourselves. Therefore, to understand the problem is to understand ourselves; the understanding of the world begins with the understanding of ourselves. The problem is not the world, but you in relationship with another, which creates a problem; and that problem extended becomes the world problem. So, to understand this enormous, complex machine, this conflict, pain, confusion, misery, we must begin with ourselves - but not individualistically, in opposition to the mass. There is no such thing as that abstraction called the mass; but when you and I do not understand ourselves, when we follow a leader and are hypnotized by words, then we become the mass and are exploited. So, the solution to the problem is not to be found in isolation, in withdrawal to a monastery, to a

mountain or a cave, but in understanding the whole problem of ourselves in relationship. You cannot live in isolation; to be, is to be related. So, our problem is relationship, which causes conflict, which brings misery, constant trouble. As long as we do not understand that relationship, it will be a source of endless pain and struggle. Understanding ourselves, which is self-knowledge, is the beginning of wisdom; and for self-knowledge you cannot go to a book - there is no book that can teach it to you. Know yourself; and once you understand yourself, you can deal with the problems that confront each one of us every day. Self-knowledge brings tranquillity to the mind, and then only can truth come into being. Truth cannot be sought after. Truth is the unknown, and that which you seek is already known. Truth comes into being unsought when the mind is without prejudice, when there is the understanding of the whole process of ourselves.

Several questions have been sent in, and I am going to answer some of them. It is very easy to ask questions. Anybody can ask a flippant or stupid question, but to ask the right question is much more difficult. Only in asking a right question is there a right answer, because only then is the problem of the questioner revealed.

Question: You say that you are not going to act as a guru to anyone. Cannot one who has understood the truth convey his understanding to another to help him also to understand?

Krishnamurti: Surely, whether a guru is necessary or not is not important: the problem is why we want a guru, why we seek a guru. That is the problem, isn't it? If we can understand that, then we will find out whether truth can be conveyed to another. Why do

you need a guru, a teacher, a leader, a guide? Obviously you will say, "I need him because I am confused, I do not know what to do, and I am seeking truth." Let us not deceive ourselves about it. You don't know what truth is, therefore you go to a teacher, asking him to teach you what truth is. You want someone to help you, to guide you out of your confusion; you are unhappy, and you want to be happy; you are dissatisfied, and you want to be satisfied. So, you choose your guru according to your satisfaction. (Laughter). May I suggest something? When you laugh at something serious, it indicates a very superficial state of mind. By laughing, you pass off the disturbing idea; so, if I may suggest, let us be a little more serious. Because, our problems are very serious, and we cannot approach them like flighty schoolboys - which is the way we are behaving, though we may have grey beards.

So, the question is, not whether a guru is necessary, but why do we want one? We want someone to give us a comforting hand - that is what we want. We don't want the truth, because the truth can be extraordinarily disturbing. We really don't want to understand what truth is, so we go to a guru to give us the satisfaction we want; and as we are confused, obviously we choose a guru or a leader who is also confused. When we choose a guru out of our confusion, that guru must also be confused, otherwise we wouldn't choose him. To understand yourself is essential, and a guru who is worthy of that name must obviously tell you that. But to most of us, this is a tiresome business; we want quick relief, a panacea, so we turn to a guru who will give us a satisfactory pill. We are searching not for truth but for comfort; and the man who gives us comfort, enslaves us.

Can truth be conveyed to another? I can give you a description of something which is over, which is past, and therefore not real; I can tell you about the past, and we can communicate with each other on the verbal level about what is known; but we cannot communicate with each other about something which we are not experiencing. Description is always of the past, not the present; therefore the present cannot be described; and reality is only in the present. So, when you go to another to be told what truth is, he can only tell you of the experience which is over; and the experience which is over is not truth, it is merely knowledge. Knowledge is not wisdom; there can be description on the verbal level of knowledge and facts, but to describe something which is in constant movement is impossible. That which is described is not truth. Truth must be experienced from moment to moment; and if you meet today with the measure of yesterday, you will not understand truth.

So, a guru is not essential. On the contrary, a guru is an impediment. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. No guru can give you self-knowledge; and without self-knowledge, do what you will, act in any manner you like, follow any leader, any social or religious pattern - you are only creating further misery. But when through self-knowledge the mind is free of impediments and limitations, then truth comes into being.

Question: You are reported as having said that ideas are not going to bring people together. Please explain how, according to you, people can be brought together to create a better world.

Krishnamurti: Let us find out what we mean by ideas; and as I have said, please listen, not with prejudice, not with a conclusion,

but listen as you would to someone whom you really like. What do you mean by ideas, what do you mean by belief, what do you mean by ideology? Let us think this out, investigate together. Do ideas bring people together, or separate people? Idea is obviously the verbal version of thought. Thought is response to conditioning, is it not? You are Sinhalese, Buddhists, Christians, or what you will, and your thought is conditioned according to your background. Background is memory, obviously; memory responds to stimulus, to challenge, and the response of memory to challenge is called thinking. Surely, you think according to the pattern in which you have been brought up - as Buddhists, as Christians, according to the left or the right, or God knows what. You are conditioned to believe certain things, and not to believe other things. That conditioning is memory, and the response of memory is thought. Thought examines ideas, and being conditioned, responds according to that conditioning, going either to the left or to the right. So, ideas gather people according to the particular pattern in which they have been brought up; and obviously ideas can oppose ideas.

As it is perhaps a little too abstract, let us put it differently. Suppose you are a real Buddhist, not a verbal Buddhist, but an active one - what does it mean? You believe in certain things and act according to that belief; and a Christian or a Communist will act according to a different ideology. How can these two ideas ever meet? Each idea, each thought, is the result of its own conditioning; and how can one idea meet another? All one idea can do is to expand and gather people around itself, as also does any other idea. So, ideas can never bring about unity. On the contrary,

they divide people. You are a Christian, I am a Buddhist, another is a Hindu or a Mussulman; I believe, you don't believe; so we are at loggerheads. Why? Why are we so divided by ideas? Because that is the only thing we have - the word is the only thing we have; therefore ideas have become extraordinarily important, and we gather around ideas to act: the Christian in opposition to the Communist, Labour in opposition to Capitalism, Capitalism in opposition to Socialism. Idea is not action, idea prevents action. We will have to think it out, we will go into it at another discussion. Action based upon idea divides people. That is why there is starvation in the world, there is hunger, there is misery, there is war. We have ideas about it; but idea prevents our understanding of the problem, because the problem is not an idea. The problem is pain and conflict. It is very comforting to have an idea about pain, suffering, trouble, exploitation; then you can talk about it and not act. Think it out and you will see, if you are really going into the problem and not merely reacting according to a certain pattern, that ideas are dividing people. Have you not noticed? You Sinhalese are fighting for nationalism, which is just an idea; Hindus are against Europeans, Germans and Americans against Russians. All over the world nationalism, which is an idea, prevents people from coming together; and because nationalism is elementarily gratifying and stupid, you are satisfied with it. Everywhere the word "nationalism" arises like a wall and keeps people apart. So, throughout the world, ideas are separating people, setting man against man. The ideas which we worship are the very denial of love; they have no significance, they cannot bring about a radical transformation. To bring about this fundamental revolution.

you must begin to understand yourself; it is only then that you can bring about unity and not through ideas.

Question: I feel uncertain about everything and consequently find it difficult to act well, as I fear that my action will only lead to further confusion. Is there a way I can act in the matter to avoid confusion?

Krishnamurti: Obviously, without knowing yourself, whatever you do is bound to increase confusion; if you don't know the whole structure of your being, your action will inevitably create mischief, though you may have a perfect pattern of conduct. That is why reformation, revolution according to a pattern, is a disintegrating factor in society: it merely carries on the past in a modified way. Self-knowledge, which you cannot buy in a book or get from any teacher, is to be discovered in relationship with people, with ideas. Relationship is a mirror in which you see yourself as you are. Nothing can live in isolation. One must understand relationship and not merely condemn it, justify it or identify oneself with it. We condemn because that is the easiest way to get rid of something, like putting a child in the corner. If I want to understand my child, my neighbour, my wife, I must study that person, I must be aware in my relationship with that person, mustn't I? So, to act without increasing confusion is possible only through self-knowledge.

Question: You are reported as having said that religion cannot provide a solution to the problems of humanity. Is that correct?

Krishnamurti: Now, what do we mean by religion? As we know it, it is organized belief, dogma, action according to a particular pattern, is it not? Organized belief is the experience of someone else arranged according to a pattern of yesterday, and you are

conditioned by that belief. Is that religion? The pattern may be of the left, of the right, or of the centre; or it may be a so-called divine plan - there is not much difference between them; all have their ideals, all have their Utopia or heaven, so all may be called religion, each perpetuating exploitation. Now, is that religion? Obviously, belief, with its authority and dogmas, with its pageantry and sensation, is not religion. So, what is religion? That is our question. It is simply a word. The word "door" is not a door, but only the symbol of something else. Similarly, religion is something behind the conditioned response evoked by that word, which means that we have to discover the thing behind the word. That thing is the unknown, isn't it? What you know has already receded into the past. There must be direct experiencing of what is; and for this the first requirement is freedom, which means you must be free of the false, which is belief, not at the end but at the beginning. You must have the freedom to discover what is false - surely that is religion. The whole process of yourself must be understood; for without understanding yourself, there is no wisdom. The beginning of wisdom is the understanding of yourself, and that is meditation.

December 25 1949

COLOMBO CEYLON 2ND PUBLIC TALK 1ST JANUARY 1950

We were saying how important it is, before we ask what to do or how to act, to discover what is right thinking; because, without right thinking, obviously there cannot be right action. Action according to a pattern, according to a belief, has set man against man, as we discussed last Sunday. There can be no right thinking as long as there is no self-knowledge; because, without self-knowledge, how can one know what one is actually thinking? We do a great deal of thinking, and there is a great deal of activity; but such thought and action produce conflict and antagonism, which we see, not only in ourselves, but also about us in the world. So, our problem is, is it not?, how to think rightly, which will produce right action, thereby eliminating the conflict and confusion which we find not only in ourselves, but in the world about us.

Now, to find out what is right thinking, we must enquire into what don't know what we think, or if our thought is based on the background which is our conditioning, whatever we think is obviously merely a reaction and therefore leads to further conflict. So, before we can find out what is right thinking, we have to know what is self-knowledge. Self-knowledge, surely, is not mere learning a particular kind of thinking. Self-knowledge is not based on ideas, belief, or conclusion. It must be a living thing, otherwise it ceases to be self-knowledge and becomes mere information. There is a difference between information which is knowledge, and wisdom which is knowing the processes of our thoughts and feelings. But most of us are caught up in information, superficial

knowledge, and so we are incapable or going much deeper into the problem. To discover the whole process of self-knowledge, we have to be aware in relationship. Relationship is the only mirror we have, a mirror that will not distort, a mirror in which we can exactly and precisely see our thought unfolding itself. Isolation, which many people seek, is the surreptitious building up of resistance against relationship. Isolation obviously prevents the understanding of relationship - relationship with people, with ideas, with things. As long as we don't know our relationship, actually what is, between ourselves and our property, ourselves and people, ourselves and ideas, obviously there must be confusion and conflict.

So, we can find out what is right thinking only in relationship. That is, we can discover in relationship how we think from moment to moment, what are our reactions, and thereby proceed step by step to the unfoldment of right thinking. This is not an abstract or difficult thing to do: to watch exactly what is taking place in our relationship, what are our reactions, and thus discover the truth of each thought, each feeling. But if we bring to it an idea or a preconception of what relationship should be, then obviously that prevents the uncovering, the unfoldment of what is. That is our difficulty: we have already made up our minds as to what relationship should be. To most of us, relationship is a term for comfort, for gratification, for security; and in that relationship we use property, ideas and persons for our gratification. We use belief as a means of security. Relationship is not merely a mechanical adjustment. When we use people, it necessitates possession, physical or psychological; and in possessing someone we create all

the problems of jealousy, envy, loneliness and conflict. Because, if we examine it a little more closely and deeply, we will see that using a person or property for gratification is a process of isolation. This process of isolation is not actual relationship at all. So our difficulty and our mounting problem comes with the lack of understanding of relationship, which is essentially self-knowledge. If we do not know how we are related to people, to property, to ideas, then our relationship will inevitably bring about conflict. That is our whole problem at the present time, is it not? - relationship not only between people, but between groups of people, between nations, between ideologies, either of the left or of the right, religious or secular. Therefore, it is important to understand fundamentally your relationship with your wife, with your husband, with your neighbour; for relationship is a door through which we can discover ourselves, and through that discovery we understand what is right thinking.

Right thinking, surely, is entirely different from right thought. Right thought is static. You can learn about right thought, but you cannot learn about right thinking; because right thinking is movement, it is not static. Right thought you can learn from a book, from a teacher, or gather information about; but you cannot have right thinking by following a pattern or a mould. Right thinking is the understanding of relationship from moment to moment, which uncovers the whole process of the self.

At whatever level you live, there is conflict, not only individual conflict, but also world conflict. The world is you, it is not separate from you. What you are, the world is. There must be a fundamental revolution in your relationship with people, with ideas; there must

be a fundamental change, and that change must begin, not outside you, but in your relationships. Therefore, it is essential for a man of peace, for a man of thought, to understand himself; for without self-knowledge his efforts only create further confusion and further misery. Be aware of the total process of yourself. You need no guru, no book, to understand from moment to moment your relationship with all things.

Question: Why do you waste your time preaching instead of helping the world in a practical way?

Krishnamurti: Now, what do you mean by "practical"? You mean bringing about a change in the world, a better economic adjustment, a better distribution of wealth, a better relationship - or, to put it more brutally, helping you to find a better job. You want to see a change in the world, every intelligent man does, and you want a method to bring about that change, and therefore you ask me why I waste my time preaching instead of doing something about it. Now, is what I am actually doing a waste of time? It would be a waste of time, would it not?, if I introduced a new set of ideas to replace the old ideology, the old pattern. Perhaps that is what you want me to do. But instead of pointing out a so-called practical way to act, to live, to get a better job, to create a better world, is it not important to find out what are the impediments which actually prevent a real revolution - not a revolution of the left or the right, but a fundamental, radical revolution, not based on ideas? Because, as we have discussed it, ideals, beliefs, ideologies, dogmas, prevent action. There cannot be a world transformation, a revolution, as long as action is based on ideas; because action then is merely reaction; therefore ideas become much more important

than action, and that is precisely what is taking place in the world, isn't it? To act, we must discover the impediments that prevent action. But most of us don't want to act - that is our difficulty. We prefer to discuss, we prefer to substitute one ideology for another, and so we escape from action through ideology. Surely, that is very simple, is it not? The world at the present time is facing many problems: overpopulation, starvation, division of people into nationalities and classes, and so on. Why isn't there a group of people sitting together trying to solve the problems of nationalism? But if we try to become international while clinging to our nationality, we create another problem; and that is what most of us do. So, you see that ideas are really preventing action. A statesman, an eminent authority, has said the world can be organized and all the people fed. Then why is it not done? Because of conflicting ideas, beliefs, and nationalism. Therefore, ideas are actually preventing the feeding of people; and most of us play with ideas and think we are tremendous revolutionaries, hypnotizing ourselves with such words as "practical". What is important is to free ourselves from ideas, from nationalism, from all religious beliefs and dogmas, so that we can act, not according to a pattern or an ideology, but as needs demand; and, surely, to point out the hindrances and impediments that prevent such action is not a waste of time, is not a lot of hot air. What you are doing is obviously nonsense. Your ideas and beliefs, your political, economic and religious panaceas, are actually dividing people and leading to war. It is only when the mind is free of idea and belief that it can act rightly. A man who is patriotic, nationalistic, can never know what it is to be brotherly, though he may talk about it; on the contrary,

his actions, economically and in every direction, are conducive to war. So, there can be right action and therefore radical, lasting transformation, only when the mind is free of ideas, not superficially, but fundamentally; and freedom from ideas can take place only through self-awareness and self-knowledge.

Question: I am a teacher, and after studying what you say, I see that most of the present education is harmful or futile. What can I do about it?

Krishnamurti: Surely, the question is what we mean by education, and why we are educating people. We see throughout the world that education has failed, because it is producing more and more destruction and war. Education so far has furthered industrialism and war; that has been the process for the last century or so. What is actually taking place is war, conflict, unceasing waste of one's own effort, everything leading to more conflict, greater confusion and antagonism - and is that the end of education? So, to find out how to educate, not only must the educator be educated, but there must be an understanding of what it is all about and what we are living for, the end and purpose of life. When we seek the purpose of life, we can find it only as a self-projection. The end and purpose of life, obviously, is living. But living is not a goal, happiness is not a goal. It is only when we are unhappy that we seek the goal of happiness. Similarly, when life is confused, then we want a purpose, an end. So, we have to find out what living means. Is it merely a technique, a capacity to earn money mechanically, or is it a process of understanding the total way of our whole existence? What is happiness? Is it to be educated, to pass the B. A. or M. A., or God knows what? Apart

from profession, what are you actually? What is your state of being apart from your social status, so many rupees earned from such and such a job - strip yourselves of these, and what are you? Hardly anything; nothing very great, but something shallow and empty.

Knowledge is what we call education. You can get information from any book as long as you can read; so education so far has actually been an escape from ourselves; and, as with all escapes, it must inevitably create further confusion and further misery.

Without understanding the total process of yourself, which is understanding relationship, mere gathering of information and mere memorizing of books in order to pass examinations is utterly futile. Surely I am not exaggerating. Education is understanding, and helping others to understand, the total process of our existence. The teacher must understand the whole significance of his action in relationship with society, with the world; so it is essential that the educator be educated. To bring about revolution in the world, transformation must take place in you; but we avoid radical revolution in ourselves, and try to bring about revolution in the State, in the economic world. Therefore education must begin with you, with the guru. When you give your background to the child, the mind of the child responds to that conditioning; and it is only through freedom from conditioning that there can be the true salvation of the world.

Question: I am a smoker, and I am trying to break myself of the habit of smoking. Can you help me? (Laughter)..

Krishnamurti: I do not know why you are laughing. The questioner wants to know how to stop smoking. It is a problem to him, and by merely laughing it away you have not solved it.

Perhaps you also smoke, or have some other habit. Let us find out how to understand this whole process of habit-forming and habit-breaking. We can take the example of smoking, and you can substitute your own habit, your own particular problem, and experiment with your own problem directly as I am experimenting with the problem of smoking. It is a problem, it becomes a problem, when I want to give it up; as long as I am satisfied with it, it is not a problem. The problem arises when I have to do something about a particular habit, when the habit becomes a disturbance. Smoking has created a disturbance, so I want to be free of it. I want to stop smoking, I want to be rid of it, to put it aside; so my approach to smoking is one of resistance or condemnation. That is, I don't want to smoke; so my approach is either to suppress it, condemn it, or to find a substitute for it: instead of smoking, to chew. Now, can I look at the problem free of condemnation, justification, or suppression? Can I look at my smoking without any sense of rejection? Try to experiment with it now, as I am talking, and you will see how extraordinarily difficult it is not to reject or accept. Because, our whole tradition, our whole background, is urging us to reject or to justify, rather than to be curious about it. Instead of being passively watchful, the mind always operates on the problem. So, the problem is not smoking, but our approach to smoking which creates the problem. Because, if you find smoking rather stupid, a waste of money, and so on - if you really see that, you will drop it, there will be no problem. Smoking, drinking, or any other habit, is an escape from something else; it makes you feel socially at ease. It is an escape from your own nervousness, or from a disturbed state; and the habit becomes

a means of your conditioning. So, smoking is not the problem. When you approach smoking with your memory, your recollection of previous trials and failures, you approach it with a conclusion already made. Therefore, the problem is not in the fact, but in your approach to the fact. You have tried by discipline, control, denial, and you have not succeeded. So you say, "I shall go on smoking, I cannot stop" - which is after all an attempt to justify yourself; which means your approach is not very intelligent. So, smoking or any other habit is not a problem. The problem is thought, which is your approach to the fact. You are the problem, not the habit which you have created; and thus you will see, if you really try, how difficult it is for the mind to be free from the sense of condemnation and justification. When your mind is free, the problem of smoking or any other problem is non-existent.

Question: Is continence or chastity necessary for the attainment of liberation?

Krishnamurti: The question is wrongly put. For the attainment of liberation, nothing is necessary. You cannot attain it through bargaining, through sacrifice, through elimination; it is not a thing that you can buy. If you do these things you will get a thing of the marketplace, therefore not real. Truth cannot be bought, there is no means to truth; if there is a means, the end is not truth, because means and end are one, they are not separate. Chastity as a means to liberation, to truth, is a denial of truth. Chastity is not a coin with which you buy it. You cannot buy truth with any coin, and you cannot buy chastity with any coin. You can buy only those things which you know, but you cannot buy truth because you don't know it. Truth comes into being only when the mind is quiet, still; so the

problem is entirely different, is it not?

Why do we think chastity is essential? Why has sex become a problem? That is really the question, isn't it? We shall understand what it is to be chaste when we understand this corroding problem of sex. Let us find out why sex has become such an extremely important factor in our life, more of a problem than property, money, and so on. What do we mean by sex? Not merely the act, but thinking about it, feeling about it, anticipating it, escaping from it - that is our problem. Our problem is sensation, wanting more and more. Watch yourself, don't watch your neighbour. Why are your thoughts so occupied with sex. Chastity can exist only when there is love, and without love there is no chastity. Without love, chastity is merely lust in a different form. To become chaste is to become something else; it is like a man becoming powerful, succeeding as a prominent lawyer, politician, or whatever else - the change is on the same level. That is not chastity, but merely the end result of a dream, the outcome of the continual resistance to a particular desire. So, our problem is not how to become chaste, or to find out what are the things necessary for liberation, but to understand this problem which we call sex. Because, it is an enormous problem, and you cannot approach it with condemnation or justification. Of course, you can easily isolate yourself from it - but then you will be creating another problem. This all-important, engrossing and destructive problem of sex can be understood only when the mind liberates itself from its own anchorage. Please think it out, don't brush it aside. As long as you are bound through fear, through tradition, to any particular job, activity, belief, idea, as long as you are conditioned by and attached to all that, you will

have this problem of sex. Only when the mind is free of fear is there the fathomless, the inexhaustible; and only then does this problem take its ordinary place. Then you can deal with it simply and effectively; then it is not a problem. So, chastity ceases to be a problem where there is love. Then life is not a problem, life is to be lived completely in the fullness of love; and that revolution will bring about a new world.

Question: The idea of death terrifies me. Can you help me to overcome the dread of my own death and that of my loved ones?

Krishnamurti: Let us think this problem out together and go to the end of it; because we must find the truth of it, and not merely an opinion. Opinions are not truth. Death is a fact. You may like to dodge it, to escape from it through belief in reincarnation, continuity, growth; but it is a fact. Why are we terrified of it? What do we mean by death? Surely, we mean the end of something - of the body, and of our experiences which we have gathered throughout life: the psychological ending of accumulated experiences. Innumerable books are written about death, about the hereafter. But we are afraid of death. So, we try to find immortality, continuity, through property, through title, through name, through achievement, so that desire, memory, can be immortalized. Why do you want to continue? What is there to continue? Your memories? Memories are but accumulated experiences. Only in ending is there creation, not in continuity; therefore there must be death. In death only is there renewal, not in continuing, Incompleteness of action in the present creates fear of death; and as long as there is the desire for continuity, there must be fear. That which continues must decay, it cannot be renewed;

but in dying there is creation of the new.

January 1 1950

COLOMBO CEYLON 3RD PUBLIC TALK 8TH JANUARY, 1950

One of our major problems is this question of creative living. Obviously, most of us have dull lives, we have only a very superficial reaction. After all, most of our responses are superficial and thereby create innumerable problems. Creative living does not necessarily mean becoming a big architect or a great writer. This is merely capacity, and capacity is entirely different from creative living. No one need know that you are creative, but you yourself can know that state of extraordinary happiness, a quality of indestructibility; but that is not easily realized, because most of us have innumerable problems - political, social, economic, religious, family - which we try to solve according to certain explanations, certain rules, traditions, any sociological or religious pattern with which we are familiar. But our solution of one problem seems inevitably to create other problems, and we set up a net of problems ever multiplying and increasing in their destructiveness. When we try to find the answer, a way out of this mess, this confusion, we seek the answer at one particular level. One must have the capacity to go beyond all levels, because the creative way of living cannot be found at any particular level. That creative action comes into being only in understanding relationship, and relationship is communion with another. So, it is not really a selfish outlook to be concerned with individual action. We seem to think that we can do very little in this world, that only the big politicians, the famous writers, the great religious leaders, are capable of extraordinary action. Actually, you and I are infinitely

more capable of bringing about a radical transformation than the professional politicians and economists. If we are concerned with our own lives, if we understand our relationship with others, we will have created a new society; otherwise, we will but perpetuate the present chaotic mess and confusion.

So, it is not out of selfishness, not because of a desire for power, that one is concerned with individual action; and if we can find a way of living which is creative, not merely conforming to religious, social, political or economic standards as we are doing at the present time, then I think we will be able to solve our many problems. At present we are merely repetitive gramophones, perhaps changing records occasionally under pressure; but most of us always play the same tunes for every occasion. It is this constant repetition, this perpetuation of tradition, that is the source of the problem with all its complexities. We seem to be incapable of breaking away from conformity, though we may substitute a new conformity for the present one, or try to modify the present pattern. It is a constant process of repetition, imitation. We are Buddhists, Christians or Hindus, we belong to the left or to the right. By quoting from the various sacred books, by mere repetition, we think we shall solve our innumerable problems. Surely, repetition is not going to solve human problems. What has the "revolutionary" done for the so-called masses? Actually, the problems are still there. What happens is that this constant repetition of an idea prevents the understanding of the problem itself. Through self-knowledge one has the capacity to free oneself from this repetition. Then it is possible to be in that creative state which is always new, and therefore one is always ready to meet

each problem afresh.

After all, our difficulty is that, having these immense problems, we meet them with previous conclusions, with the record of experience, either our own or acquired through others; and so we meet the new with the old, which creates a further problem.

Creative living is being without that background; the new is met. as the new, therefore it does not create further problems. Therefore it is necessary to meet the new with the new until we can understand the total process, the whole problem of mounting disaster, misery, starvation, war, unemployment, inequality, the battle between conflicting ideologies. That struggle and confusion is not to be solved by repetition of old ways. If you will really look a little more closely without prejudice, without religious bias, you will see much bigger problems; and being free from conformity, from belief, you will be able to meet the new. This capacity to meet the new with the new is called the creative state, and that surely is the highest form of religion. Religion is not merely belief, it is not the following of certain rituals, dogmas, the calling yourself this or that. Religion is really experiencing a state in which there is creation. This is not an idea, a process. It can be realized when there is freedom from self. There can be freedom from self only through understanding the self in relationship - but there can be no understanding in isolation.

As I suggested in answering the questions last Sunday, it is important that we experience each question as it arises, and not merely listen to my answers; that we discover together the truth of the matter, which is much more difficult. Most of us would like to be apart from the problem, watching others; but if we can discover

together, take the journey together, so that it is your experience and not mine, though you are listening to my words - if we can go together; then it will be of lasting value and importance. Question: Do you advocate vegetarianism? Would you object to the inclusion of an egg in your diet?

Krishnamurti: Is that really a very great problem, whether we should have an egg or not? Perhaps most of you are concerned with non-killing. What is really the crux of the matter, is it not? Perhaps most of you eat meat or fish. You avoid killing by going to a butcher, or you put the blame on the killer, the butcher - that is only dodging the problem. If you like to eat eggs, you may get infertile eggs to avoid killing. But this is a very superficial question - the problem is much deeper. You don't want to kill animals for your stomach, but you do not mind supporting governments that are organized to kill. All sovereign governments are based on violence, they must have armies, navies, and air forces. You don't mind supporting them, but you object to the terrible calamity of eating an egg! (Laughter). See how ridiculous the whole thing is; investigate the mentality of the gentleman who is nationalistic, who does not mind the exploitation and the ruthless destruction of people, to whom wholesale massacre is nothing - but who has scruples as to what goes into his mouth. (Laughter). So, there is much more involved in this problem - not only the whole question of killing, but the right employment of the mind. The mind may be used narrowly, or it is capable of extraordinary activity; and most of us are satisfied with superficial activity, with security, sexual satisfaction, amusement, religious belief - with that, we are satisfied and discard entirely the deeper response and wider

significance of life. Even the religious leaders have become petty in their response to life. After all, the problem is not only killing animals but human beings, which is more important. You may refrain from using animals and degrading them, you may be compassionate about killing them, but what is important in this question is the whole problem of exploitation and killing - not only the slaughter of human beings in war time, but the way you exploit people, the way you treat your servants, and look down on them as inferiors. Probably you are not paying attention to this, because it is near home. You would rather discuss God, reincarnation - but nothing requiring immediate action and responsibility.

So, if you are really concerned with not killing, you should not be a nationalist, you should not call yourself Sinhalese, German or Russian. Also you must have right employment, make right use of machinery. It is very important in modern society to have right employment, because today every action leads to war, the whole thing is geared for war; but at least we can find out the wrong professions; and avoid them intelligently. Obviously, the army, the navy, are wrong professions; so is the profession of law which encourages litigation, and the police, especially the secret police. So, right employment must be found and exercised by each one, and only then. can there be the cessation of killing which will bring about peace among men. But the economic pressure is so great in the modern world that very few can withstand it. Almost no one is concerned with seeking right profession; and if you are concerned not to kill, then you have to do far more than merely avoid the killing of animals, which means you have to go into this whole problem of right employment. Though the question may appear

very petty, if you go into it a little more carefully you will see that it is a very great question; because, what you are, you make the world to be. If you are greedy, angry, dominating, possessive, you will inevitably create a social structure that will bring about further conflict, misery, further destruction. But unfortunately, most of us are not concerned with any of these things. Most of us are concerned with immediate pleasures, with everyday living; and if we can get them, we are satisfied. We do not want to look into the deeper and wider problems; though we know they exist, we want to avoid them. By avoiding these problems, they are increased, you have not solved them. To solve them, they cannot be approached through any particular ideology, either of the left or of the right. Look at these problems more closely and effectively and you will begin to understand the total process of yourself in relation to others, which is society.

But you will tell me that I have not answered the question about the egg, whether to eat an egg or not. Surely, intelligence is the important thing - not what goes into your mouth, but what comes out of it, and most of us have filled our hearts with the things of the mind, and our minds are very small, shallow. Our problem is to find out how to bring about a transformation in that which is shallow and small; and this transformation can come about only through understanding the shallow. Those of you who want to go into the question more deeply will have to find out whether you are contributing to war and how to avoid it, whether indirectly you are the cause of destruction. If you can really solve that question, then you can easily settle the superficial matter of whether you should be a vegetarian or not. Tackle the problem at a much deeper level

and you will find the answer.

Question: You say that reality or understanding exists in the interval between two thoughts. Will you please explain..

Krishnamurti: This is really a different way of asking the question, "What is meditation?" As I answer this question, please experiment with it, discover how your own mind works, which is after all a process of meditation. I am thinking aloud with you, not superficially - I have not studied. I am just thinking aloud with you about the question, so that we can all journey together and find the truth of this question.

The questioner asks about the interval between two thoughts in which there can be understanding. Before we can enquire into that, we must find out what we mean by thought. What do you mean by thinking? Is this getting a little too serious? You must have patience to listen to it. When you think something - thought being an idea - , what do you mean by that? Is not thought a response to influence, the outcome of social, environmental influence? Is not thought the summation of all experience reacting? Say, for example, you have a problem, and you are trying to think about it, to analyze it, to study it. How do you do that? Are you not looking at the present problem with the experience of yesterday - yesterday being the past - , with past knowledge, past history, past experience? So, that is the past, which is memory, responding to the present; and this response of memory to the present you call thinking. Thought is merely the response of the past in conjunction with the present, is it not?, and for most of us thought is a continuous process. Even when we are asleep there is constant activity in the form of dreams; there is never a moment when the

mind is really still. We project a picture and live either in the past or the future, like many old and some young people do, or like the political leaders who are always promising a marvellous Utopia. (Laughter). And we accept it because we all want the future, so we sacrifice the present for the future; but we cannot know what is going to happen tomorrow or in fifty years" time. So, thought is the response of the past in conjunction with the present; that is, thought is experience responding to challenge, which is reaction. There is no thought if there is no reaction. Response is the past background - you respond as a Buddhist, a Christian, according to the left or to the right. That is the background, and that is the constant response to challenge - and that response of the past to the present is called thinking. There is never a moment when thought is not. Have you not noticed that your mind is incessantly occupied with something or other - personal, religious, or political worries? It is constantly occupied; and what happens to your mind, what happens to any machinery, that is in constant use? It wears away. The very nature of the mind is to be occupied with something, to be in constant agitation, and we try to control it, to dominate it, to suppress it; and if we can succeed, we think we have become great saints and religious people, and then we stop thinking.

Now, you will see that in the process of thinking there is always an interval, a gap between two thoughts. As you are listening to me, what exactly is happening in your mind? You are listening, perhaps experiencing what we are talking about, waiting for information, the experience of the next moment. You are watchful; so there is passive watching, alert awareness. There is no response; there is a state of passiveness in which the mind is strongly aware,

yet there is no thought - that is, you are really experiencing what I am talking about. Such passive watchfulness is the interval between two thoughts.

Suppose you have a new problem - and problems are always new - , how do you approach it? It is a new problem, not an old one. You may recognize it as old, but as long as it is a problem it is always new. It is like one of those modern pictures to which you are entirely unaccustomed. What happens if you want to understand it? If you approach it with your classical training, your response to that challenge, which is that picture, is rejection; so if you want to understand the picture, your classical training will have to be put aside - just as, if you want to understand what I am talking about, you have to forget you are a Buddhist, a Christian, or what not. You must look at the picture free of your classical training, with passive awareness and watchfulness of mind, and then the picture begins to unfold itself and tell its story. That is possible only when the mind is in a state of watchfulness, without trying to condemn or justify the picture; it comes only when thought is not, when the mind is still. You can experiment with that and see how extraordinarily true is a still mind. Only then is it possible to understand. But the constant activity of the mind prevents the understanding of the problem.

To put it around the other way, what do you do when you have a problem, an acute problem? You think about it, don't you? What do you mean by "think about it"? You mean working for an answer, searching for an answer, according to your previous conclusions. That is, you try to shape the problem to fit certain conclusions which you have, and if you can make it fit, you think

you have solved it. But problems are not solved by being put into the pigeonholes of the mind. You think about the problem with the memory of past conclusions and try to find out what Christ, Buddha, X, Y or Z has said, and then apply those conclusions to the problem. Thereby you do not solve the problem, but cover it up with the residue of previous problems. When you have a really big and difficult problem, that process will not work. You say you have tried everything and you cannot solve it. That means you are not waiting for the problem to tell its story. But when the mind is relaxed, no longer making an effort, when it is quiet for just a few seconds, then the problem reveals itself and it is solved. That happens when the mind is still, in the interval between two thoughts, between two responses. In that state of mind understanding comes; but it requires extraordinary watchfulness of every movement of thought. When the mind is aware of its own activity, its own process, then there is quietness. After all, self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation, and if you do not know the whole, total process of yourself, you cannot know the importance of meditation. Merely sitting in front of a picture or repeating phrases is not meditation. Meditation is a part of relationship; it is seeing the process of thought in the mirror of relationship. Meditation is not subjugation, but understanding the whole process of thinking. Then thought comes to an end, and only in that ending is there the beginning of understanding.

Question: What happens to an individual at death? Does he continue, or does he go to annihilation?

Krishnamurti: Now, it is very interesting to find out from what point of view we are approaching this question. Please put this

question to yourself and find out how you as an individual approach it. Why do you put this question? What is the motive that makes you ask about total annihilation? Either you are approaching the question because you want to know the truth of it and are therefore not seeking self-gratification; or you want a solution because you are afraid. If you approach it with the idea that you are afraid of death and want to continue, then your question will have a gratifying answer, because you are merely seeking consolation. Then you may just as well adopt a new belief that will satisfy you or take a drug that will make you dull. When you suffer you want to be made dull. Suffering is the response of sensitiveness; that is, sensitiveness makes for pain, and when there is pain you want a drug. So, either you want to find the truth of this question, or you are merely seeking a means to lull yourself to sleep - only you don't put it so crudely. You want to be comforted, you ask because you are afraid of death and you want to be sure of continuity. According to your approach you will find the answer, obviously. If you are seeking consolation, then you are not seeking truth; if you are afraid, then you are not trying to find out what is real. So, first you have to be very earnest in your thinking. Most of us are afraid of seeking the truth. Most of us are scared of there being no continuity, and we want to be assured that we will continue. Let us find out whether there is continuity - you may want it, but it may not be there.

What do you mean by continuity and coming to an end? What is it that continues? We are trying to find the truth of continuity and the truth of non-continuity, so we have to examine what it is that continues in your daily life. Have you noticed yourself in

continuation - in relation to your property, your family, your ideas? You say a hundred times, "this is my property, my reputation", and it becomes continuity. You say, "this is my name, my wife, my work, my job, these are my ambitions, my characteristics or tendencies; I am a big entity, or a little entity trying to become a big entity" - and that is what you are in daily life, not spiritually but actually. Obviously, those are all memories, and you want to know if that bundle of memories, identified as yourself, will continue. "You" are not separate from the bundle. There is no "you" as an entity different from memory. The "you" may be placed at a higher level, but even at that level it is within the whole field of memory of thought; and you want to know whether it will continue.

Memory is word, symbol, picture, image; without the word there is no memory. The symbol, the image, the past picture, the memory of certain relationships - all that is "you", which is the word. You want to know whether that word, which is identified with memory, will continue. In other words, you are seeking immortality through memory identified as "you". You are not different from the various qualities which go toward making the "you". So, you are the house, the memory, the experience, the family; you are not separate from the idea. And you want to know whether that "you" continues.

Now, why do you want to know? What is the motive, what is the urge? You say, "I am finished, I must have space in which to grow, to become; life is too short, I must have another chance". Now, have you noticed that idea, thought, can continue? You can experience it for yourself - it is very simple. Thought as memory, as idea, continues. So you have the question answered. The "you" that continues is merely a bundle of memories; that is, when there

is identification of thought as "I am" this superficial thing in some form or other continues, as thought did before. The "you" as an idea, as thought, continues; but that is not very satisfactory, because you have an idea that you are something more than thought, and you want to know if that something more continues. There is nothing more - "you" are merely the result of social, environmental influences; that is, "you" are the result of conditioning. You may say, "What nonsense it is to talk of a future life - it is superstitious rot; others, who are differently conditioned, believe there is something more. Surely, there is not much difference between the two. Both are conditioned, one to believe and the other not to believe, Belief in any form is detrimental to the discovery of truth. Belief in continuity and belief in non-continuity are both detrimental to the discovery of truth. To find out what truth is, there can be no fear and no belief - which fetter the mind. Only when continuity ends can you know the truth of what is beyond continuity.

To put it differently, death is the unknown, it is ever new, and to understand it you must go to it with a fresh mind, a mind that is new, not merely a continuation of the past. In that state you are capable of knowing the significance of death. At present we know neither life nor death, and we are anxious to know what death is. Thought must end for life to be. There must be death in order for life to flourish. When life is only the continuation of thought, such continuity can never know reality. If you are seeking continuity, you have it in your house in your work, in your children, in your name, in your property, in certain qualities - all that is "you", it is thought continued. Immortality can be known only when thinking

ceases when through understanding, the process of thought comes to an end. You can only think about something that you know. So when you think of yourself as a spiritual entity, it is your own projection, something born out of the past; therefore it is not spiritual. It is only when you understand continuity that thought comes to an end - which is an extraordinary process requiring a great deal of alertness, not discipline, vows, dogmas, creeds, beliefs, and all the rest of it. There is immortality only when the mind is completely still, and that stillness comes when thought is wholly understood.

Question: I pray to God, and my prayers are answered. Is this not proof of the existence of God?

Krishnamurti: If you have proof of the existence of God, then it is not God; (laughter) because proof is of the mind. How can the mind prove or disprove God? Therefore your god is a projection of the mind according to your satisfaction, appetite, happiness, pleasure or fear. Such a thing is not God, but merely a creation of thought, a projection of the known which is past. What is known is not God, though the mind may look for it, may be active in the search for God.

The questioner says that his prayers are answered, and asks if this is not proof of the existence of God. Do you want proof of love? When you love somebody, do you seek proof? If you demand proof of love, is that love? If you love your wife, your child, and you want proof, then love is surely a bargain. So your prayer to God is merely bargaining. (Laughter). Don't laugh it off, look at it seriously, as a fact. The questioner approaches what he calls God through supplication and petition. You cannot find

reality through sacrifice, through duty, through responsibility, because these are means to an end, and the end is not different from the means. The means are the end.

The other part of the question is, "I pray to God, and my prayers are answered. "Let us examine that. What do you mean by prayer? Do you pray when you are joyous, when you are happy, when there is no confusion, no misery? You pray when there is misery, when there is disturbance, fear, turmoil, and your prayer is supplication, petition. When you are in misery, you want somebody to help you out, a higher entity to give you a helping hand; and that process of supplication in different forms is called prayer. So, what happens? You put out your begging bowl to someone, it does not matter who it is - an angel, or your own projection whom you call God. The moment you beg, you have something - but whether that something is real or not, is a different question. You want your confusion, your miseries solved; so you get out your traditional phrases, you turn on your devotion, and the constant repetition obviously makes the mind quiet. But that is not quietness - the mind is merely dulled and put to sleep. In that induced quiet, when there is supplication there is an answer. But it is not at all an answer from God - it is from your own ornamental projection. Here is the answer to the question. But you do not want to enquire into all this, that is why the question is put. Your prayer is supplication - you are only concerned to get a response to your prayer because you want to be free from trouble. Something is gnawing at your heart, and by praying you make yourself dull and quiet. In that artificial quietness there is a response - obviously satisfying, otherwise you would reject it. Your prayer is satisfying, and therefore it is what

you yourself have created. It is your own projection that helps you out - that is one type of prayer. Then there is the deliberative type of prayer, to make the mind quiet, receptive and open. How can the mind be open when it is conditioned by tradition, the background of the past? Openness implies understanding, the capacity to follow the imponderable. When the mind is held, tethered to a belief, it cannot be open. When it is deliberately opened, obviously any answer it receives is a projection of itself. Only when the mind is unconditioned, when it knows how to deal with each problem as it arises - only then is there no longer a problem. As long as the background continues, it must create a problem; as long as there is continuity, there must be ever increasing turmoil and misery. Receptivity is the capacity to be open, without condemnation or justification, to what is; and it is that from which you try to escape through prayer.

January 8, 1950

COLOMBO CEYLON 4TH PUBLIC TALK 15TH JANUARY, 1950

Surely, there is great confusion everywhere, not only within ourselves individually, but also in the world and among our so-called leaders. When there is confusion, there is a desire to find someone who will lead us out of our difficulties, and we turn to some kind of authority. We turn the responsibility over to our leaders, or seek a pattern of action, or look to the past or to the future to try to find out what ought to be done. Our morality is based on the pattern of yesterday or the ideal of tomorrow; and when tradition and the ideal of the future both fail, we turn to some authority. Because, most of us want security, we want some kind of refuge from all this turmoil, and we seek it in morality according to a pattern of the past, or in some sort of ideal; we cling to an example hoping to see our way out of our confusion, out of our uncertainty. Our ideal is a projection of ourselves created by the interpretation of various books, and our whole intention and purpose is to find something - a person, an idea, or a system - that will lead us out of this confusion. So, being confused, being uncertain, we seek external or inward authority and spend our energies in trying to conform ourselves either to the pattern of tradition or the ideal of what should be. Obviously, conformity at any level denies intelligence, which is the capacity to adjust, the capacity of quick response to challenge; and when that intelligence is not functioning, then we conform to a pattern, to authority. That is what is happening in the world at present, is it not? We are confused individually, and being confused, being insecure in

ourselves, we turn to somebody. To find out, is it not necessary to be insecure, to be uncertain? Can you find anything if you are certain? Is it not essential to be uncertain to discover reality, or what you will? There must be this state of uncertainty, this state of constant enquiry - not to find a result, but to enquire into each incident, each thought and feeling as it arises, which is to understand experience from moment to moment.

So, being confused, being uncertain, is not the following of a pattern detrimental to intelligence, to real inward integrity? Because, the pattern, the system, eventually leads to security; and how can a person who is psychologically secure ever find anything? Obviously, you must be physically secure; but physical security is destroyed as long as we are seeking psychological security. Surely, the desire for psychological security prevents creative response to life, which is intelligence. So, our problem is obviously not the substitution of one pattern for another, but how to be free of patterns, so that we can respond to every challenge anew. This is reality, is it not? - reality is to understand every moment of life as it is, without interpreting it according to our past experience. A mind that is bound by authority, whether its own or that of another, a mind that is conforming, imitating, following a particular pattern of action - how can such a mind be capable of understanding the real, of understanding what is at every moment of thought and feeling? The mind that is burdened with authority, with confusion, with discipline, obviously cannot find that which is free. Can a mind that is disciplined, controlled, subjugated, ever be free? Can a wrong means lead to a right end? To discover the real, the mind must be free at the beginning, not at some ultimate end.

How can there be freedom for the mind that is conforming, that is merely imitating, following a certain course of action? And the mind will follow patterns of action, it will discipline itself, it will conform, as long as there is fear of psychological uncertainty. Physically you must have clothes, food, shelter; but when there is psychological certainty, does it not exclude enquiry and so discovery? Surely, discovery is possible only in freedom, not in a course of action disciplined according to a pattern.

So, our enquiry is about not what is discipline, or what system or course of action to follow, but how to free the mind from the fear of being insecure. Is it not essential for the mind to be insecure? Obviously, only in insecurity can there be understanding of what is false. It requires a certain alertness, the non-acceptance of any authority. So, a mind that desires to understand reality must be free at the very beginning from all compulsion, inward or outward; that is, it must be in a state of uncertainty, not tethered to any particular belief or ideal which is merely a refuge. Only then, surely, is the mind carefree, aloof, happy, and only such a mind is capable of understanding that which is true. The capacity to understand requires freedom from conformity, which is freedom from fear. After all, we conform because we do not know, and we are afraid; but is it not a fact that not-knowing is essential for the unknown to be? If you observe you will see how the mind is constantly moving from the known to the known; but only when the mind is free from the known is it possible to receive the unknown, which means it must be entirely free from all sense of conformity, authority or imitation. The major calamity of modern civilization is that we are like so many gramophone records

repeating what is said in the books, whether it is the Koran, the Bible, or what you will. Surely, a mind that repeats is not really in search of understanding, for it is incapable of being uncertain; and uncertainty is essential in order to find.

Question: Why don't you participate in politics or in social reform?

Krishnamurti: Have you noticed how politics and social reform have become extraordinarily predominant in our lives at the present time? All our newspapers and most of the magazines, except the purely escapist ones, are full of politics, economics, and other problems. Have you ever asked yourself why they are that way, why human beings are giving such extraordinary importance to politics, economics, and social reform? Reforms are obviously necessary because of the economic, social and political confusion and the general deterioration of the state of man following the two wars. So, crowds gather round political leaders; people line the streets, watching them as though they were strange animals trying to solve the problem on the economic, social or political level, independent of the total process of man. Are these problems to be tackled separately, unrelated to the whole psychological problem of man? You may have a perfect system that you think will solve the economic problems of the world, but another will also have a perfect system; and the two systems, representing two different ideologies, will fight each other. As long as you are fighting over ideas, systems, there cannot be a true, radical revolution, there cannot be fundamental social transformation. Ideas do not transform people. What brings about transformation is freedom from ideas. Revolution based on ideas is no longer revolution, but

merely a continuation of the past in a modified state. Obviously, that is not revolution.

The questioner wants to know why I don't take part in politics or in social reform. Surely, if you can understand the total process of man, then you are dealing with the fundamental issues, not merely trimming particular branches of the tree. But most of us are not interested in the entire problem. We are concerned merely with reconciliation, superficial adjustment, not with the fundamental understanding of man as a total process. It is very much easier to be an expert on one particular level. The experts on the economic or political level leave the psychological level to other experts, and so we become slaves to experts; we are sacrificed by experts for an idea. So, there can be fundamental revolution only in understanding the total process of yourself, not as an individual opposed to the mass, to society, but as an individual interrelated with society; because without you there is no society, without you there is no relationship with another. There is no revolution, no fundamental transformation, as long as we do not understand ourselves. Reformers and so-called revolutionists are really factors of retrogression in society. A reformer tries to patch up the present society, or create a new one, on the basis of an ideology and his idea is the conditioned response to a pattern; and such revolution, based on an ideology, can never produce a fundamental, radical transformation in social relationships. What we are concerned with is not reformation or modified continuity, which you call revolution, but the fundamental transformation of man in his relationship with man; and as long as that basic change does not take place in the individual, we cannot produce a new social order.

That fundamental transformation does not depend on belief, on religious organizations, or on any political or economic system: it depends on your understanding of yourself in relationship with another. That is the real revolution that must take place, and then you as an individual will have an extraordinary influence in society. But without that transformation, merely to talk about revolution or to sacrifice yourself for a so-called practical idea - which is not really sacrifice at all - , is obviously mere repetition, which is retrogression.

Question: Do you believe in reincarnation and karma?

Krishnamurti: Now I suppose you will settle back in your seats and feel comfortable. What do you mean by "believe", and why do you want to believe? Is belief necessary to find out what is true? To find out what is true, you must approach life afresh, you must have the capacity to see things anew; but the mind that is cradled in belief is obviously incapable of discovering what is new. So, before you can discover whether there is reincarnation or not, you must find out if your mind is free from belief. Most of us believe because it is convenient, because it is satisfying; in it there is a great deal of hope. It is like taking some drug or narcotic and feeling pacified. Such a belief is a projection of our own desire. So, to find out the truth of any matter, obviously there must be freedom from hypothesis, from belief, from any form of conclusion - whether of Buddha, Christ, yourself, or your grandmother. You must approach it afresh, and only then are you capable of discovering what is true. Belief is an impediment to reality, and that is a very difficult pill to swallow for most of us. We are not seeking reality; we want gratification, and belief gives us

gratification, it pacifies us. So, we are essentially seeking gratification, escaping from the problem, from pain and suffering. Therefore we are not really seeking the truth. To find the truth, there must be the direct experiencing of sorrow, pain, and pleasure, but not through a screen of belief.

So, similarly, let us find out what you mean by reincarnation - the truth of it, not what you like to believe, not what someone has told you, or what your teacher has said. Surely, it is the truth that liberates, not your own conclusion, your own opinion. Now, what do you mean by reincarnation? To reincarnate, to be reborn - what do you mean by that? What is it that actually comes into birth again? - not what you believe or do not believe. Please put all that aside, it is only childish stuff. Let us find out what it is that comes back again or reincarnates. To find that out, you must first know what it is that you are. When you say, "I shall be reborn", you must know what the "I" is. That is the question, is it not? I am not dodging it. Don't think this is a clever move of mine. You will see the problem clearly as we proceed, as we explore. You say, "I shall be reborn. "What is the "I" that is to be reborn? Is the "I" a spiritual entity, is the "I" something continuous, is the "I" something independent of memory, experience, knowledge? Either the "I" is a spiritual entity, or it is merely a thought process. Either it is something out of time which we call spiritual, not measurable in terms of time, or it is within the field of time, the field of memory, thought. It cannot be something else. Let us find out if it is beyond the measurement of time. I hope you are following all this. Let us find out if the "I" is in essence something spiritual. Now by "spiritual" we mean, do we not?, something not capable of being

conditioned, something that is not the projection of the human mind, something that is not within the field of thought, something that does not die. When we talk of a spiritual entity, we mean by that something which is not within the field of the mind, obviously. Now, is the "I" such a spiritual entity? If it is a spiritual entity, it must be beyond all time, therefore it cannot be reborn or continued. Thought cannot think about it; because thought comes within the measure of time, thought is from yesterday, thought is a continuous movement, the response of the past; so thought is essentially a product of time. If thought can think about the "I", then it is part of time: therefore that "I" is not free of time, therefore it is not spiritual - which is obvious. So, the "I", the "you" is only a process of thought; and you want to know whether that process of thought, continuing apart from the physical body, is born again, is reincarnated in a physical form. Now go a little further. That which continues - can it ever discover the real, which is beyond time and measurement? We are experimenting to discover truth, not exchanging opinions. That "I", that entity which is a thought-process - can it ever be new? If it cannot, then there must be an ending to thought. Is not anything that continues inherently destructive? That which has continuity can never renew itself. As long as thought continues through memory, through desire, through experience, it can never renew itself; therefore, that which is continued cannot know the real. You may be reborn a thousand times, but you can never know the real; for only that which dies, that which comes to an end, can renew itself.

The other part of the question is whether I believe in karma. What do you mean by the word karma? To do, to act, to be. Let us

try to find out in spite of old women's tales. Karma implies, does it not?, cause and effect - action based on cause, producing a certain effect; action born out of conditioning, producing further results. So karma implies cause and effect. And are cause and effect static, are cause and effect ever fixed? Does not effect become cause also? So there is no fixed cause or fixed effect. Today is a result of yesterday, is it not? Today is the outcome of yesterday, chronologically as well as psychologically; and today is the cause of tomorrow. So cause is effect, and effect becomes cause - it is one continuous movement, there is no fixed cause or fixed effect. If there were a fixed cause and a fixed effect, there would be specialization; and is not specialization death? Any species that specializes obviously comes to an end. The greatness of man is that he cannot specialize. He may specialize technically, but in structure he cannot specialize. An acorn seed is specialized - it cannot be anything but what it is. But the human being does not end completely. There is the possibility of constant renewal, he is not limited by specialization. As long as we regard the cause, the background, the conditioning, as unrelated to the effect, there must be conflict between thought and the background. So the problem is much more complex than whether to believe in reincarnation or not, because the question is how to act, not whether you believe in reincarnation or in karma. That is absolutely irrelevant. Your action is merely the outcome of certain causes, and that action modifies future action - therefore there is no escape from conditioning.

So, to put our problem differently, can action ever bring about freedom from this chain of cause-effect? I have done something in

the past, I have had experience, which obviously conditions my response today; and today's response conditions tomorrow. That is the whole process of karma, cause and effect; and obviously, though it may temporarily give pleasure, such a process of cause and effect ultimately leads to pain. That is the real crux of the matter: Can thought be free? Thought, action, that is free does not produce pain, does not bring about conditioning. That is the vital point of this whole question. So, can there be action unrelated to the past? Can there be action not based on idea? Idea is the continuation of yesterday in a modified form, and that continuation will condition tomorrow, which means action based on idea can never be free. As long as action is based on idea, it will inevitably produce further conflict. Can there be action unrelated to the past? Can there be action without the burden of experience, the knowledge of yesterday? As long as action is the outcome of the past, action can never be free; and only in freedom can you discover what is true. What happens is that, as the mind is not free, it cannot act; it can only react; and reaction is the basis of our action. Our action is not action, but merely the continuation of reaction, because it is the outcome of memory, of experience, of yesterday's response.

So, the question is, can the mind be free from its conditioning? Surely, that is implied in this question of karma and reincarnation, As long as there is continuity of thought, action must be limited; and such action creates opposition, conflict, and karma - the response of the past in conjunction with the present, creating a modified continuity. So, a mind which has continuity, which is based on continuity - can such a mind be free? If it cannot be free,

is it possible for continuity to cease? This is a most important question. To discover whether the mind can ever be free from the background implies a tremendous enquiry. Is not the mind based on the background? Is not thought founded upon the past? So, can thought ever free itself from the past? All that thought can do is to come to an end - but obviously not through compulsion, not through effort, not through any form of discipline, control or subjugation. As an observer, see the truth of what it means for thought to come to an end. See the truth, the significance of it, and the false response is removed. That is what we are trying to do in answering this particular question. When there is action not based on idea or on the past, then the mind is silent, absolutely silent. In that silence, action is free from idea. But you will want an answer to your question, whether I believe or not in reincarnation. Do you know, are you any wiser, if I say I believe in it or do not believe in it? I hope you are confused about it. To be satisfied by words of explanation indicates a petty mind, a stupid mind. Examine the whole process of yourself. That examination can take place only in relationship; and to discover the truth in any relationship there must be a state of constant watchfulness, constant, passive alertness. That will show you the truth, for which you need no confirmation from anybody. As long as thought continues, there can be no reality; as long as thought continues as the yesterday, there must be confusion and conflict. Only when the mind is still, passively watchful, is it possible for the real to be.

Question: Why are you against nationalism?

Krishnamurti: Aren't you against nationalism? Why are you a nationalist? Is not nationalism, calling yourself English, Tamil, or

God knows what else, one of the fundamental reasons for war, for the appalling destruction and misery in the world? What is this process of identifying yourself with a group, with a particular country, whether economically, socially or politically? What is the reason for calling yourself a man of Ceylon, an Indian, a German, an American, a Russian, or whatever it is? Social conditioning and economic pressure make you identify yourself with a group. That is one factor. But why do you identify yourself with something? - that is the problem. You identify yourself with the family, with an idea, or with what you call God. Why do you identify yourself with something that you consider great? I live in a little village, I am nobody; but if I call myself a Hindu, if I identify myself with a certain class or caste, then I am somebody. Psychologically I am nobody - empty, insufficient, lonely, poor; but if I identify myself with something great, I become great. (Laughter). Don't laugh it off, this is what you are actually doing - you call it nationalism, for which you sacrifice everything. A sovereign government must always be on the defensive against attack by some enemy; but you are willing to destroy yourself for an idea, which is your desire to be something great. Actually, you are not great, you are still what you were, only you call yourself a big man. Nationalism is false; like belief, it divides people; and as long as you are nationalistic, you cannot have physical security.

Question: What do you mean when you say that the thinker and the thought are one?

Krishnamurti: This is a serious question, and you will have to be a little attentive. Now, are we not aware that there is the thinker apart from the thought, that the thinker is an entity separate from

the process of thought? Because, the thinker is operating on thought, trying to control, subjugate, modify, or even find a substitute for thought. So, we say there is the thinker separate from thought. Now, is that so? Is the thinker separate from thought? If he is, why is he separate, what has brought about this separation? Is it so in reality, or is it an illusion? Is there actually a thinker separate from thought, or only thought separating itself as the thinker? Surely, thought has created the thinker: the thinker is not beyond thought, the thinker is the product of thought. So, the idea that the thinker is separate from thought, is false. It is thought that makes the thinker; and if there were no capacity to think at all, there would be no thinker. The thinker comes into being through thought; and why has this separation taken place? Obviously, for the simple reason that thought is constantly changing; that is, recognizing itself to be in transformation, in change, in constant flux, thought creates an entity, the thinker, to give itself permanency. So desire for permanency creates the thinker. Obviously, thoughts are impermanent; but the entity, the thinker, feels himself to be permanent. Actually, there is no thinker at all: there is only thought creating a permanent entity because there is fear of impermanency. Therefore, it is an illusion. Most of us think this false process is a real process, and, because there is the thinker and the thought, because there is the experiencer who is always experiencing, there is no integration. There is integration only when thought does not create the thinker, which means that thought does not identify itself as "my" thought, "my" achievement, "my" experience - for it is this "my" that separates the thought from the thinker. When there is the experience of

integration between thought and the thinker, then there is a fundamental revolution in thinking. Then there is no entity dominating or controlling thought, there is no longer the idea of a "me" becoming something, growing more perfect, more virtuous. The complete integration is when there is only the thought to be understood through right meditation. There is no time now to discuss what is right meditation, we will do it next Sunday - it requires a great deal of time; but integration, that complete revolution in thinking, can be understood only in relationship.

Question: Is belief in God necessary or helpful?

Krishnamurti: As I said, belief in any form is a hindrance. A man who believes in God can never find God. If you are open to reality, there can be no belief in reality. If you are open to the unknown, there can be no belief in it. After all, belief is a form of self-protection, and only a petty mind can believe in God. Look at the belief of the aviators during the war, who said God was their companion as they were dropping bombs! So you believe in God when you kill, when you are exploiting people. You worship God and go on ruthlessly extorting money, supporting the army - yet you say you believe in mercy, compassion, kindness. Obviously, such belief is a hindrance to the understanding of reality. All belief in any form is a hindrance, including your belief in God. Your belief is a hindrance to the discovery of the real because it is based on an idea or patterned after a tradition. As long as belief exists, there can never be the unknown; you cannot think about the unknown, thought cannot measure it. The mind is the product of the past, it is the result of yesterday; and can such a mind be open to the unknown? It can only project an image, but that projection is

not real; so your god is not God, it is an image of your own making, an image of your own gratification. There can be reality only when the mind understands the total process of itself and comes to an end. When the mind is completely empty - only then is it capable of receiving the unknown. The mind is not purged until it understands the content of relationship, its relationship with property, with people; until it has established the right relationship with everything. Until it understands the whole process of conflict in relationship, the mind cannot be free. Only when the mind is wholly silent, completely inactive, not projecting, when it is not seeking and is utterly still - only then that which is eternal and timeless comes into being. This is not speculation, something which you can learn from another, it is not sentiment or sensation - it is a thing that has to be experienced. You cannot experience it as long as the mind is active. Silence of the mind is not achieved by action, it is not a thing to be gone after: it comes only when conflict ceases. To understand one's conflict in relationship is the beginning of wisdom; and when the mind is tranquil, that which is eternal comes into being.

January 15, 1950

COLOMBO CEYLON 5TH PUBLIC TALK 22ND JANUARY, 1950

This is the last talk, and it will be more or less a summary of what we have been discussing here for the last four or five weeks.

It must seem very odd to most of us that life has become such a struggle at all levels of existence - not only physically, but psychologically as well; inwardly as well as outwardly. We seem to be on a battle field of the world; and we have accepted, we have taken for granted, that conflict is the natural state of man. This conflict, this struggle, is the picture of man which so-called philosophers seem to have created; and we have accepted that as our normal life in relationship, not only with regard to property, but also in our relationship with people. There is this constant battle, individual and collective, between men and women, between man and man, between man and society; and there is also conflict between ideas, between the ideology of the left and of the right, between various beliefs, whether religious or secular, whether economic, social or political. So, there is constant division going on between man and man, not only outwardly, but inwardly.

Can we understand, can we actually create anything, in a state of conflict? Can you write a book, paint a picture, can you appreciate another human being, feel with him or love him, if there is conflict? Surely, conflict is the antithesis of understanding, and through conflict there can be no understanding at any time at any level. We have philosophically accepted that conflict is inevitable, and perhaps we are entirely wrong to accept such a thesis, such an idea. Can understanding come from conflict, from warfare, from a

proletarian revolution? To understand the structure of society and bring about a radical revolution, must you not understand what is actual, and not create the opposite and thus bring about conflict? Does conflict bring about a synthesis? To understand, surely, we must see, examine, what is actually, and not bring in other ideas about it; obviously, only then is it possible to solve the problem, As long as we approach the problem with ideas, with a conclusion, with opinions, with belief, with schemes, with systems of any kind, surely it prevents understanding. There are the problems of starvation, of unemployment, of war, to be solved. What is actually happening? The systems, based on left or right ideologies, are setting man against man; and in the meantime, there is still starvation. So, systems, ideologies, obviously do not solve the problem; yet we are fighting each other over ideas and particular systems. Surely, we must approach the problem without any conclusions of the past; for it is obvious that conclusions prevent understanding of the problem.

So, we can see that conflict at any level indicates deterioration - it is a sign of the disintegration of society as well as of the individual. If we see, not theoretically but actually, that conflict invariably prevents understanding, that through conflict you can never bring about harmony, surely then our approach to the problem is entirely different, is it not? Then our attitude undergoes a fundamental change. Up to now, our approach to the problem has created other problems, mounting sorrow and pain, which are ever the result of conflict and lack of understanding of the problem; and understanding can come only when there is no conflict. If I want to understand you, there must not be any conflict; on the contrary, I

must look at you, I must observe you, I must study you, not with previous conclusions, schemes or systems. Those are all prejudices, and prejudice prevents understanding. I must have a very clear mind, undimmed by any prejudice, any previous knowledge. Only such a mind is capable of understanding the problem, and in that approach lies the solution. The purgation of the mind, surely, is the first requirement in understanding the problem. The mind which is constantly in conflict, grappling, must be free from its own conditioning to meet the problem, whether economic, personal, or social.

So, what is important is how we approach any problem. It is essential that we see very clearly the relationship which creates conflict. It is the lack of right relationship that brings about conflict; and it is therefore essential that we understand conflict in relationship, the whole process of our thought and action. Obviously, if we do not understand ourselves in relationship, whatever society we create, whatever ideas, opinions we may have, will only bring about further mischief and further misery. Therefore, the understanding of the whole process of oneself in relationship with society is the first step in understanding the problem of conflict. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom; because, you are the world, you are not separate from the world. Society is your relationship with another, you have created it; and the solution lies through your own understanding of that relationship, the interaction between you and society. Without understanding yourself, to seek for a solution is utterly useless - it is merely an escape. Therefore, what is important is understanding relationship. It is relationship which causes conflict, and that

relationship cannot be understood unless we have the capacity to be passively watchful; then, in that passive alertness, in that awareness, there comes understanding.

Question: What is the simple life, and how can I live a simple life in the modern world?

Krishnamurti: The simple life has to be discovered, is it not so? There is no pattern for a simple life. Having few clothes, a loin cloth and a begging bowl, does not indicate a simple life. It must be discovered. Surely, to make a pattern for a simple life does not bring about simplicity; on the contrary, it creates complexity. What do we mean by the simple life? Having but few clothes, going about half-naked, possessing little - does that indicate the simple life? Is not life much more complex than that? Obviously, one must have but few things. It is silly, foolish, stupid, to have many things and depend on them. Man has many possessions and he clings to them - his property, his title, and so on. But is it the simple life for a man to have innumerable beliefs, or even one belief?

Dependence on systems, authority, the urge to become, to attain, to acquire, to imitate, to conform, to discipline oneself according to a particular pattern - is that the simple life? Does that indicate simplicity? Surely, simplicity must begin, not merely in the expression of outward things, but much deeper. The man who is simple has no conflict. Conflict indicates an escape towards the more or towards the less. That is, conflict indicates acquisitiveness, the desire to become something more or something less; and a man who wants to become something, is he a simple entity? You despise the man who is trying to acquire wealth, possessions, and you appreciate the man who is supposed not to be interested in

worldly things but who is striving to become virtuous, or to become like Buddha, Christ, or to follow a certain pattern - you will say he is a marvellous entity. Surely, the man who is striving to become something in the world is the same as the man who wants to be spiritual. Both are united in one desire - to become someone or something, either respectable or so-called spiritual.

Surely, the simple life is not something theatrical. It can be discovered in daily life; in this rotten world, which after two dreadful wars is perhaps preparing for a third, we can live simply, not only outwardly but inwardly. Why do we give such importance to the outward manifestations of simplicity? Why do we inevitably begin at the wrong end? Why don't we begin at the right end, which is the psychological? Surely, we must begin at the psychological end to find what is the simple life, because it is the inner that creates the outer. It is inward insufficiency that makes people cling to property, to beliefs; it is this sense of inward insufficiency that forces us to accumulate goods, clothes, knowledge, virtue. Surely, in that way we can only create much more mischief, much more harm. It is extraordinarily difficult to have a simple mind - not the so-called intellectual mind of the educated, but the simplicity that comes when we understand something, that simplicity that perceives the problem of what is. Surely, we cannot understand anything when our mind is complex. I don't know if you have noticed that when you are worried over a problem, when you are concerned about something, you do not see anything very clearly, it is all out of focus. Only when the mind is simple and vulnerable is it possible to see things clearly, in their true proportion. So simplicity of the mind is essential for simplicity

of life. The monastery is not the solution. Simplicity comes when the mind is not attached, when the mind is not acquiring, when the mind accepts what is. It really means freedom from the background, from the known, from the experience it has acquired. Only then is the mind simple, and then only is it possible to be free. There cannot be simplicity as long as one belongs to any particular religion, to any particular class or society, to any dogma, either of the left or of the right. To be simple inwardly, to be clear, to be vulnerable, is to be like a flame without smoke; and therefore you cannot be simple without love. Love is not an idea, love is not thought. It is only in the cessation of thinking that there is the possibility to know that simplicity which is vulnerable.

Question: I find that loneliness is the underlying cause of many of my problems. How can I deal with it?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by loneliness? Are you actually aware that you are lonely? Surely, loneliness is not a state of aloneness. Very few of us are alone; we don't want to be alone. It is essential to understand that aloneness is not isolation. Surely, there is a difference between being alone, and isolation. Isolation is the sense of being enclosed, the sense of having no relationships, a feeling that you have been cut off from everything. That is entirely different from being alone, which is to be extraordinarily vulnerable. When we are lonely, a feeling of fear, anxiety, the ache of finding oneself in isolation, comes over one. You love somebody, you feel that without that somebody you are lost; so that person becomes essential to you in order for you not to feel the sense of isolation. So, you use the person in order to escape from what you are. That is why we try to establish relationship, a

communion with another, or establish a contact with things, property - just so that we feel alive; we acquire furniture, dresses, cars, we seek to accumulate knowledge, or become addicted to love. By loneliness we mean that state which comes upon the mind, a state of isolation, a state in which there is no contact, no relationship, no communion with anything. We are afraid of it, we call it painful; and being afraid of what we are, of our actual state, we run away from it, using so many ways of escape - God, drink, the radio, amusements - anything to get away from that sense of isolation. And are not our actions, both in individual relationship and in relationship with society, an isolating process? Is not the relationship of father, mother, wife, husband, an isolating process for us at the present time? Is not that relationship almost always - a relationship based on mutual need? So, the process of self-isolation is simple - you are all the time seeking, in your relationships, an advantage for yourself. This isolating process is going on continually, and when awareness of isolation comes upon us through our own activities, we want to run away from it; so we go to the temple, or back to a book, or turn on the radio, or sit in front of a picture and meditate - anything to get away from what is.

So, we come to the actual question which is the desire to escape. What do you fear, why are you afraid of the unknown, that insufficiency in yourself, that emptiness? If you are afraid, why do you not look into it? Why should you be afraid of losing what you have, of losing association, contact? What exactly do you know, with your pretensions of knowledge? Your knowledge is but memory; you don't know the living, you know the past - the dead things, the decadent things. So, is it not our trouble that we never

find what is? We never face the conflict of our insufficiency - we keep smothering it down and suppressing it, running away from it, and we don't know what is. Surely, when we approach it without any fear or condemnation, then, we come to find the truth of it; and it may be extraordinarily more significant than the significance we give it through fear. Through fear of insufficiency, the mind is operating upon thought - the mind never looks at it; and it is only when we have the capacity to look at thought that there is the possibility of understanding what has made that thought, and thus is revealed to us the whole process of escape from what is. Then loneliness is transformed, it becomes aloneness; and that aloneness is a state of vulnerability which is capable of receiving the unknown, the imponderable, the measureless. Therefore, to understand that state of vulnerability, we must understand the whole process of thinking - which means that we must look at it and see its extraordinary qualities. That state cannot be accepted verbally; it must be experienced.

Question: You lay great emphasis on being aware of our conditioning. How can I understand my mind?

Krishnamurti: Is not conditioning inevitable - inevitable in the sense that it is actually taking place all the time? You condition your children as Buddhists, Sinhalese, Tamil, Englishmen, Chinese Communists, and so on. There is a constant impingement of influences - economic, climatic, social, political, religious - acting all the time. Look at yourself: you are either a Buddhist, Sinhalese, Hindu, Christian, or Capitalist. That is the whole process - the mind is constantly being conditioned, which means the mind is a result of the past, is founded upon the past. Thought is the response

of the past. Mind is the past, mind is part of the past; and the past is tradition, morality. So, action is patterned on the past, or on the future as the ideal. This is the actual state of all who are conditioned. We are the product of the environment, social, economic, or what you will. What you believe is the product of what your father and society have put into you. If they had not put into you the idea of Buddhism, surely you would be something else - Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Communist. Your beliefs are the result of your environment, and these beliefs are also created by you; because you are the product of the past, and the past in conjunction with the present creates the present social entity. So, your mind is conditioned; that conditioned mind meets the challenge the stimulus, and invariably responds according to its conditioning, and this is what creates a problem. So, a conditioned mind meeting the challenge creates a problem, because the response of a conditioned mind to the challenge is inadequate. Inadequacy of the conditioned response creates the problem. The problem is always new, the challenge is always new; challenge implies newness, otherwise it is not challenge. So, the conditioned mind meeting the challenge creates a problem, which brings on conflict.

Now, if you ask, "Can I be free from conditioning?", your question has validity, not otherwise. As long as the mind is conditioned according to a pattern, it will always respond according to that pattern. There are those who say that the mind cannot be unconditioned, that it is an impossibility; therefore, they substitute a new form of conditioning for the old. Instead of the capitalists, there is the communist; instead of the Roman Catholic,

the Protestant or the Buddhist. That is what is actually happening now all over the world. They speak of revolution; it is not revolution, but merely substitution of ideas. Ideas don't produce revolution; they only produce a modified continuity, not revolution. So, there are those who say the mind cannot be unconditioned, but can only be reconditioned in a different way. The very assertion implies conditioning. If you say that it can, or that it cannot, you are already conditioned. Therefore, what is important is to find out if the mind can be unconditioned - completely, not superficially or momentarily. How can we do it?

Now, why do you call yourselves Buddhists? You have been told from childhood that you are Buddhists - and why do you accept it and hold on to it? If you can understand that, you will be free of it. What would happen if you didn't hold on to it? If you didn't call yourself a Buddhist, you would feel that you were left out and isolated. So, you do it for economic reasons - that is one factor. Another factor is that you identify yourself with something larger, otherwise you feel lost. You are nobody; but when you say you are a Buddhist, you are somebody, it gives you colouration. So, your desire to be somebody, your desire to be identified with something great, conditions you. The desire to be somebody is the very essence of conditioning. If you had no desire to be somebody, you would not be conditioned in the deeper sense. Surely being what is, is the beginning of virtue; contentment is the understanding of what is. The desire to be something invariably conditions thought, and therefore creates a problem ever deeper and wider, increasing conflict and misery. To be free from conditioning is very simple - experiment with it. When you don't

want to be an artist, a Master, a minister, a great, wise, or learned person, then you are nobody. That is the fact, but we don't like to accept it; so we cling to possessions, furniture, books, property. Instead of indulging in pretensions, why not just be small? Then you will see that the mind is extraordinarily pliable, capable of quickly responding to challenge. Such a mind is capable of responding anew to the challenge. Surely, that is clear.

Conditioning is not only superficial, in the upper layer of the mind - it is also in the deeper layers; in both the hidden as well as the upper content of the mind there is the desire to be somebody. It is the desire to be somebody, to seek a result, that brings about conditioning; and a conditioned mind can never be revolutionary, it is merely acting according to a pattern - it is somnambulant, not revolutionary. Revolution comes into being when the mind is free, when it does not act according to the past and is aware of its conditioning. Only when the mind is quiet can it be free.

Question: What is right meditation?

Krishnamurti: This is a very complex subject, and it requires a great deal of understanding. Let us go into the question. You and I are going to find out what is right meditation, which means that you and I are going to meditate. How do we understand anything? What is the state of the mind for understanding? We are going to find out the many implications of what is meditation. To understand something, you must have communion with it - there must be no barriers. There must be complete integration if you want to understand something new. How would you approach it? You will have to look at it, not condemn or justify it. To understand the problem, the mind must be passively watchful.

Meditation is the process of understanding, it is the passive state which brings about discovery of truth. I have discussed meditation before, but now we are discussing it anew. The mind must be extremely quiet to understand deeply. If I want to understand something, my mind must be silent. If I have a problem and want really to understand it, I must not go to it with a worried and agitated mind. I must go with a free mind; for only a passive, alert mind can understand. A mind that is capable of being silent is in a position to receive the truth. Because, you don't know what truth is; if you know the truth, it is not truth. Truth is utterly new, free. It cannot be approached through preconceptions, it is not the experience of another. So, to discover truth, reality, the mind must be absolutely still. That is a requisite for the understanding of any problem, political, economic, or mathematical.

So, it is essential for the mind to be quiet in order to understand. The mind is new only when it is quiet; it is free, tranquil, only when it is not conditioned by the past. It is only then that the unknown is instinctively discovered. So, there must be freedom; and a mind that is disciplined, regimented, is not a free mind, it is not still. Its function is conditioned when it is under discipline. Such a mind is made still by discipline, it is controlled, shaped to be still. For the mind to be really still, there must be freedom, not at the end, but at the beginning. A mind that is overburdened, or a disciplined mind, is incapable of understanding a problem. What brings about freedom? - not a qualified freedom, prompted by desire. How does freedom come into being, so that the mind may receive the truth? Such freedom can be only when there is virtue. At present, you are striving to become virtuous, and to become

something obviously means another form of conditioning. When you strive to become non-violent, the actual process of striving is violence. That is, in trying to become non-violent you are imitating the ideal of nonviolence, which is your own projection. So, the ideal is homemade, it is the outcome of your own violence. Being violent, you create the opposite; but the opposite always contains its own opposite, therefore the ideal of non-violence must inevitably contain the element of violence - they are not different. So, the mind that is trying to become merciful, to become humble, is conditioned, and therefore can never see the truth. Virtue is the understanding of what is without escape. You cannot understand what is if you resist it, because understanding requires freedom from conditioned response to what is, it not only requires freedom from condemnation and justification, but also from the whole process of terming or giving a name. Virtue is a state of freedom, because virtue brings order and clarity. Virtue is free from becoming; it is the understanding of what is. Understanding is not a matter of time; but time is required to escape through the process of acquiring virtue. So, only the mind that is silent can receive the unknown; because, the unknown is immeasurable. That which is measured is not the unknown; it is known, therefore it is not true, not real. Freedom comes from virtue, not through discipline. A disciplined mind is an exclusive mind; and there is freedom only when each thought is completely understood without exclusion or distraction. What is called concentration is merely a process of exclusion, and the mind that knows how to exclude, to resist, is not a free mind. You cannot understand thought if you resist it. The mind must be free to meet each thought and

understand it fully, and then you will see that thought as an accumulative process comes to an end.

There is also the question of making the mind still through various practices. Is not the thinker, the observer, the same as the thought which he observes? They are not two different processes, but one process. As long as there is the thinker as an observer apart from thought, there is no freedom. Meditation is the process of understanding the thinker; meditation is the process of understanding the mediator - that is, understanding oneself at all levels as "my house", "my property", "my wife", "my beliefs", "my knowledge", "my acquisition", "my work". As long as the thinker is separate from thought, there must be conflict, there cannot be freedom. So, understanding the mediator is self-knowledge, which is what we have been doing this evening. The beginning of meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge, because we cannot be free without self-knowledge. Understanding yourself requires passive alertness. There must be freedom at the beginning, not at the end. Truth is not an ultimate end to be personally achieved; it is to be experienced, lived at every minute in relationship. The mind that is silent - not made silent - alone can perceive the immeasurable. The solution to the problem of bringing about quietness without compulsion lies in understanding relationship; therefore meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge, and self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom is not the accumulation of knowledge and experience; wisdom is not acquired from books, from ceremonies, or by compulsion. Wisdom comes into being only when there is freedom of the mind; and a still mind will find the timeless, which is the immeasurable come

into being. That state is not a state of experience; it is not a state to be remembered. What you remember, you will repeat, and the immeasurable is not repeatable, it cannot be cultivated. The mind must be moved to receive it afresh each time; and a mind that accumulates knowledge, virtue, is incapable of receiving the eternal.

January 22, 1950

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 18TH DECEMBER, 1949

Perhaps if we can understand this whole problem of searching, seeking we may be able to understand the complex problem of dissatisfaction and discontent. Most of us are seeking something at various levels of existence, physical comfort or psychological well-being; or we say we are seeking truth or seeking wisdom. We are apparently always seeking something. Now, what does this mean, actually? What is it that we are seeking? We can only seek something that we know; we cannot seek something that we do not know. We cannot search for something that we do not know exists; we can only search for something that we have had and have lost. The search is the desire for satisfaction.

Most of us are dissatisfied both outwardly and inwardly; and if we observe ourselves closely, we find that this discontent is merely the search for an enduring satisfaction at different levels of existence which we call truth, happiness, understanding, or any other term. Basically, this urge is to find lasting gratification; and being discontented with everything we do, finding no gratification in any of the things we have tried, we go from one teacher, one religion, one path, to another, hoping to find ultimate satisfaction. So, essentially our search is not for truth, but for satisfaction. Most of us are discontented, dissatisfied, with things as they are; and our psychological, inward struggle is to find a permanent refuge; whether the refuge is one of ideas or of immediate relationship, the basic urge is a desire to achieve complete satisfaction. This drive is what we call seeking.

We try various gratifications, various 'isms', communism included; and when these do not satisfy, we turn to religion and pursue one guru after another, or we become cynics. Cynicism also gives great satisfaction. Our search is always for a state of mind in which there will be no disturbance whatever, in which there will no longer be a struggle, but complete satisfaction. Is there the possibility of complete satisfaction in anything which the mind seeks? The mind is searching for its own projections, which are satisfying, gratifying; and the moment it finds one of these projections troublesome, it leaves it and goes to another. That is, we are seeking a psychological state which will be so pacifying, so reconciled, that it eliminates all conflicts. If we look into it deeply, we shall see that no such state is possible unless we are in illusion or attached to some form of psychological assertion.

Can discontent ever find permanent satisfaction? And what is it that we are discontented with? Are we seeking a better job, more money, a better wife, or a better religious formulation? If we examine it closely, we shall find that all our discontent is a search for permanent satisfaction - and that there can be no permanent satisfaction. Even physical security is impossible. The more we want to be secure, the more we become enclosed, nationalistic, ultimately leading to war. So, as long as we are seeking satisfaction, there must be everincreasing conflict.

Is it possible ever to be content? What is contentment, actually? What brings contentment, how does it come about? Surely, contentment comes only when we understand what is. What brings discontent is the complex approach to what is. Because I want to change what is into something else, there is the struggle of

becoming. But mere acceptance of what is also creates a problem. Surely, to understand what is, there must be passive watchfulness without the desire to change it into something else; which means that one must be passively aware of what is. Then it is possible to go beyond the mere outward show of what is. What is, is never static, though our response may be static.

Our problem, therefore, is not the search for an ultimate gratification which we call truth, God, or a better relationship, but the understanding of what is. To understand what is requires an extraordinarily swift mind which sees the futility of the desire to change what is into something else, of comparing or trying to reconcile what is with something else.

This understanding comes, not through discipline, control, or self-immolation, but through the removal of hindrances which prevent us from seeing what is directly.

There is no ending to satisfaction, it is continuous; and unless we see that, we are incapable of dealing with what is as it is. Direct relationship with what is, is right action. Action based upon an idea is merely a self-projection. The idea, the ideal, the ideology, is all a part of the thought process, and thought is a response to conditioning at any level. Therefore, the pursuit of an idea, of an ideal or an ideology, is a circle in which the mind is caught. When we see the whole process of the mind and all its crafty manoeuvring, only then is there understanding which brings transformation.

Question: We see inequality among men, and some are far above the rest of mankind. Surely, then, there must be higher types of beings like Masters and devas who may be deeply interested in

co-operating with mankind. Have you contacted any of them? If so, can you tell us how we can contact them?

Krishnamurti: Most of us are interested in gossip; and gossip is an extraordinarily stimulating thing, whether it is about Masters and devas, or about our neighbours. The more dull we are, the more we love gossip. When one is fed up with social gossip, one wants to gossip about something higher. We are interested, not in the problem of inequality, but in gossipy tidbits about strange entities we do not see, thus seeking a means of escaping from our shallowness. After all, the Masters and devas are your own projections; when you follow them, you follow your own projections. If they were to say to you, "Drop your nationalism, your societies, do not be greedy, do not be cruel", you would soon leave them and pursue others who would satisfy you. You want me to help you to contact the Masters. I am really not interested in the Masters. There is a lot of talk about them, and it has become a cunning means of exploiting people. We make a mess in the world, and we want a big brother to come and help us out of it. A great deal of that is cant. This division between Master and pupil, the hierarchical climbing of the ladder of success - is it really spiritual? This whole idea of hierarchical becoming, struggling to become what you call spiritual, to attain liberation - is it spiritual? When our hearts are empty, we fill them with the images of Masters, which means there is no love. When you love someone, you are not conscious of equality or inequality. Why are you so occupied with the question of Masters? The Masters are important to you because you have a sense of authority, and you give authority to something which has no authority. You give authority because it pleases you;

it is self-flattery.

The problem of inequality is more fundamental than the desire to contact the Masters. There is inequality in capacity, in thought, in action - between the genius and the dull witted man, the man who is free and the man who practises a routine. Every kind of revolution has tried to break this down, and in the process has created another inequality. The problem is how to go beyond the sense of inequality, of the inferior and the superior. That is true spirituality - not seeking Masters and thereby maintaining the sense of inequality. The problem is not how to bring about equality, because equality is an impossibility. You are entirely different from another. You see more, you are much more alert than the other; you have a song in your heart, the other's heart is empty and to him a dead leaf is a dead leaf which he burns. Some people have extraordinary capacity, they are swift and capable. Others are slow, dull, unobserving. There is no end to physical and psychological differences, and you cannot break them down - that is an utter impossibility. All that you can do is to give an opportunity to the dull and not kick him, not exploit him. You cannot make him a genius.

So the problem is not how to contact Masters and devas but how to transcend the sense of inequality; seeking to contact Masters is the pursuit of the very, very dull. When you know yourself you know the Master. A real Master cannot help you, because you have to understand yourself. We are all the time pursuing phony Masters; we seek comfort, security, and we project the kind of Master we want, hoping that Master, will give us all that we desire. Since there is no such thing as comfort, the problem

is much more fundamental, that is, how to go beyond this sense of inequality. Wisdom is not the struggle to become more and more.

Now, is it possible to transcend the sense of inequality? For inequality is there, we cannot deny it. What happens when we do not deny inequality, when we do not come to it with a prejudiced mind, but face it? There is the dirty village, and there is also the nice clean house: both are what is. How do you approach ugliness and beauty? In that lies the solution. The beautiful you wish to be identified with, and the ugly you put aside. For the inferior you have no consideration, but for the superior you have the greatest consideration and deference. Your approach is identification with the higher, and rejection of the lower; you look upward with cringing, and downward with contempt.

Inequality can be transcended only when we understand our approach to it. As long as we resist the ugly and identify ourselves with the beautiful, there is bound to be all this misery. But, if we approach inequality without condemnation, identification, or judgment, then our response is entirely different. Please try it, and you will see what an extraordinary change occurs in your life. The understanding of what is brings contentment - which is not the contentment of stagnation, not the contentment caused by the possession of property, of an idea, of a woman. Contentment is the state of approach to what is as it is, without any barrier whatsoever. Then only is there love, the love which destroys the sense of inequality; and this is the only thing that is revolutionary, that can transform. Since we have not that flame of revolution, we fill our hearts and minds with ideas of revolution of the left or the right, the modification of what has been. That way there is no hope. The

more you reform, the greater the need for further reforms.

It is not important to know how to contact the Masters, for they have no significance in life. What is important is to understand yourself, otherwise your Master is an illusion. Without understanding yourself you are creating more and more misery in the world. Look at what is happening in the world and see the narrow spirit displayed by the zealous votaries of peace, of the Masters, of love and brotherhood. You are all out for yourselves, though you wrap it up in beautiful words. You want the Masters to help you to become more glorified and self-enclosed.

I know I have answered this question at different times in different ways. I also know that, in spite of all I say, you are going to perform your rituals and rattle your swords for king and country. You do not want to understand and solve this problem of inequality. People have written to me saying, "You are very ungrateful to the Masters who have brought you up". It is so easy to make these statements. It is all cant. One has to discover for oneself that no Master can help one. Is it ungrateful to see that which is false and say it is false? You want me to be grateful to your idea, to your formulation of a Master; and when your ideas are disturbed, you call me ungrateful. The problem is not one of gratitude to the Masters, but of understanding yourself.

There is great joy in understanding and discovering what you are, the whole content of what you are, from moment to moment. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Without self-knowledge, you cannot know anything - or if you know something, you will misuse it. To pursue the Master is easy; but to have self-knowledge, to be passively watchful of every thought and feeling,

is arduous. You cannot watch if there is judgment or identification; for identification and judgment prevent understanding. If you watch passively, the thing that you watch begins to unfold, and then there is understanding which renews itself from moment to moment.

Question: In one of your talks you have stated that if a person prays, he receives, but he will pay for it in the end. What do you mean by this? What is the entity that grants our prayers, and why do we not succeed in getting all that we pray for?

Krishnamurti: Are you not happy that all you pray for is not granted? Would that not be deadly boring? You should see the whole picture, not only the part you like. Most of you pray to be satisfied. Your prayers are petitions, supplications for help to get away from your own confusion. Obviously, you pray only when you are confused, in trouble, unhappy. You do not pray when you are joyous, but only when there is fear and when there is pain. What happens when you pray? Please experiment with yourself and watch what happens. When you pray, you quiet the mind by the repetition of certain phrases; that is, the mind is made quiet, is drugged, by repeating a word or by looking at a picture or an image. When the superficial mind is quiet, into that upper layer of the mind comes the response which is most satisfactory. Mass prayer also has a similar effect. You supplicate, you put out the begging bowl to receive; you want gratification, you want an escape from your confusion. So, when the mind is drugged into insensitivity or is partly asleep, into it is projected unconsciously the satisfying answer, which is the general influence of the world about you. There is the collective reservoir of greed, of the

universal demand away from what is; and when you tap it, you obviously get what you want. But that reservoir - is it God, the ultimate truth? Please do look at it, watch it closely, and you will see.

When you pray to God, you pray to something with which you have a relationship, and you can have a relationship only with what you know; therefore your `God' is a projection of yourself, either inherited or acquired. When the mind is begging, it will have an answer, but that answer will always be more enclosing and more troublesome, and will create further problems. That is the price you pay. When you sing or chant together, you are only avoiding, seeking an escape from what is. The escapes have their satisfactions; but their price is, that you have yet to meet the problem which pursues you like a shadow. Your prayers may be gratifying most of the time; but you are in misery all the time, and you want to run away. Your search is the search of avoidance. To understand requires watchfulness, knowing every thought, every gesture. But you are lazy; you have convenient escapes which help you to avoid the understanding of yourself, the creator of pain. Until you understand the problem of yourself, your ambitions, your greed, your exploitation, your desire to maintain inequality; until you face the fact that you are the creator of pain and suffering in the world, of what value are your prayers? You are the problem, you cannot ultimately avoid it; and you can dissolve it only by understanding the whole of it.

So, your prayer is a hindrance to understanding. There is a different kind of prayer - a state of mind where there is no demand, no supplication. In that prayer - perhaps this is a wrong word to use

- there is no forward movement, no denial; it is not put together, it cannot be brought about by any kind of trick. That state of mind is not seeking a result, it is still; it cannot be thought of, practised, or mediated upon. That state of mind alone can discover and allow truth to come into being, and it alone will solve our problem. That quiet state of mind comes when what is, is observed and understood; and then the mind is capable of receiving the inexhaustible.

Question: There is widespread misery in the world, and all religions have failed; yet you seem to be talking religion more and more. Will any religion help us to be free from misery?

Krishnamurti: We must find out what we mean by religion. Religions have failed throughout the world, perhaps, because we are not religious. You may call yourselves by certain names, but your beliefs, your images, your incense-burning, are not religious at all. To you, all these have become important - not religion. Look at what we have done throughout the world. Ideas have set man against man. The extension of dogma is not freedom from dogma. Belief is separating people. Separation is the emphasis of belief, and it is a good means of exploiting the credulous. In belief, you find comfort, security - which is all illusion. Wherever there is a tendency to separateness, there must be disintegration. Where there is the enclosing force of belief, there must be disintegration. You call yourselves Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Theosophists, and what not, and thereby you enclose yourselves. Your ideas create opposition, enmity, and antagonism; so also your philosophies, however clever, idealistic and amusing. As a man is addicted to drink, you are addicted to your beliefs. That is why

organized religions have failed through out the world.

True religion is experiencing, and it has nothing to do with belief. It is that state of mind which, in the process of self - knowledge, discovers truth from moment to moment. Truth is not continuous, it is never the same, it is incomparable. Truth is the alone; it is not the symbol of anything. The worship of any symbol brings about disaster, and a mind that is addicted to belief in any form can never be a religious mind. It is only the religious mind, not the ideological mind, that is capable of solving the problem. Quoting others is no good. A mind that quotes, whether it be Plato or Buddha, is incapable of experiencing reality. To experience reality, the mind must be completely stripped; and such a mind is not a seeking mind.

Religion, therefore, is not belief; religion is not ceremonies; religion is not an idea, or various ideas put together to form an ideology. Religion is experiencing the truth of what is from moment to moment. Truth is not an ultimate end - there is no ultimate end to truth. Truth is in what is; it is in the present, it is never static. A mind that is clouded with the past cannot possibly understand truth. All religions, as they are, divide man. The beliefs of these religions are not truth. Truth is not to be found in any belief in reincarnation; truth is experienced only when there is an ending, the ending which is implied in death. Your belief in God is not religion, is not truth. There is little difference between the believer and the non-believer; they are both conditioned by their respective environments; they bring separation in the world, through ideas, through beliefs. Therefore, neither the believer nor the non-believer can experience reality.

When you see things as they are without any prejudice, without praise or condemnation, in direct relationship with what is, there is action. When the idea intervenes, there is postponement of action. The mind which is the structure of ideas, the residue of all memories and thoughts, can never find reality. Your reading and quoting will not help you to experience reality. Reality must come to you. You can search only for something that you know; you cannot search for reality. please do see the truth of this matter, see the beauty of the mind that is experiencing directly and therefore acting without a reward, without a punishment. But experience is not the criterion of truth. Experience only nurtures memory. Your self is thought, and thought is memory; experience is memory as thought. Therefore, such a mind can organize the word `truth' and exploit people; but it is incapable of experiencing reality. Only the mind that has no idea can experience reality. A religious man is the truly revolutionary man. The man who acts on ideas may kill others. In direct relationship with what is there is experiencing, and such a mind is no longer fabricating ideas. A mind that has no idea is sensitive, is able to see what is directly, and is therefore capable of action. Such action alone is revolutionary.

Question: It has been said that the acquirement of wisdom is the ultimate goal of life, and that wisdom has to be sought little by little through a life of purification and dedication, with the mind and the emotions directed to high ideals through prayer and meditation. Do you agree?

Krishnamurti: Let us find out what you mean by wisdom, and then see whether we can find that wisdom. What do you mean by wisdom? Is it the goal of life? If it is, and if you know the goal, the

purpose of life, then wisdom is the known. Can you know or acquire wisdom, or can you only know facts, acquire knowledge? Surely, knowledge and wisdom are two separate things. You may know all about something; but, is that wisdom? Is wisdom to be acquired little by little, life after life? Is wisdom the storing up of experience? Acquisition implies accumulation; experience implies residue. Residue, accumulation - is that wisdom? You have already accumulated the racial, the inherited residues in conjunction with the present. Is that process of accumulation, wisdom? You accumulate to safeguard yourself, to live secure; you acquire experience gradually. The accumulation of knowledge, the slow gathering of experience - is that wisdom. Your whole life is accumulation, acquiring more and more, Will that make you wise? You have acquired something, you have had an experience which has left a residue; and that residue conditions your further experience. Your response is this experience, and it is the continuation of the background in a different way. So when you say that wisdom is experience, you mean the collection of many experiences. Why are you not wise? Can the man who is constantly acquiring, be wise? Can the man burdened with experience, be wise? Can the man who knows, be wise? The man who knows is not wise, and the man who does not know is wise. Do not smile and pass it off.

When you know, you have experienced, you have accumulated; and the projection of that accumulation is further knowledge. Therefore, wisdom is not a slow process, it is not to be gathered little by little like a bank account. To believe that gradually through several lives you are going to become Buddha, is immature

thinking and feeling. Such statements appear wonderful, especially when ascribed to a Master. When you enquire to find out the truth, then you will see it is only your own projection that wants to continue to experience the same thing as before.

So, accumulation is never wisdom, because there can be accumulation only of what is known; and what is known, can never be the unknown. The emptying of the mind is not a slow process; but trying to empty it is a hindrance. If you say, "I will empty the mind", then it is the same old process. Just see the truth that a mind that is acquiring can never be wise - in six lives or in ten. A man who has acquired is already rich; and a rich man is never wise. You want to be rich in knowledge, which is the acquisition of experience in words; but the man who has, can never be wise. Also, the man who deliberately has not, can never be wise.

Truth cannot be accumulated. It is not experience. It is experiencing in which there is neither the experiencer nor the experience. Knowledge always has the accumulator, the gatherer; but wisdom has no experiencer. Wisdom is as love is; and without that love, we attempt to pursue wisdom through continuous acquisition. What continues must decay. Only that which ends can know wisdom. Wisdom is ever fresh, ever new. How can you know the new if there is continuity? There is continuity as long as you are continuing experience. Only when there is ending is there the new, which is creative. But, we want to continue, we want accumulation, which is the continuity of experience; and such a mind can never know wisdom. It can only know its own projection, its own creations, and the reconciliation between its creations. Truth is wisdom. Truth cannot be sought out. Truth comes only

when the mind is empty of all knowledge, of all thought, of all experience; and that is wisdom.

December 18, 1949

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 29TH JANUARY 1950

Let us see what place the individual has in society, whether the individual can do anything to bring about a radical change in society; whether the transformed entity, the intelligent human being who has fundamentally transformed himself, has any influence, any action, upon the current of events; or, whether the individual I am talking of, the transformed entity, cannot do anything himself but can, merely by his very existence, inject some kind of order into society, into the stream of chaos and confusion. We see all over the world that mass action obviously produces results. Seeing that, we feel that individual action has very little importance, that you and I, though we may transform ourselves, can have very little influence; and so we ask what value do we have when we cannot affect the stream.

Now, why do we think in mass terms? Are fundamental revolutions brought about by the mass, or are they started by the few who see and who, by their talk and energy, influence very many people? That is how revolutions are brought about. Is it not a mistake to think that, as individuals, we cannot do anything? Is it not a fallacy to think that all fundamental revolutions are produced by the mass? Why do we think that individuals are not important as individuals? If we have this attitude of mind, we will not think for ourselves, but will respond automatically. Is action always of the mass? Does it not spring essentially from the individual, and then spread from individual to individual? There is really no such thing as the mass. After all, the mass is an entity formed of people who

are caught, hypnotized by words, by certain ideas. The moment we are not hypnotized by words, we are outside that stream - something no politician would like. Should we not remain outside the stream, and collect more and more from the stream, in order to affect the stream? Is it not important that there should be a fundamental transformation in the individual first, that you and I should radically change first, without waiting for the whole world to change? Is it not an escapist's view, a form of laziness, an avoidance of the issue, to think that you and I, in however small a degree, cannot affect society as a whole?

When we see so much misery, not only in our own lives but also in the society around us, what is it that prevents us from transforming ourselves, from changing ourselves fundamentally? Is it merely habit, lethargy, the quality of the mind that likes the pattern in which it is enclosed and does not want it to break? Surely, it is not only that, because, economic circumstances break up that pattern; but the inward psychological pattern persists. Why does it persist? In order to change fundamentally, radically, do we need an outside influence or agency - like sorrow, economic or social revolution, or a guru - , all of which are a form of compulsion? An outside agency implies conformity, dependence, compulsion, fear. Do we change fundamentally through dependence? And is it not one of our difficulties that we are dependent for change on outside agencies, economic upheavals, and so on? This dependence upon an outside agency prevents radical revolution, because radical revolution can come about only in understanding the total process of oneself. If you depend on an outside agency of any kind to bring about transformation, you have

introduced fear and certain other factors which actually prevent transformation. A man who really wants transformation does not depend upon any outside agency, he has no struggle within himself; he sees the necessity, and transforms himself.

Is the transformation of the individual really difficult? Is it difficult to be kind, to be compassionate, to love somebody? After all, that is the very essence of a radical transformation. The difficulty with us is that we have a dualistic nature in which there is hate, dislike, various forms of antagonism, and so on, which takes us away from the central issue. We are so caught up in the impulses that incite hatred, dislike, that the very flame is lost, and we are left with the smoke; and then our problem is how to get rid of the smoke. We have not got the flame of creation at all, but we think the smoke is the flame, Is it not necessary to investigate what the flame is, that is, see things anew without being caught in a pattern, look at things as they are without naming them? Is it really difficult? The difficulty with most of us is that we have committed our selves up to the hilt, we have assumed innumerable responsibilities, duties, and so on, and we say that we cannot get out of them. Surely, that is not a real difficulty. When we feel something deeply we do what we want to do, irrespective of the family, of society, and all that. So, the only difficulty which stands in the way is that we do not sufficiently feel the importance of radical individual transformation. It is imperative to bring about transformation. Transformation will take place when we live without verbalization, when we see things as they are and accept truth as it is. It must begin with us as individuals. It does not begin merely because we do not pay enough attention, we do not give our

whole being to the understanding of this one thing; we see so much misery outside of us and confusion within us, and yet we do not want to break through it.

Now, what happens when I have a problem and try to resolve it? In the resolution of that problem, I find several others that have come in; in solving one problem, I have multiplied it. So, I want to find the solution to the problem without increasing the problem, I want to live happily, I want to be free of psychological sorrow without finding a substitute for it. Is it possible to find out if one can really resolve sorrow, to enquire into it without anybody authority, to go into it in oneself watching oneself all the time in every kind of relationship? Is not this the only way out of the difficulty? - watching ourselves constantly, what we think, what we feel what we do, being in that state of watchfulness in which everything revealed. You must experiment with it and not merely say it cannot be done, or accept my authority and merely repeat it. Let us say that you are happy and I am not; and I want to be happy, I do not want to be drugged by belief and all that, I want to go to the very end of it. I come to you and enquire, and go deeper and deeper into it. What is preventing you from doing that now? Why is it you do not have the feeling of happiness, of creation of seeing things as they are? Why do you not operate in that deep sense? Because you say that sorrow is helpful to happiness, that sorrow is a means to happiness, and you have accepted sorrow, or some kind of substitution. We have made ourselves so dull that we do not see the need for changing, that is the difficulty.

You may say that you want to change, but that there is something which prevents the change from taking place.

Explanations will not bring about change. To say that the ego is in the way, is explanation, mere description. You want me to describe how to overcome the impediments; but we must find a way of jumping the hurdle if we can, we must venture out into the stream and see what happens - not sit on the shore and speculate. What is actually preventing us from taking the jump? Tradition which is memory, which is experience, prevents us, does it not? We are so satisfied with words, with explanations, that we do not take the jump, even when we see the necessity for jumping. It is suggested that there is no venturing out in the stream because of fear of the unknown. But can I ever know what will happen, can I ever know the unknown? If I knew, then I would have no fear - and it would not be the unknown. I can never know the unknown without venturing.

Is it fear that is holding us from venturing forth? What is fear? Fear can exist only in relation to something, it is not in isolation. How can I be afraid of death, how can I be afraid of something I do not know? I can be afraid only of what I know. When I say I am afraid of death, am I really afraid of the unknown, which is death, or am I afraid of losing what I have known? My fear is not of death, but of losing my association with things belonging to me. My fear is always in relation to the known, not to the unknown.

So, my enquiry now is how to be free from the fear of the known, which is the fear of losing my family, my reputation, my character, my bank account, my appetites, and so on. You may say that fear arises from conscience; but your conscience is formed by your conditioning, it may be foolish or wise; so, conscience is still the result of the known. What do I know? Knowing is having ideas,

having opinions about things, having a sense of continuity as the known, and no more. Ideas are memories, the result of experience, which is response to challenge. I am afraid of the known, which means I am afraid of losing people, things or ideas, I am afraid of discovering what I am, afraid of being at a loss, afraid of the pain which might come into being when I have lost, or have not gained, or have no more pleasure.

There is fear of pain. Physical pain is the nervous response; psychological pain arises when I hold on to things that give me satisfaction, for then I am afraid of anyone or anything that may take them away from me. The psychological accumulations prevent psychological pain as long as they are undisturbed; that is, I am a bundle of accumulations, experiences, which prevent any serious form of disturbance - and I do not want to be disturbed. Therefore, I am afraid of any one who disturbs them. Thus my fear is of the known, I am afraid of the accumulations, physical or psychological, that I have gathered as a means of warding off pain or preventing sorrow. But sorrow is in the very process of accumulating to ward off psychological pain. Knowledge also helps to prevent pain. As medical knowledge helps to prevent physical pain, so beliefs help to prevent psychological pain, and that is why I am afraid of losing my beliefs, though I have no perfect knowledge or concrete proof of the reality of such beliefs. I may reject some of the traditional beliefs that have been foisted on me, because my own experience gives me strength, confidence, understanding; but such beliefs and the knowledge which I have acquired are basically the same - a means of warding off pain.

Fear exists as long as there is accumulation of the known, which

creates the fear of losing. Therefore, fear of the unknown is really fear of losing the accumulated known. Accumulation invariably means fear, which in turn means pain; and the moment I say, 'I must not lose', there is fear. Though my intention in accumulating is to ward off pain, pain is inherent in the process of accumulation. The very things which I have create fear, which is pain.

The seed of defence brings offence. I want physical security; thus I create a sovereign government, which necessitates armed forces, which means war, which destroys security. Wherever there is a desire for self-protection, there is fear. When I see the fallacy of demanding security, I do not accumulate any more. If you say that you see it but you cannot help accumulating, it is because you do not really see that, inherently, in accumulation there is pain.

Fear exists in the process of accumulation, and belief in something is part of the accumulative process. My son dies, and I believe in reincarnation to prevent me psychologically from having more pain; but in the very process of believing, there is doubt. Outwardly I accumulate things, and bring war; inwardly I accumulate beliefs, and bring pain. As long as I want to be secure, to have bank accounts, pleasures, and so on, as long as I want to become something, physiologically or psychologically, there must be pain. The very things I am doing to ward off pain, bring me fear, pain.

Fear comes into being when I desire to be in a particular pattern. To live without fear means to live without a particular pattern. When I demand a particular way of living, that in itself is a source of fear. My difficulty is my desire to live in a certain frame. Can I not break the frame? I can do so only when I see the truth: that the

frame is causing fear, and that this fear is strengthening the frame. If I say I must break the frame because I want to be free of fear, then I am merely following another pattern, which will cause further fear. Any action on my part based on the desire to break the frame will only create another pattern, and therefore fear. How am I to break the frame without causing fear, that is, without any conscious or unconscious action on my part with regard to it? This means that I must not act, I must make no movement to break the frame. So, what happens to me when I am simply looking at the frame without doing anything about it? I see that the mind itself is the frame, the pattern; it lives in the habitual pattern which it has created for itself. So, the mind itself is fear. Whatever the mind does, goes towards strengthening an old pattern or furthering a new one. This means that whatever the mind does to get rid of fear, causes fear. Seeing the truth of all this, seeing the process of it, what happens? The mind becomes sensitive, quiet.

Now, why is not the mind quiet all the time? Each time the pattern crystallizes, why does not the mind see the truth of it? Because, the mind wants permanency, stability, a refuge from which it can act. The mind wants to be secure. There is the breaking up of one particular pattern, and a few minutes later there is again crystallization; and instead of examining this new crystallization and understanding it fully, the mind goes back to the old experience and says, 'I have seen the truth, and that must continue'. In seeking continuation, the mind creates a new pattern and gets caught in it. Each time the crystallization takes place, it has to be watched and understood; and the repetition occurs because of the incompleteness of understanding.

Truth is non-continuity. The truth of yesterday is not the truth of today. Truth is not of time, and so not of memory; it is not something to be experienced, to be remembered, gained, lost or achieved. We pursue truth in order to gain it and give it a continuity; and once we really see this, then the pattern will break up, because then the mind is already adrift.

January 29, 1950

MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 5TH FEBRUARY 1950

In all our relationships - with people, with nature, with ideas, with things - we seem to create more and more problems. In trying to solve one problem, whether economic, political, social, collective or individual, we introduce many other problems. We seem somehow to breed more and more conflict, and need more and more reform. Obviously, all reform needs further reform, and therefore it is really retrogression. As long as revolution, whether of the left or the right, is merely the continuity of what has been in terms of what shall be, it also is retrogression. There can be fundamental revolution, a constant inward transformation, only when we, as individuals, understand our relationship to the collective. The revolution must begin with each one of us and not with external, environmental influences. After all, we are the collective; both the conscious and the unconscious in us is the residue of all the political, social, cultural influences of man. Therefore, to bring about a fundamental outward revolution, there must be a radical transformation within each one of us, a transformation which does not depend on environmental change. It must begin with you and me. All great things start on a small scale, all great movements begin with you and me as individuals; and if we wait for collective action, such collective action, if it takes place at all, is destructive and conducive to further misery.

So, revolution must begin with you and me. That revolution, that individual transformation, can take place only when we understand relationship, which is the process of self-knowledge.

Without knowing the whole process of my relationship at all the different levels, what I think and what I do has no value at all.

What basis have I for thinking if I do not know myself? We are so desirous to act, so eager to do something, to bring some kind of revolution, some kind of amelioration, some change in the world; but without knowing the process of ourselves both at the periphery and inwardly, we have no basis for action, and what we do is bound to create more misery, more strife. The understanding of oneself does not come through the process of withdrawal from society, or through retirement into an ivory tower. If you and I really go into the matter carefully and intelligently, we will see that we can understand ourselves only in relationship and not in isolation. Nobody can live in isolation. To live is to be related. It is only in the mirror of relationship that I understand myself - which means that I must be extraordinarily alert in all my thoughts, feelings and actions in relationship. This is not a difficult process or a superhuman endeavour; and as with all rivers, while the source is hardly perceptible, the waters gather momentum as they move, as they deepen. In this mad and chaotic world, if you go into this process advisedly, with care, with patience, without condemning, you will see how it begins to gather momentum and that it is not a matter of time. Truth is from moment to moment in relationship, it is to see each action, each thought and feeling as it arises in relationship. Truth is not something that can be accumulated, stored up; it has to be found anew in the moment of thought and feeling at every moment - which is not an accumulative process and is not therefore a matter of time. When you say you will eventually understand through experience or knowledge, you are

preventing that very understanding, because understanding does not come through accumulation. You can accumulate knowledge, but that is not understanding. Understanding comes when the mind is free of knowledge. When the mind does not demand the fulfilment of desires, when it is not seeking out experience, there is stillness; and when the mind is still, then only can there be understanding. It is only when you and I are quite willing to see things clearly as they are that there is a possibility of understanding. Understanding comes, not through discipline, through compulsion, through enforcement, but when the mind is quiet and willing to see things clearly. Quietness of mind is never brought about by any form of compulsion, conscious or unconscious; it must be spontaneous. Freedom is not at the end, but at the beginning; because the end and the beginning are not different, the means and the end are one. The beginning of wisdom is the understanding of the total process of oneself, and that self-knowledge, that understanding, is meditation.

Question: We all experience loneliness, we know its sorrow and see its causes, its roots. But what is aloneness? Is it different from loneliness?

Krishnamurti: Loneliness is the pain, the agony of solitude, the state of isolation when you as an entity do not fit in with anything, neither with the group, nor with the country, with your wife, with your children, with your husband; you are cut off from others. You know that state. Now, do you know aloneness? You take it for granted that you are alone; but are you alone?

Aloneness is different from loneliness, but you cannot understand it if you do not understand loneliness. Do you know

loneliness? You have surreptitiously watched it, looked at it, not liking it. To know it, you must commune with it with no barrier between it and you, no conclusion, prejudice or speculation; you must come to it with freedom and not with fear. To understand loneliness, you must approach it without any sense of fear. If you come to loneliness saying that you already know the cause of it, the roots of it, then you cannot understand it. Do you know its roots? You know them by speculating from outside. Do you know the inward content of loneliness? You merely give it a description, and the word is not the thing, the real. To understand it, you must come to it without any sense of getting away from it. The very thought of getting away from loneliness is in itself a form of inward insufficiency. Are not most of our activities an avoidance? When you are alone, you switch on the radio, you do pujas, run after gurus, gossip with others, go to the cinema, attend races, and so on. Your daily life is to get away from yourselves, so the escapes become all-important and you wrangle about the escapes - whether drink, or God. The avoidance is the issue, though you may have different means of escape. You may do enormous harm psychologically by your respectable escapes, and I sociologically by my worldly escapes: but to understand loneliness, all escapes must come to an end - not through enforcement, compulsion, but by seeing the falseness of escape. Then you are directly confronting what is, and the real problem begins.

What is loneliness? To understand it, you must not give it a name. The very naming, the very association of thought with other memories of it, emphasizes loneliness. Experiment with it and see. When you have ceased to escape you will see that, till you realize

what loneliness is, anything you do about it is another form of escape. Only by understanding loneliness can you go beyond it.

The problem of aloneness is entirely different. We are never alone; we are always with people except, perhaps, when we go for solitary walks. We are the result of a total process made up of economic, social, climatic and other environmental influences; and as long as we are influenced, we are not alone. As long as there is the process of accumulation and experience, there can never be aloneness. You can imagine that you are alone by isolating yourself through narrow individual, personal activities; but that is not aloneness. Aloneness can be, only when influence is not. Aloneness is action which is not the result of a reaction, which is not the response to a challenge or a stimulus. Loneliness is a problem of isolation, and we are seeking isolation in all our relationships, which is the very essence of the self, the 'me' - my work, my nature, my duty, my property, my relationship. The very process of thought, which is the result of all the thoughts and influences of man, leads to isolation. To understand loneliness is not a bourgeois act; you cannot understand it as long as there is in you the ache of that undisclosed insufficiency which comes with emptiness, frustration. Aloneness is not an isolation, it is not the opposite of loneliness; it is a state of being when all experience and knowledge are not.

Question: You have been talking for a number of years about transformation. Do you know of anyone who has been transformed in your sense of the word?

Krishnamurti: What is the point of your singing, what is the point of your laughter? Do you laugh, do you smile, in order to

convince some body, to make somebody happy? If you have a song in your heart, you sing. So it is with my talking. It is your responsibility to transform yourself, and not mine. You want to know if anyone has been transform ed. I don't know. I have not look ed to see who has been transformed and who has not been. It is your life of sorrow, of misery, and I am not the judge. You are yourself the judge. Neither you nor I are propagandists. To do propaganda is to tell a lie; to see truth is quite a different matter. If you who are responsible for this misery, chaos, corruption, these degrading wars, do not see that you are responsible and that you must transform yourselves to bring about a revolution in the world, it is your affair. Unless you want to change, you will not change. You cannot be a singer by listening to songs; but if you have a song in your heart, you will not be repetitive.

The important thing in this is to find out why you listen so much and so often, why you come and listen at all. Why do you waste your time if you are not doing anything about it? Why are you not changed? I am not putting this question to you - you should put it to yourself. When you see so much misery, so much corruption - not only in your individual life, but in your social relationship and in every political endeavour - , what do you do about it? Why are you not interested in this? Merely reading the newspaper is obviously no solution. Is it not a vital matter to find out what you are doing and why? Most of us are dull, insensitive to the whole process that is going on around us, though the things in front of us demand action. Why are you dull, insensitive? Is it not because of your worship of authority, political or religious? You have read the Bhagavad Gita and so many other books, which you can repeat like

parrots, but you have not even one thought of your own; and the man who can repeat in a nice voice, who explains texts over and over again, you worship. So, authority dulls the mind, and imitation or repetition makes the mind insensitive, unplayable. That is why gurus multiply and followers destroy. You want direction, and the desire for direction is the building up of authority; and being caught in authority, your minds, seeking comfort, seeking satisfaction, become insensitive, dull. The performance of rituals or the constant reading of a so-called sacred book is the same as having a drink. What would you do if there were no books? You would have to think everything out for yourself; you would have to search, find out, enquire every moment to discover, to understand the new. Are you not in that position now? All the social and political systems have come to nothing, though they promise everything; and yet you go on reading religious books and repeating what you have read, which makes your mind dull. Your education is merely the accumulation of book knowledge to pass an examination or to get a job. Thus you yourself have made your mind dull, and your knowledge has corrupted you.

So, your transformation is your own problem. What need have you to find out who has or who has not transformed himself? If you have beauty within you, you do not seek. A happy man does not seek; it is the man who is unhappy that seeks. Unhappiness is not resolved by search, Not only by understanding, by watching every gesture, spontaneously seeing every one of your thoughts and feelings so that it reveals its story. Then only is truth discovered.

Question: You have never talked about the future. Why? Are you afraid of it?

Krishnamurti: What is the importance of the future in our life? Why should it have any importance? What do we mean by the future? The tomorrow, the ideal, the everlasting hope of the Utopia, of what I should be, the pattern in different forms of an ideal society - is that what you mean by the future? We live by hope, and hope is a means of our death. When you hope, you are dead, because hope is an avoidance of the present. You do not hope when you are happy. It is only when you are unhappy, frustrated, restrained, when you are suffering, when you are aching, when you are a prisoner, that you look to the future. When you are really joyous, happy, time is not. We live with hope from birth to death because we are unhappy from the beginning to the very end; and hope is the way of escape, it is not the resolution of our actual state, which is unhappiness. We look to the future as a means of avoiding the present, and the man who avoids the present by going to the past or to the future, is not living; he does not know life as it is lived, he only knows life in relation to the past or to the future. Life is painful, tortuous, so we seek an escape from it; and if we are promised heaven, we are perfectly happy. That is why the party, whether of the left or the right, ultimately wins. The parties always promise something tomorrow, five years later, and we fall for it, we gobble it up; and we are ultimately destroyed. Because we want to escape from the present, if we cannot look to the future, we turn to the past - the past teachers, the past books, the knowledge of what has been said by Sankara, Buddha and others. So we either live in the past or in the future, and a man who lives

in the past or in the future has actually the responses of the dead; for all such responses are mere reactions. It is therefore no good talking about the past and the future, about rewards and punishments. What is important is to find out how to live, how to be free from misery in the present. Virtue is not tomorrow. A man who is going to be merciful tomorrow is a foolish man. Virtue is not to be cultivated; it is in the understanding of what is in the present.

How are you to live in the present without the ache, the pain of sorrow? Sorrow is to be resolved, not in terms of time, but by understanding; it can be resolved only in the present - and that is why I don't talk about the future. There comes an extraordinary activity and vitality when there is a direct observation of what is; but you want to play with things, and when you play with serious things, you get burnt. You are swept away by hopes and rewards, and a man who pursues hope lives in death.

Our problem is whether sorrow can come to an end through the process of time, which is continuity. Sorrow cannot come to an end through time, because the process of time is continuance of suffering, and therefore no resolution of suffering. Sorrow can come to an end instantly; freedom is not at the end, but at the beginning. To understand this, there must be the beginning of freedom, the freedom to see the false as false, the capacity to see things as they are, not in time, but now. You do this when you are vitally interested, when you are in a crisis. After all, what is a crisis? It is a situation which demands your full attention without taking refuge in beliefs. When there is no solution, when there is no response of the mind, when the mind has no ready made

answer, no conclusion, and you are unable to resolve the problem - then you are in a crisis. But unfortunately, through your study of books and your following of teachers, your mind has an explanation for every problem - therefore you are never in a moment of crisis. There is a challenge every minute, and a crisis comes when the mind has no ready made answer. When you cannot find a way out, consciously or unconsciously, through words or through escapes, then you are in a crisis. Death is a crisis, though you can explain it away. You are in a crisis when you lose your money, when thousands are destroyed in a single second. Ending is the crisis - but you never end, you always want things to continue. It is only when there is a crisis without avoidance or escape and you are therefore confronted with it directly - it is only then that the problem is resolved. The concern with the future is the avoidance of the crisis; hope is avoidance of what is. To meet the crisis there must be complete denudation of the future and the past; therefore it is no good talking about the future.

Question: What should be the relationship, according to you, between the individual and the State?

Krishnamurti: Do you want a blue print? Now you are back again at what should be. Speculation is the easiest and most wasteful thing that one can indulge in. Beware of the man who offers you hope, do not trust him, he will lead you to death; he is interested in his idea of the future, in his conception of what ought to be, and not in your life.

Are the State and the individual two different processes? Are they not interacting? How can you live without me, without another, and does not our relationship make society? You and I and

another are a unitary process, we are not separate processes. The `you' implies the `me' and the other. You are the collective, not the single, though you would like to consider yourself single. You are the result of all the collective, and the individual can never be single. You have put a wrong question because you have divided the individual from the State. You are a result of the total process, of all the influences of the collective; and though the result can call itself individual, it is a product of the process which is going on. The understanding of this process is to be found in relationship, whether with the single or with the collective, and that understanding, and the action springing from it, will create a new society, a new order of things; but to paint a picture of what should be and to leave it to the reformers, the politicians, or the so-called revolutionaries, is merely to seek satisfaction in ideas. There can be fundamental revolution only when you meet the crisis directly without the intervention of the mind.

Question: You have talked about relationship based on usage of another for one's own gratification, and you have often hinted at a state called love. What do you mean by love?

Krishnamurti: We know what our relationship is - a mutual gratification and use, though we clothe it by calling it love. In usage there is tenderness for and the safeguarding of what is used. We safeguard our frontier, our books, our property; similarly, we are careful in safeguarding our wives, our families, our society, because without them we would be lonely, lost. Without the child, the parent feels lonely; what you are not, the child will be, so the child becomes an instrument of your vanity. We know the relationship of need and usage. We need the postman and he needs

us, yet we don't say we love the postman. But we do say that we love our wives and children, even though we use them for our personal gratification and are willing to sacrifice them for the vanity of being called patriotic. We know this process very well - and obviously, it cannot be love. Love that uses, exploits, and then feels sorry, cannot be love, because love is not a thing of the mind.

Now, let us experiment and discover what love is - discover, not merely verbally, but by actually experiencing that state. When you use me as a guru and I use you as disciples, there is mutual exploitation. Similarly, when you use your wife and children for your furtherance, there is exploitation. Surely, that is not love. When there is use, there must be possession; possession invariably breeds fear, and with fear come jealousy, envy, suspicion. When there is usage, there cannot be love, for love is not something of the mind. To think about a person is not to love that person. You think about a person only when that person is not present, when he is dead, when he has run off, or when he does not give you what you want. Then your inward insufficiency sets the process of the mind going. When that person is close to you, you do not think of him; to think of him when he is close to you is to be disturbed, so you take him for granted - he is there. Habit is a means of forgetting and being at peace so that you won't be disturbed. So, usage must invariably lead to invulnerability, and that is not love.

What is that state when usage - which is thought process as a means to cover the inward insufficiency, positively or negatively - is not? What is that state when there is no sense of gratification? Seeking gratification is the very nature of the mind. Sex is sensation which is created, pictured by the mind; and then the mind

acts or does not act. Sensation is a process of thought, which is not love. When the mind is dominant and the thought process is important, there is no love. This process of usage, thinking, imagining, holding, enclosing, rejecting, is all smoke; and when the smoke is not, the flame of love is. Sometimes we do have that flame, rich, full, complete; but the smoke returns because we cannot live long with the flame, which has no sense of nearness, either of the one or the many, either personal or impersonal. Most of us have occasionally known the perfume of love and its vulnerability; but the smoke of usage, habit, jealousy, possession, the contract and the breaking of the contract - all these have become important for us, and therefore the flame of love is not. When the smoke is, the flame is not; but when we understand the truth of usage, the flame is. We use another because we are inwardly poor, insufficient, petty, small, lonely, and we hope that, by using another, we can escape. Similarly, we use God as a means of escape. The love of God is not the love of truth. You cannot love truth; loving truth is only a means of using it to gain something else that you know, and therefore there is always the personal fear that you will lose something that you know.

You will know love when the mind is very still and free from its search for gratification and escapes. First, the mind must come entirely to an end. Mind is the result of thought, and thought is merely a passage, a means to an end. When life is merely a passage to something, how can there be love? Love comes into being when the mind is naturally quiet, not made quiet, when it sees the false as false and the true as true. When the mind is quiet, then whatever happens is the action of love, it is not the action of knowledge.

Knowledge is mere experience, and experience is not love.

Experience cannot know love. Love comes into being when we understand the total process of ourselves, and the understanding of ourselves is the beginning of wisdom.

February 5, 1950

NEW YORK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 4TH JUNE 1950

I think it is important to bear in mind that there is a difficulty in understanding each other. Most of us listen casually, and we hear only what we want to hear; we disregard that which is penetrating or disturbing, and listen only to the things that are pleasurable, satisfying. Surely, there can be no real understanding of anything if we listen only to those things which gratify and soothe us. It is quite an art to listen to everything without prejudice, without building up defences; and may I suggest that we try to set aside our acquired knowledge, our particular idiosyncrasies and points of view, and listen to find out the truth of the matter. It is only the truth that really and fundamentally frees us - not speculations, not conclusions, but only the perception of what is true. The true is the factual, and we are incapable of looking at the factual when we approach it with our private conclusions, prejudices, and experiences. So, if I may suggest it, during these talks we should try to hear, not only what is being said verbally, but the inward content of it; we should try to discover the truth of the matter for ourselves.

Now, truth can be discovered only when we are not pursuing any form of distraction; and most of us want to be distracted. Life, with all its struggles, problems, wars, business crises and family quarrels, is a bit too much for us, so we want to be distracted; and we have probably come to this meeting in search of distraction. But distraction, whether outward or inward, will not help us to understand ourselves. Distraction - whether the distraction of politics, of religion, of knowledge, of amusement, or the distraction

of pursuing so-called truth - , however stimulating for the time being, ultimately dulls the mind, encloses, circumscribes and limits it. Distractions are both outward and inward. The outward ones we know fairly well; as we grow older we begin to recognize them if we are at all thoughtful. But though we may discard the obvious distractions, it is much more difficult to understand the inward ones; and if we merely make these meetings into a new form of distraction, a new stimulation, I am afraid they will have very little value in the understanding of oneself - which is of primary importance.

Therefore, one has to understand the whole process of distraction; because, as long as the mind is distracted, seeking a result, trying to escape through stimulation or so-called inspiration, it is incapable of understanding its own process. And, if we are to think out any of the innumerable problems that confront each one of us, it is essential to know the whole process of our own thinking, is it not? Self-knowledge is ultimately the only way of resolving our innumerable problems; and self-knowledge cannot possibly be a result, an outcome of stimulation or distraction. On the contrary, distraction, stimulation and so-called inspiration, merely take one away from the central issue. Surely, without knowing oneself fundamentally, radically, and deeply, without knowing all the layers of consciousness, both the superficial as well as the profound, there is no basis for thinking, is there? If I do not know myself in both the upper and the deeper layers of the mind, what basis have I for any thinking? And in order to know oneself, no form of distraction is helpful. Yet most of us are concerned with distractions. Our religious, political, social, and economic

activities, our pursuit of various teachers with their particular idiosyncrasies, our clamouring after what we call knowledge - these are all escapes, they are obviously distractions away from the central issue of knowing oneself. Though it has often been said that it is essential to know oneself, we actually give very little time or thought to the matter; and without knowing oneself, whatever we think or do must inevitably lead to further confusion and misery.

So, it is essential in all things to understand the process of oneself; because, without knowing oneself, no human problem can be resolved. Any resolution of a problem without self-knowledge is merely distraction, leading to further misery, confusion, and struggle - this, when one thinks about it, is fairly obvious. Seeing the truth of that, how is it possible to know the whole content, the whole structure of oneself? I think this is a fundamental question which each one of us has to face; and in considering it together, you are not merely listening to me giving you a series of ideas, nor am I expounding a particular system or method. On the contrary, you and I are trying to find out together how it is possible to know oneself - the `oneself' who is the actor, the observer, the thinker, the watcher. If I do not know the whole process of myself, mere conclusions, theories, speculations, are obviously of very little significance.

Now, to know myself, I must know my actions, my thoughts, my feelings; because, I can only know myself in action, not apart from action. I cannot know myself apart from my activities in relationship. My activities, my qualities, are myself. I can know the whole process of my thinking, the conscious as well as the unconscious, only in relationship - my relationship to ideas, to

people, and to things, property, and money; and to study myself apart from relationship has very little meaning. It is only in my relationship to these things that I can know myself. To divide myself into the `higher' and the `lower' is absurd. To think that I am the `higher self' directing or controlling my `lower self', is a theory of the mind; and without understanding the structure of the mind, merely to invent convenient theories is a process of escape from myself.

So, the important thing is to find out what my relationship is to people, to property, and to ideas; because, life is a process of relationship. Nothing can live in isolation, except theoretically; and to understand myself, I must understand the whole process of relationship. But the understanding of relationship becomes extremely difficult, and almost impossible, when I look into the mirror of relationship with a sense of condemnation, justification, or comparison. How can I understand relationship if I condemn, justify, or compare it with something? I can understand it only when I come to it anew, with a fresh mind, a mind which is not caught in the traditional background of condemnation and acceptance.

To understand myself is essential, because, whatever the problems, they are projected by me. I am the world, I am not independent of the world, and the world's problems are my own. To understand the problems around me, which are the projection of myself, I have to understand myself in relationship to everything; but there cannot be understanding if I begin by comparing, condemning, or justifying. Now, it is the nature of the mind to condemn, to justify, to compare; and when we see in the mirror of

relationship our own reactions and idiosyncrasies, our instinctive response is to condemn or justify them. The understanding of this process of condemnation and justification is the beginning of self-knowledge - and without self-knowledge, we cannot go very far. We can invent a lot of theories and speculations, join various groups, follow teachers and Masters, perform rituals, gather into little cliques and feel superior to others - but all this leads nowhere, it is merely the immature action of thoughtless people. To find out what is real, to discover whether or not there is reality, God, one must first understand oneself; because, whatever the conception one may have of reality or of God, it is merely a projection of oneself, which can obviously never be real. It is only when the mind is utterly tranquil - not forced to be tranquil, not compelled, nor disciplined - that it is possible to find out what is real; and the mind can be still only in the understanding of its own structure. Only the real, that which is not a projection of the mind, can free the mind from all the tribulations, from all the problems that confront each one of us.

So, we must first see the importance, the necessity of understanding oneself; for without understanding oneself, no problem can be resolved, and the wars, the antagonisms, the envy and strife, will continue. A man who would really understand truth must have a mind that is quiet; and that quietness can come only through the understanding of himself. Tranquillity of the mind does not come through discipline, through control, through subjugation, but only when the problems, which are the projections of oneself, are completely understood. Only when the mind is quiet, when it is not projecting itself, is it possible for the real to be. That is, for

reality to come into being, the mind must be quiet - not made quiet, not controlled, subjugated, or suppressed, but silent spontaneously because of its understanding of the whole structure of the 'me', with all its memories, limitations, and conflicts. When all this is completely and truly understood, the mind is quiet; and then only is it possible to know that which is real.

Some questions have been given to me, and I shall answer a few of them this morning; but before doing so, let me say that it is very easy to ask a question, hoping for an answer. I am afraid, however, that life has no answer like 'yes' or 'no'. We have to discover the true answer for ourselves; and to discover the true answer, we must examine the problem. To examine the problem, especially a problem that concerns us intimately, is very difficult; for most of us approach it with a prejudice, with a desire to find a result, a satisfactory answer. So, in considering these questions, let us investigate the problem together, and not wait for me to tell you the answer; because, truth must be discovered each minute, not merely explained. Truth is not knowledge - knowledge is merely the cultivation of memory, and memory is a continuity of experiences; and that which is continuous can never be the truth. So, let us investigate these questions together. I am not saying this merely to be rhetorical: I actually mean it. You and I are going to find out the truth of the matter. If you discover it for yourself, it is yours; but if you wait for me to give the answer, it will have very little value, for then you will merely remain on the verbal level and hear only words, and the words will not carry you very far.

Question: What system would assure us of economic security?

Krishnamurti: Now what do we mean by a system? The world is

torn at the present time between two systems, the left and the right. The world is broken up by beliefs, by ideas, by formulas, and we seek economic or physical security along certain lines. Now, can there be security according to any particular system? Can you base existence on any particular belief, conclusion, or theory? There is the system of the left, and the system of the right. Both of them promise economic security, and they are at war with each other - which means that you are not secure. You are not secure because you are quarrelling over systems and cultivating war in the process. So, as long as you depend on a system for security, there must be insecurity. Surely, that is fairly clear, is it not? Those who hold to beliefs, to Utopian promises, are not concerned with people: they are concerned with ideas; and action based on ideas must inevitably breed separatism and disintegration - which is actually what is taking place. So, as long as we look for security through a system, through an idea, obviously there must be separatism, contention, and disintegration, which invariably brings about insecurity.

The next problem is this: is economic security a matter of legislation, of compulsion, of totalitarianism? We all want to be secure. It is essential to be physically secure, to have food, clothing and shelter, otherwise we cannot exist. But is that security brought about by legislation, by economic regulation - or is it a psychological problem? So far, we have considered it merely as an economic problem, a matter of economic adjustment; but surely it is a psychological problem, is it not? And can such a problem be solved by economic experts? Since the economic problem is obviously the result of our own inclinations, desires, and pursuits,

it is really a psychological problem; and in order to bring about economic security, we must understand the psychological demand to be secure. I do not know if I am making myself clear.

The world is now torn up into different nationalities, different beliefs, different political ideologies, each promising security, a future Utopia; and obviously, such a process of separatism is a process of disintegration.

Now, can there ever be unity through ideas? Can ideas, beliefs, ever bring people together? Obviously, they cannot - it is being proved throughout the world. So, to bring about security, not for a small group of people but for the whole of mankind, there must be freedom from this process of division created by ideas - the idea of being a Christian, a Buddhist, a Hindu, a nationalist, a communist, a socialist, a capitalist, an American, a Russian, or God knows what else. It is these things that are separating us, and they are nothing but beliefs, ideas; and as long as we cling to beliefs as a means of security, there must be separation, there must be disintegration and chaos.

So, this is fundamentally a psychological, not an economic problem; it is a problem of the individual psyche, and therefore we have to understand the process of individuality, of the `you'. Is the `you' in America different from the `me' that lives in India or in Europe? Though we may separate ourselves by customs, by formulas, by certain beliefs, fundamentally we are the same, are we not? Now, when the me seeks security in a belief, that very belief gives strength to the `me'. I am a Hindu, a socialist, I belong to a particular religion, a particular sect, and I cling to that and defend it. So, the very attachment to belief creates separatism, which is

obviously a cause of contention between you and me. The economic problem can never be solved as long as we separate ourselves into nationalities, into religious groups, or belong to particular ideologies. So, it is essentially a psychological problem, that is, a problem of the individual in relationship to society; and society is the projection of oneself. That is why there can be no solution to any human problem without understanding oneself completely - which means living in a state of complete inward insecurity. We want to be outwardly secure, and so we pursue inward security; but as long as we are seeking inward security through beliefs, through attachments, through ideologies, obviously we will create islands of isolation in the form of national, ideological and religious groups, and therefore be at war with each other. So, it is important to understand the process of oneself. But self-knowledge is not a means of ultimate security - on the contrary, reality is something which has to be discovered from moment to moment. A mind that is secure can never be in a state of discovery; and a mind that is insecure has no belief, it is not caught in any particular ideology. Such a mind is not seeking inward security, therefore it will create outward security. As long as you are seeking security inwardly, you will never have security outwardly. Therefore, the problem is not to bring about outward security, but to understand the desire to be inwardly, psychologically secure; and as long as we do not understand that, we shall never have peace, we shall never have security in the outer world.

Now, one is horrified, very often, to discover in oneself appalling distortions. How is one to be free from them? There are

different ways of attempting to be free, are there not? There is the psychoanalytical process, and there is the process of control, of discipline, and the process of escape. Can one be free fundamentally through the psychoanalytical process? I am not condemning psychoanalysis - but let us examine it. First of all, the `me', the whole structure of the `me', is the result of the past. You and I are the result of the past, of time, of many incidents, experiences; we are made up of various qualities, memories, idiosyncrasies. The whole structure of the `me' is the past. Now, in the past there are certain qualities which I dislike and want to get rid of, so I go into the past and look at them; I bring them out and analyze them, hoping to dissolve them; or, using the actions of the present as a mirror to reflect the past, I try to dissolve the past. Either I go to the past and try to dissolve it through analysis, or I use the present as a means through which the past is discovered; that is, in present action I seek to discover and understand the past. So, that is one way.

Then there is the way of discipline. I say to myself, `These particular distortions are not worthwhile, I am going to suppress, subjugate, control them'. This implies, does it not?, that there is an entity separate from the thought process - call it the higher self, or what you will - that is controlling, dominating, choosing. Surely that is implied, is it not? When I say, `I am going to dissolve the distortions', I am separate from those distortions. That is, I don't like the distortions, they hinder me, they bring about fear, conflict, and I want to dissolve them; so there arises the idea that the `me' is separate from the distortions and is capable of dissolving them.

Before we discuss this further, we will have to find out if the

`me', the examiner, the observer, the analyzer, is different from the qualities. Am I making it clear? Is the thinker, the experiencer, the observer, different from the thought, from the experience, from the thing which is observed? Is the `me', whether you place it at the highest or at the lowest level - is that `me' different from the qualities which compose it? Is the thinker, the analyzer, different from his thoughts? You think that he is - that the thinker is separate from thought; therefore, you control thought, you shape thought, you subjugate, push it aside. The thinker, you say, is different from thought. But is that so? Is there a thinker without thought? If you have no thought, where is the thinker? So, thought creates the thinker; the thinker doesn't create thought. The moment we separate the thinker from the thought, we have the whole problem of trying to control, dissipate, suppress thought, or of trying to be free from a particular thought. This is the conflict between the thinker and the thought in which most of us are caught - it is our whole problem.

One sees certain distortions in one- self which one doesn't like, and one wants to be free of them; so one tries to analyze or to discipline them, that is, to do something about the thoughts. But before we do that, should we not find out if the thinker is actually separate from thought? Obviously he is not: the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experienced - they are not two different processes, but a single, unitary process. Thought divides itself and creates the thinker for its own convenience. That is, thought is invariably transient, it has no resting place; and seeing itself as transient, thought creates the thinker as the permanent entity. The permanent entity then acts upon thought, choosing this

particular thought and rejecting that. Now, when you really see the falseness of that process, you will discover that there is no thinker, but only thoughts - which is quite a revolution. This is the fundamental revolution which is essential in order to understand the whole process of thinking. As long as you establish a thinker independent of his thoughts, you are bound to have conflict between the thinker and the thought; and where there is conflict, there can be no understanding. Without understanding this division in yourself, do what you will - suppress, analyze, discover the cause of struggle, go to a psychoanalyst, and all the rest of it - , you will inevitably remain in the process of conflict. But if you can see and understand the truth that the thinker is the thought, the analyzer is the analyzed - if you can understand that, not merely verbally, but in actual experience, then you will discover that an extraordinary revolution is taking place. Then there is no permanent entity as the `me' choosing and discarding, seeking a result, or trying to achieve an end. Where there is choice there must be conflict; and choice will never lead to understanding, because choice implies a thinker who chooses. So, to be free of a particular distortion, a particular perversion, we must first discover for ourselves the truth that the thinker is not separate from thought; then we will see that what we call distortion is a process of thinking, and that there is no thinker apart from that process.

Now, what do we mean by thinking? When we say, `This is ugly', `That is fear', `This must be discarded', we know what that process is. There is the `me' who is choosing, condemning, discarding. But if there is not the `me' but only that process of fear, then what happens? Am I explaining the problem? If there is not

the one who condemns, who chooses, who thinks that he is separate from that which he dislikes, then what happens? Please experience this as we go along, and you will see. Don't merely listen to my words, but actually experience that there is only thought, and not the thinker. Then you will see what thinking is. What is thought? Thought is a process of verbalization, is it not? Without words, you cannot think. So, thought is a process of memory, because words, symbols, names, are the product, the result of memory. So, thinking is a process of memory; and memory gives a name to a particular feeling and either condemns or accepts it. By giving a name to something, you condemn or accept it, don't you? When you say someone is an American, a Russian, a Hindu, a Negro, you have finished with him, haven't you? By labeling a thing you think you have understood it. So, when there is a particular reaction which you term 'fear', in giving it a name you have condemned it. That is the actual process you will see going on when you begin to be aware of your thinking.

Is it possible not to name a feeling? Because, by calling a particular feeling 'anger', 'fear', 'jealousy', we have given it strength, have we not? We have fixed it. The very naming is a process of confirming that feeling, giving it strength, and therefore enclosing it in memory. Observe it and you will see. It is possible to be free fundamentally only when the process of naming is understood - naming being terming, symbolizing, which is the action of memory; because memory is the 'you'. Without your memory, without your experiences, the 'you' is not; and the mind clings to those experiences as essential in order to be secure. So, we cultivate memory, which is experience, knowledge, and

through that process we hope to control the reactions and feelings which we call distortions. If we would be free of any particular quality, we must understand the whole process of the thinker and the thought, we must see the truth that the thinker is not separate from thought, but that they are a single, unitary process. If you actually realize that, you will see what an extraordinary revolution takes place in your life. By revolution I do not mean economic revolution, which is no revolution at all, but merely a modified continuity of what is. But when the thinker realizes that he is not different from thought, then you will see that radically, deeply, there is an extraordinary transformation; because, then there is only the fact of thought, and not the translation of that fact to suit the thinker.

Now, what is there to understand about a fact? There is nothing, is there? A fact is a fact, it is self-evident. The struggle to understand comes only when the thinker is trying to do something about the fact. The action of the thinker upon the fact is shaped by his memory, by his past experience; therefore, the fact is always shaped by the thinker, and therefore he never understands the fact. But if there is no thinker, but only the fact, then the fact has not to be understood - it is a fact; and when you are face to face with a fact, what happens? When there is no escape, when there is no thinker trying to give the fact a meaning to suit himself or shape it according to his particular pattern, what happens? When you are face to face with a fact, surely then you have understood it, have you not? Therefore, there is freedom from it. And such freedom is a radical freedom, it is not just a superficial reaction, a result of the mind's trying to identify itself with a particular opposite. As long as

we are seeking a result there must be the thinker, there must be the process of isolation; and a person who, in his thoughts, is isolated as the thinker, can never find what is true. The so - called religious person who is seeking God is merely establishing himself as a permanent entity apart from his thoughts, and such a person can never find reality.

So, then, our problem is this: being aware of a particular reaction, of a response of fear, of guilt, of anger, of envy, or what you will, how is one to be radically free of it? One can see that it is impossible to be free of it through discipline, because a product of conflict is never the truth: it is only a result, the effect of a cause. Whereas, if one sees as true, that the thinker can never be separate from his thought, that the qualities and memories of the `me' are not separate from the `me'-when one realizes that and has direct experience of it, then one will see that thought becomes a fact, and that there is no translating of the fact. The fact is the truth, and when you are confronted with truth and there is no other action but seeing it directly as it is, without condemnation or justification, that very recognition of the fact frees the mind from the fact.

So, only when the mind is capable of seeing itself in its relationship to all things is it possible for the mind to be quiet, to be tranquil. The mind that is tranquil through a process of isolation, of subjugation, of control, is not tranquil, but dead; it is merely conforming to a pattern, seeking a particular result. Only a free mind can be tranquil, and that freedom does not come through any form of identification; on the contrary, it comes only when we realize that the thinker is the thought, and not separate from thought. The tranquillity of freedom, of understanding, is not a

matter of knowledge. Knowledge can never bring understanding. Knowledge is merely the cultivation of memory, in which the mind seeks security, and such a mind can never understand reality. Reality can be found only in freedom, which means to face the fact as it is, without distorting it. There must be distortion as long as the 'I' is separate from the thing it observes. Surely, the tranquil mind is a free mind, and it is only in freedom that truth can be discovered.

June 4, 1950

NEW YORK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 11TH JUNE 1950

I think it is important to see the necessity of self-knowledge; because, what we are, that we project. If we are confused, uncertain, worried, ambitious, cruel or fearful, it is just that which we produce in the world. We do not seem to realize how essential it is for thought and action that there should be a fundamental understanding of oneself - not only of the superficial layers of one's consciousness, but also of the deeper layers of the unconscious, of the totality of one's whole process of thinking and feeling. We seem to regard this understanding of oneself as such a difficult task that we prefer to run away from it into all kinds of infantile, immature activities, such as ceremonies, so-called spiritual organizations, political groups, and so on - anything rather than study and comprehend oneself integrally and completely.

The fundamental understanding of oneself does not come through knowledge or through the accumulation of experiences, which is merely the cultivation of memory. The understanding of oneself is from moment to moment; and if we merely accumulate knowledge of the self, that very knowledge prevents further understanding, because accumulated knowledge and experience become the centre through which thought focuses and has its being. The world is not different from us and our activities, because it is what we are which creates the problems of the world; and the difficulty with the majority of us is that we do not know ourselves directly, but seek a system, a method, a means of operation by which to solve the many human problems.

Now, is there a means, a system, of knowing oneself? Any

clever person, any philosopher, can invent a system, a method; but surely, the following of a system will merely produce a result created by that system, will it not? If I follow a particular method of knowing myself, then I shall have the result which that system necessitates; but that result will obviously not be the understanding of myself. That is, by following a method, a system, a means through which to know myself, I shape my thinking, my activities, according to a pattern; but the following of a pattern is not the understanding of oneself.

So, there is no method for self-knowledge. Seeking a method invariably implies the desire to attain some result - and that is what we all want. We follow authority - if not that of a person, then of a system, of an ideology - because we want a result which will be satisfactory, which will give us security. We really do not want to understand ourselves, our impulses and reactions, the whole process of our thinking, the conscious as well as the unconscious; we would rather pursue a system which assures us of a result. But the pursuit of a system is invariably the outcome of our desire for security, for certainty, and the result is obviously not the understanding of oneself. When we follow a method, we must have authorities - the teacher, the guru, the saviour, the Master - who will guarantee us what we desire; and surely, that is not the way to self-knowledge.

Authority prevents the understanding of oneself, does it not? Under the shelter of an authority, a guide, you may have temporarily a sense of security, a sense of well-being; but that is not the understanding of the total process of oneself. Authority in its very nature prevents the full awareness of oneself, and therefore

ultimately destroys freedom; and in freedom alone can there be creativeness. There can be creativeness only through self-knowledge. Most of us are not creative, we are repetitive machines, mere gramophone records playing over and over again certain songs of experience, certain conclusions and memories, either our own or those of another. Such repetition is not creative being - but it is what we want. Because we want to be inwardly secure, we are constantly seeking methods and means for this security, and thereby we create authority, the worship of another, which destroys comprehension, that spontaneous tranquility of mind in which alone there can be a state of creativeness.

Surely, our difficulty is that most of us have lost this sense of creativeness. To be creative does not mean that we must paint pictures or write poems and become famous. That is not creativeness - it is merely the capacity to express an idea, which the public applauds or disregards. Capacity and creativeness should not be confused. Capacity is not creativeness. Creativeness is quite a different state of being, is it not? It is a state in which the self is absent, in which the mind is no longer a focus of our experiences, our ambitions, our pursuits, and our desires. Creativeness is not a continuous state, it is new from moment to moment, it is a movement in which there is not the `me', the `mine', in which the thought is not focused around any particular experience, ambition, achievement, purpose, and motive. It is only when the self is not, that there is creativeness - that state of being in which alone there can be reality, the creator of all things. But that state cannot be conceived or imagined, it cannot be formulated or copied, it cannot be attained through any system, through any method, through any

philosophy, through any discipline; on the contrary, it comes into being only through understanding the total process of oneself.

The understanding of oneself is not a result, a culmination; it is seeing oneself from moment to moment in the mirror of relationship - one's relationship to property, to things, to people, and to ideas. But we find it difficult to be alert, to be aware, and we prefer to dull our minds by following a method, by accepting authorities, superstitions, and gratifying theories; so, our minds become weary, exhausted, and insensitive. Such a mind cannot be in a state of creativeness. That state of creativeness comes only when the self, which is the process of recognition and accumulation, ceases to be; because, after all, consciousness as the 'me' is the centre of recognition, and recognition is merely the process of the accumulation of experience. But we are all afraid to be nothing, because we all want to be something. The little man wants to be a big man, the unvirtuous wants to be virtuous, the weak and obscure crave power, position, and authority. This is the incessant activity of the mind. Such a mind cannot be quiet, and therefore can never understand the state of creativeness.

So, to transform the world about us, with its misery, wars, unemployment, starvation, class divisions, and utter confusion, there must be a transformation in ourselves. The revolution must begin within oneself - but not according to any belief or ideology; because revolution based on an idea, or in conformity to a particular pattern, is obviously no revolution at all. To bring about a fundamental revolution in oneself, one must understand the whole process of one's thought and feeling in relationship. That is the only solution to all our problems - and not to have more

disciplines, more beliefs, more ideologies and more teachers. If we can understand ourselves as we are from moment to moment without the process of accumulation, then we will see how there comes a tranquillity that is not a product of the mind, a tranquillity that is neither imagined nor cultivated; and only in that state of tranquillity can there be creativeness.

There are several questions, and in considering them together, let us as individuals experiment together to find out the truth of each question. It is not my explanation that is going to dissolve the problem, nor your eager search for a solution; but what dissolves any problem is to unravel it step by step and thereby see the truth of it. It is seeing the truth of our difficulties, which dissolves them; but to see things as they are, is not easy. Listening is an art; and if in listening we can follow what is said experimentally, operationally, then there is a possibility of seeing the truth and thereby dissolving the particular problem which may confront each one of us.

Question: What mental attitude would you consider best suited for the achievement of contentment in today's troubled world, and how would you suggest we attain it?

Krishnamurti: When you want to attain contentment, you have an idea about it, haven't you? You have a preconception of what it is to be contented, and you want to be in that state; so, you seek a method, you want to know how to attain it. Is contentment a result, a thing to be achieved? Is not the very search for a result itself the cause of discontent? Surely, the moment I want to be something, I have already sown the seed of discontent; because I want to attain contentment, I have already brought discontent into being.

Please let us see the significance of this desire to achieve an end. The end is always gratifying, it is something that we think will give us permanent security, happiness. That is, the end is always self-projected; and having projected it, or imagined it, or formulated it in words, we want to attain it, and then we seek a method for its attainment. We want to know how to be contented. Does not that very desire to be contented, or the search for a method to that end, show the stupidity of our own minds? A man who says, 'I want to attain contentment', is surely already in a state of stagnation. He is only concerned with being enclosed in a state wherein nothing will disturb him; so, his contentment is really the ultimate security, which is undisturbed isolation. Contentment which is achieved, and which we call the highest spiritual attainment, is really a condition of decay. But if we can understand the process of discontent, see what it is that brings it about; if, without coming to any conclusion, we can be aware of the ways of discontent, choicelessly watching its every movement - then, in that very understanding, there comes a state of contentment which is not a product of the mind, the thought process, or of desire.

Whatever the mind produces is obviously based on thought, and thought is merely the response of memory, of sensation. When we seek contentment, we are pursuing a sensation that will be completely satisfying; and sensation can never be contentment. If I am aware that I am contented, if I am conscious of it, is that contentment? Is virtue self-conscious? Is happiness a state in which I am conscious that I am happy? Surely, the moment I am aware that I am contented, I am discontented: I want more. (Laughter.) Please do not laugh at these things, because by laughing you are

putting it away, you are not taking it in. It is a superficial reaction to something serious which you do not want to face and look at.

Contentment is a thing that cannot be achieved - though all the religious books, all the saints and the Masters, promise it to you. Their promise is no promise at all; it is just a vanity which gratifies you. But there is a possibility of understanding the whole process of discontent, is there not? What is it that makes me discontented? Surely, it is the desire for a result, a reward, an achievement, the desire to become something. In the very process of achieving a reward, there is punishment; and the man who seeks a reward is already punishing himself. Gaining implies discontent. The longing to achieve creates the fear of loss, and the very desire to attain contentment brings discontent. It is important, is it not?, to see this, not as a theory, not as something to be thought about, discussed, and meditated upon, but as a simple fact. The moment you want something, you have already created discontent; and all the advertisements, everything in our society, is instigating this desire to possess, to grow, to achieve, to become. And can this struggle to become something, be called evolution, growth, progress?

Surely, there is a process of understanding discontent; and in the process of understanding it, you will see that discontent is the very nature of the self, the `me'. The `me' is the centre of discontent, because the `me' is the accumulation of memories; and memories cannot thrive unless there are more memories, more sensations. Until you and I understand the `me', which is the centre of discontent, until we go into it and understand this whole process of becoming, achieving, there must always be discontent. How can a mind that is agitated by the desire for a result, ever understand

anything? It may be quiet for a time in the isolation of its own achievement; but such a mind is obviously self-enclosed, and it can never know the tranquillity of that contentment which is not a result. The mind that is caught up in a result can never be free, and it is only in freedom that there can be contentment.

Question: You say we use physiological needs for our psychological expansion and security. You further show us that security is non-existent. This gives us a feeling of complete hopelessness and fear. Is this all?

Krishnamurti: This is a complex problem, and let us work it out together. First of all, there must be a physiological security, must there not? You must have food, clothing, and shelter. There must be security in the sense that our physical needs must be satisfied, otherwise we cannot exist at all. But the physical needs are used as a means for our psychological self-expansion, are they not? That is, one uses property, clothes, all the physical necessities, as a means of one's own position, progress, and authority.

To put it in a different way, nationalism, calling oneself an American, a Russian, a Hindu, or what you will, is obviously one of the causes of war. Nationalism is separatism, and that which separates obviously disintegrates. Nationalism destroys physical security; but one is nationalistic because there is a psychological security in being identified with the larger, with a particular country, group, or race. It gives me a sense of psychological security to call myself a Hindu, or by some other name; I feel flattered, it gives me a sense of well being.

Similarly, we use property, things, as a means of psychological enlargement, expansion of the `me; and that is why we have all this

confusion, conflict and separation which is taking place in the world. So, the economic problem is not wholly on its own level, but is fundamentally a psychological problem. That is one of the things involved in this question.

Now, as long as we are seeking psychological or inward security, obviously we must deny outward security. That is, as long as we are nationalistic, we must create war, thereby destroying the outward security which is so essential. It is the individual's seeking of inward security that brings about wars, class struggles, the innumerable divisions of religion, and all the rest of the business, ultimately destroying outward security for all. So, as long as I am seeking inward security in any form, I must bring about outward chaos and misery. The mere rearrangement of outward security, individual or collective, without understanding the inward processes of desire, is utterly futile; because, the psychological necessity for inward expansion will inevitably destroy whatever outward structure has been created. This is a fact which we can discuss and which I will go into later.

Now, inward security is a non-existent state, and when we seek it, what we are doing is merely isolating ourselves, enclosing ourselves in an idea, in a hope, in a particular pattern which gratifies us. That is, we enclose ourselves either in the collective experience and knowledge, or in our own particular experience and knowledge, and in that state we like to remain because we feel secure. Having a particular name, possessing certain qualities and things, gives you a sense of well being. Calling yourself a doctor, a mayor, a swami, or God knows what else, gives you a sense of inward security; and that inward security is obviously a process of

separation, and therefore of disintegration.

Now, when you actually see that there is no inward security, you say you have a feeling of complete hopelessness and fear. Why is there this sense of hopelessness? Why is there this sense of despair? What do you mean by hope? A man who clings to hope is obviously dead; a man who is hoping is dying, because to him what is important is the future - not what is, but what will be. A man who lives in hope is not living at all; he is living somewhere else, in the future, and living in the future is obviously not living. Now, you say that when you are without hope, you become hopeless. Is that so? When you see the truth about hope, how destructive it is, do you become hopeless? Do you? If you see the truth that there is no inward security of any kind - really see the truth of it, not merely speculate about the psychological state of insecurity - , are you hopeless, are you in despair? Because we always think in terms of opposites, when we are in despair we want hope; and when there is no hope, we become hopeless. Does this not indicate that we are seeking a state in which there will be no disturbance of any kind? And why should we not be disturbed? Must not the mind be completely uncertain in order to find out? But the moment you are uncertain, you fall into a state of hopelessness, despair, and fear; and then you develop a philosophy of despair and pursue that. Surely, if you really see the truth as regards hope, there comes a freedom from both hopelessness and hope; but one must see it, one must realize and experience that state.

What do we mean by fear? Fear of what? Fear of not being? Fear of what you are? Fear of losing, of being at a loss? Fear,

whether conscious or unconscious, is not abstract: it exists only in relation to something. What we are afraid of is being insecure, is it not? We are afraid of being insecure - not only economically, but much more so inwardly. That is, we are afraid of loneliness, afraid of being nothing, afraid of a sense of complete denudation, a total purgation of all the beliefs, experiences and memories of the mind. Of that state, whatever it is, we are afraid; the state of not being loved, of losing, or not achieving. But when once we see what loneliness is, when we know what it is to be lonely without escape, then there is a possibility of going beyond; because, aloneness is entirely different from loneliness. There must be aloneness; but at present we are made up of many things, of many influences, and we are never alone. We are not individuals, we are merely a bundle of collective responses, with a particular name and a particular group of memories, both inherited and acquired. Surely, that is not individuality.

Now, to understand what it is to be alone, you must understand the whole process of fear. The understanding of fear ultimately brings you to that state in which you are completely empty, completely alone; that is, you are face to face with a loneliness which cannot be satisfied, which cannot be filled in, and from which there is no escape. Then you will see that one can go beyond loneliness - and then there is neither hope nor hopelessness, but a state of aloneness in which there is no fear.

As I said, a man who hopes is obviously not living, because to him the future is extraordinarily important; therefore, he is willing to sacrifice the present for the future. That is what all the ideologist, all the people who build Utopias, are doing: they are

sacrificing the present, that is, they are willing to liquidate you and me for the future - as though they knew the future. All political parties, all ideologists, dangle a hope in front of us; and those who pursue hope are ultimately destroyed. But if we can understand the desire for inward security, see its whole process, and not merely deny it or live in some fanciful state; if through alert watchfulness we are aware of every response of the self, of the 'me', and see that there is no inward security of any kind, whether through property, through a person, or through an ideology; then, in that state of complete insecurity of the mind, there comes a freedom in which alone there is a possibility of discovering what is. But such a state is not for those who hope, or fear, or who want to achieve a result.

Question: How can I experience God in myself?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by experience? What is the process of experiencing? When do we say, 'I have had an experience'? We say that only when we recognize the experience, that is, only when there is an experiencer apart from the experience. This means that our experiencing is a process of recognition and accumulation. Am I explaining myself?

I can experience only when there is a recognition of the experience, and the recognition is recollection, memory; and memory is obviously the centre of the 'me'. That is, the whole process of recognition and accumulation of experience is the 'me', and the 'me' then says, 'I have had an experience'. What is recognized and accumulated as experience is the response to stimuli, the response to challenge. If I do not recognize the response to a challenge, I have no experience. Surely, if you challenge me, and I do not recognize the meaning, the significance

of your challenge, nor my response to it, how can I have an experience? There is experiencing only when I respond to a challenge and recognize the response.

Now, the questioner asks, "How can I experience God in myself?" Is God, reality, or what you will, a thing to lie experienced, a thing to be recognized, so that you can say, 'I have had an experience of God'? Obviously, God is the unknown; it cannot be the known. The moment you know it, it is not God: it is something self-projected, recognized, which is memory. That is why the believer can never know God; and since most of you believe in God, you can never know God, because your very belief prevents you. But non-belief in God, which is another form of belief, also hinders the discovery of the unknown; because all belief is obviously a process of the mind. Belief is the result of the known. You may believe in the unknown, but that belief is born of the known, it is part of the known, which is memory. Memory says, 'I do not know God, it is something unknown'. So, memory creates the unknown, and then believes in it as a means of experiencing the unknown.

Is God to be believed in? The priests, the preachers, the organizers of religions, the bishops, the cardinals, the butcher, the man who flies an airplane and drops a bomb - they all say, 'God is with me'. The man who makes money, exploits others, the man who accumulates wealth and builds temples or churches, says that God is his companion. All such people believe in God; and surely, their belief is merely a form of self-expansion, it is their own conceit. Such people, those who believe in organized dogmas, who have conditioned their minds according to a particular pattern

called religion, obviously can never know the ultimate reality.

For the unknown to be, the mind must be completely empty; there can be no experiencing of reality, because the experiencer is the `me', with all his accumulated memories, conscious as well as unconscious. The `me', which is the residue of all that, says, `I am experiencing; but what he can experience is only his own projection. The `me' cannot experience the unknown; he can only experience the known, the self-projected, the thing believed in or hoped for, which is the creation of thought as a reaction from the past. Such a mind is obviously incapable of being completely empty, completely alone, and therefore it can never be free. It is only a free mind that can know what is - that thing which is indescribable, which cannot be put into words for you or me to recognize. The description of it is merely the cultivation of memory; to verbalize it, is to put it in time, and that which is of time can never be the timeless.

So, the important thing is not what you believe or disbelieve, or what your activities are, but to understand the whole process, the whole content, of yourself; and that means being aware from moment to moment without any sense of accumulation. When the mind is utterly tranquil, quiet, without any sense of acceptance or rejection, without any sense of acquisitiveness or accumulation, when there is that state of tranquillity in which the experiencer is not - only then is there that which may be called God. The word is not important. And then there is a state of creation which is not the expression of the self.

June 11, 1950

NEW YORK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 18TH JUNE 1950

It is most important, is it not?, that the various disintegrating factors in our lives should be understood. These disruptive elements exist, not only at the superficial or economic level, but also at the deeper levels of one's consciousness. We can see throughout the world that there is division, not only between various groups of people, but within the individual himself there is conflict, contradiction. Until we understand this contradiction in ourselves, we shall not be able to deal with the contradictions about us. This contradiction which exists in each one, and of which most of us are aware if we are at all thoughtful, cannot be resolved by the desire to be integrated - which merely becomes another problem to contend with; but if we can be aware of and understand the factors that bring about contradiction, then perhaps there will be a possibility of being integrated.

Now, what brings about contradiction in each one of us? Surely, it is the desire to become something, is it not? We all want to become something: to become successful in the world, and, inwardly, to achieve a result. So, as long as we think in terms of time, in terms of achievement, in terms of position, there must be contradiction. After all, the mind is the product of time. Thought is based on yesterday, on the past; and as long as thought is functioning within the field of time, thinking in terms of the future, of becoming, gaining, achieving, there must be contradiction, because then we are incapable of facing exactly what is. Only in realizing, in understanding, in being choicelessly aware of what is, is there a possibility of freedom from that disintegrating factor

which is contradiction.

So, it is essential, is it not?, to understand the whole process of our thinking, for it is there that we find contradiction. Thought itself has become a contradiction, because we have not understood the total process of ourselves; and that understanding is possible only when we are fully aware of our thought, not as an observer operating upon his thought, but integrally and without choice - which is extremely arduous. Then only is there the dissolution of that contradiction which is so detrimental, so painful.

As long as we are trying to achieve a psychological result, as long as we want inward security, there must lie a contradiction in our life. I do not think that most of us are aware of this contradiction; or, if we are, we do not see its real significance. On the contrary, contradiction gives us an impetus to live; the very element of friction makes us feel that we are alive. The effort, the struggle of contradiction, gives us a sense of vitality. That is why we love wars, that is why we enjoy the battle of frustrations. As long as there is the desire to achieve a result, which is the desire to be psychologically secure, there must be a contradiction; and where there is contradiction, there cannot be a quiet mind. Quietness of mind is essential to understand the whole significance of life. Thought can never be tranquil; thought, which is the product of time, can never find that which is timeless, can never know that which is beyond time. The very nature of our thinking is a contradiction, because we are always thinking in terms of the past or of the future, and therefore we are never fully cognizant, fully aware of the present.

To be fully aware of the present is an extraordinarily difficult

task, because the mind is incapable of facing a fact directly without deception. As I explained, thought is the product of the past, and therefore it can only think in terms of the past or of the future, it cannot be completely aware of a fact in the present. So, as long as thought, which is the product of the past, tries to eliminate contradiction and all the problems that it creates, it is merely pursuing a result, trying to achieve an end, and such thinking only creates more contradiction, and hence conflict, misery, and confusion in us, and, therefore, about us.

To be free of contradiction, one must be aware of the present without choice. How can there be choice when you are confronted with a fact? Surely, the understanding of the fact is made impossible as long as thought is trying to operate upon the fact in terms of becoming, changing, altering. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of understanding; and without self-knowledge, contradiction and conflict will continue. To know the whole process, the totality of oneself, does not require any expert, any authority. The pursuit of authority only breeds fear. No expert, no specialist, can show us how to understand the process of the self. One has to study it for oneself. You and I can help each other by talking about it; but none can unfold it for us, no specialist, no teacher, can explore it for us. We can be aware of it only in our relationship - in our relationship to things, to property, to people, and to ideas. In relationship we will discover that contradiction arises when action is approximating itself to an idea. The idea is merely the crystallization of thought as a symbol; and the effort to live up to the symbol brings about a contradiction.

So, as long as there is a pattern of thought, contradiction will

continue; and to put an end to the pattern, and so to contradiction, there must be self-knowledge. This understanding of the self is not a process reserved for the few. The self is to be understood in our everyday speech, in the way we think and feel, in the way we look at another. If we can be aware of every thought, of every feeling, from moment to moment, then we shall see that in relationship the ways of the self are understood. Then only is there a possibility of that tranquillity of mind in which alone the ultimate reality can come into being.

I am going to answer some questions, and when I do so, let us together explore each problem. I am not the authority, the specialist, the teacher, who is telling you what to do; that would be too absurd for grown up people - if we are grown up at all. So, in considering these questions, let us try to explore and discover the truth for ourselves. It is the discovery of truth that is going to free us from our problems; but that truth cannot be discovered, it cannot come to us, if the mind is merely agitated in the current of these problems. In order to discover the ways of the problem, the problem must be unfolded, and the mind allowed to be quiet; then we see the truth, and it is the truth that frees us.

Question: How am I to get rid of fear, which influences all my activities?

Krishnamurti: This is a very complex problem requiring close attention; and if we do not follow and explore it fully in the sense of experiencing each step as we go along, we will not be able at the end of it to be free of fear.

What do we mean by fear? Fear of what? There are various types of fear, and we need not analyze every type. But we can see

that fear comes into being when our comprehension of relationship is not complete. Relationship is not only between people, but between ourselves and nature, between ourselves and property, between ourselves and ideas; and as long as that relationship is not fully understood, there must be fear. Life is relationship. To be, is to be related, and without relationship there is no life. Nothing can exist in isolation, and as long as the mind is seeking isolation, there must be fear. So, fear is not an abstraction; it exists only in relation to something.

Now, the question is, how to be rid of fear? First of all, anything that is overcome has to be conquered again and again. No problem can be finally overcome, conquered; it can be understood, but not conquered. They are two completely different processes; and the conquering process leads to further confusion, further fear. To resist, to dominate, to do battle with a problem, or to build a defence against it, is only to create further conflict. Whereas, if we can understand fear, go into it fully step by step, explore the whole content of it, then fear will never return in any form; and that is what I hope we can do this morning.

As I said, fear is not an abstraction; it exists only in relationship. Now, what do we mean by fear? Ultimately, we are afraid, are we not?, of not being, of not becoming. Now, when there is fear of not being, of not advancing, or fear of the unknown, of death, can that fear be overcome by determination, by a conclusion, by any choice? Obviously not. Mere suppression, sublimation, or substitution, creates further resistance, does it not? So, fear can never be overcome through any form of discipline, through any form of resistance. That fact must be clearly seen, felt and

experienced: that fear cannot be overcome through any form of defence or resistance. Nor can there be freedom from fear through the search for an answer, or through mere intellectual or verbal explanation.

Now, what are we afraid of? Are we afraid of a fact, or of an idea about the fact? Please see this point. Are we afraid of the thing as it is, or are we afraid of what we think it is? Take death, for example. Are we afraid of the fact of death, or of the idea of death? The fact is one thing, and the idea about the fact is another. Am I afraid of the word 'death', or of the fact itself? Because I am afraid of the word, of the idea, I never understand the fact, I never look at the fact, I am never in direct relation with the fact. It is only when I am in complete communion with the fact that there is no fear. But if I am not in communion with the fact, then there is fear; and there is no communion with the fact as long as I have an idea, an opinion, a theory, about the fact. So, I have to be very clear whether I am afraid of the word, the idea, or of the fact. If I am face to face with the fact, there is nothing to understand about it: the fact is there, and I can deal with it. But if I am afraid of the word, then I must understand the word, go into the whole process of what the word, the term, implies.

For example, one is afraid of loneliness, afraid of the ache, the pain of loneliness. Surely, that fear exists because one has never really looked at loneliness, one has never been in complete communion with it. The moment one is completely open to the fact of loneliness, one can understand what it is; but one has an idea, an opinion about it, based on previous knowledge; and it is this idea, opinion, this previous knowledge about the fact, that creates fear.

So, fear is obviously the outcome of naming, of terming, of projecting a symbol to represent the fact; that is, fear is not independent of the word, of the term. I hope I am making myself clear.

I have a reaction, say, to loneliness; that is, I say I am afraid of being nothing. Am I afraid of the fact itself, or is that fear awakened because I have previous knowledge of the fact, knowledge being the word, the symbol, the image? How can there be fear of a fact? When I am face to face with a fact, in direct communion with it, I can look at it, observe it; therefore, there is no fear of the fact. What causes fear is my apprehension about the fact, what the fact might be or do.

So, it is my opinion, my idea, my experience, my knowledge about the fact, that creates fear. As long as there is verbalization of the fact, giving the fact a name and therefore identifying or condemning it, as long as thought is judging the fact as an observer, there must be fear. Thought is the product of the past, it can only exist through verbalization, through symbols, through images; and as long as thought is regarding or translating the fact, there must be fear.

So, it is the mind that creates fear, the mind being the process of thinking. Thinking is verbalization. You cannot think without words, without symbols, images; these images, which are the prejudices, the previous knowledge, the apprehensions of the mind, are projected upon the fact, and out of that there arises fear. There is freedom from fear only when the mind is capable of looking at the fact without translating it, without giving it a name, a label. This is quite difficult, because the feelings, the reactions, the

anxieties that we have, are promptly identified by the mind and given a word. The feeling of jealousy is identified by that word. Now, is it possible not to identify a feeling, to look at that feeling without naming it? It is the naming of the feeling that gives it continuity, that gives it strength. The moment you give a name to that which you call fear, you strengthen it; but if you can look at that feeling without terming it, you will see that it withers away. Therefore, if one would be completely free of fear, it is essential to understand this whole process of terming, of projecting symbols, images, giving names to facts. That is, there can be freedom from fear only when there is self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, which is the ending of fear.

Question: How can I permanently get rid of sexual desire?

Krishnamurti: Why do we want to get permanently rid of a desire? You call it sexual, somebody else calls it attachment, fear, and so on. Why do we want to get rid of any desire permanently? Because that particular desire is disturbing to us, and we don't want to be disturbed. That is our whole process of thinking, is it not? We want to be self-enclosed, without any disturbance, that is, we want to be isolated; but nothing can live in isolation. In his search for God, the so-called religious person is really seeking complete isolation in which he will never be disturbed; but such a person is not really religious, is he? The truly religious are those who understand relationship completely, fully, and therefore have no problems, no conflict. Not that they are not disturbed; but because they are not seeking certainty, they understand disturbance and therefore there is no self-enclosing process created by the desire for security.

Now, this question requires a great deal of understanding, because we are dealing with sensation, which is thought. To most people, sex has become an extraordinarily important problem. Being uncreative, afraid, enclosed, cut off in all other directions, sex is the only thing through which most people can find a release, the one act in which the self is momentarily absent. In that brief state of abnegation when the self, the 'me', with all its troubles, confusions, and worries, is absent, there is great happiness. Through self-forgetfulness there is a sense of quietness, a release; and because we are uncreative religiously, economically, and in every other direction, sex becomes an overwhelmingly important problem. In daily life we are mere gramophone records, repeating phrases that we have learned; religiously we are automatons, mechanically following the priest; economically and socially we are bound, strangled, by environmental influences. Is there a release for us in any of that? Obviously not; and where there is no release, there must be frustration. That is why the sexual act, in which there is a release, has become such a vital problem for most of us. And society encourages and stimulates it through advertisements, magazines, the cinema, and all the rest of it.

Now, as long as the mind, which is the result, the focal point of sensation, regards sex as a means of its release, sex must be a problem; and that problem will continue as long as we are incapable of being creative comprehensively, totally, and not merely in one particular direction. Creativeness has nothing to do with sensation. Sex is of the mind, and creation is not of the mind. Creation is never a product of the mind, a product of thought; and in that sense, sex, which is sensation, can never be creative. It may

produce babies, but that is obviously not creativeness. As long as we depend for release on sensation, on stimulation in any form, there must be frustration, because the mind becomes incapable of realizing what creativeness is.

This problem cannot be resolved by any discipline, by any taboos, by any social edicts or sanctions. It can be resolved only when we understand the whole process of the mind; because it is the mind that is sexual. It is the mind's images, fancies, and pictures, that stimulate it to be sexual; and as the mind is the result of sensation, it can only become more and more sensuous. Such a mind can never be creative, because creation is not sensation. It is only when the mind does not seek stimuli in any form, whether outward or inward, that it can be completely quiet, free; and only in that freedom is there creation. We have made sex into something ugly because it is the only private sensation that we have; all other sensations are public, open. But as long as we use sensation in any form as a means of release, it will only increase the problems, the confusion and trouble; because, release can never come into being through seeking a result.

The questioner wants to end sexual desire permanently because he has an idea that then he will be in a state in which all disturbances have disappeared; that is why he is seeking it, striving towards it. The very striving towards that state is preventing him from being free to understand the process of the mind. As long as the mind is merely seeking a permanent state in which it will have no disturbance of any kind, it is closed, and therefore it can never be creative. It is only when the mind is free of the desire to become something, to achieve a result, and hence free of fear, that it can be

utterly quiet; and only then is there a possibility of that creativeness which is reality.

Question: Should I be a pacifist?

Krishnamurti: I am afraid I cannot tell you what you should or should not be. We are supposed to be mature, and seeking advice from another in a matter of this kind indicates immaturity. The search for authority only creates corruption, it does not bring freedom. It is only in freedom that truth can be discovered. By following another you will never find what it is to be free of violence.

Let us find out what we mean by pacifism. Is pacifism opposed to violence? Is peace the denial of conflict? Is good the opposite of evil? When you deny vice and go to the opposite, is that virtue? If you deny, resist, put away the ugly, are you beautiful? Is the pursuit of an opposite ever peaceful, ever virtuous or beautiful? The opposite implies conflict, does it not? If you deny violence and pursue peace, what happens? The very pursuit of peace creates conflict, because you are denying violence. The very denial creates conflict; and is virtue ever the result of conflict? Is peace the denial of war? War is obviously the extension, the projection of ourselves, is it not? War is the spectacular and bloody projection of our own daily existence. We call ourselves Americans, or Russians, or Hindus, or God knows what else, out of our desire to be safe; and this identification with a particular country, race, or group of people, gives us a sense of security. But identification with a group or nation means separation, leading to disintegration and war. Surely, as long as I am seeking identification in any form - with my family, with my group, with my property, with my particular

ideology or belief - there must be separation, disintegration, and war. Although it is the dream of all ideologists, whether of the left or of the right, to have everybody believing in one particular theory or system, such a thing is an impossibility. Belief always separates, and therefore it is a disintegrating factor.

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

a modified continuity. Ideas can never be revolutionary, because ideas are merely the reactions of memory. Thought is mere reaction; and an action based on reaction can never be fundamental, can never be true.

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

thought can never progress except in terms of its own becoming. Thought moves from the known to the known; but that is not growth, that is not evolution, that is not freedom.

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

Question: I am not loved and I want to be, for without it life has no meaning. How can I fulfil this longing?

Krishnamurti: I hope you are not merely listening to words, because then these meetings will be another distraction, a waste of time. But if you are really experiencing the things that we are discussing, then they will have an extraordinary significance; because, though you may follow words with the conscious mind, if you are experiencing what is being said, the unconscious also takes part in it. If given an opportunity, the unconscious will reveal its whole content, and so bring about a complete understanding of ourselves. So, I hope you are not merely listening to another talk, but are actually experiencing the things as we go along.

The questioner wants to know how to love and to be loved. Is not that the state of most of us? We all want to be loved, and also to give love. We talk a great deal about it. All religions, all

preachers, talk about it. So, let us find out what we mean by love. Is love sensation? Is love a thing of the mind? Can you think about love? You can think about the object of love, but you cannot think about love, can you? I can think about the person I love; I can have a picture, an image of that person, and recall the sensations, the memories, of our relationship. But is love sensation, memory? When I say, 'I want to love and be loved', is that not merely thought, a reflection of the mind? Is thought love? We think it is, do we not? To us, love is sensation. That is why we have pictures of the people whom we love, that is why we think about them and are attached to them. That is all a process of thought, is it not?

Now, thought is frustrated in different directions, and therefore it says, 'I find happiness in love, so I must have love'. That is why we cling to the person we love, that is why we possess the person, psychologically as well as physiologically. We create laws to protect the possession of what we love, whether it be a person, a piano, a piece of property, or an idea, a belief; because, in possession, with all its complications of jealousy, fear, suspicion, anxiety, we feel secure. So, we have made love into a thing of the mind; and with the things of the mind we fill the heart. Because the heart is empty, the mind says, 'I must have that love; and we try to fulfil ourselves through the wife, through the husband. Through love, we try to become something. That is, love becomes a useful thing, we use love as a means to an end.

So, we have made of love a thing of the mind. The mind becomes the instrument of love, and the mind is only sensation. Thought is the reaction of memory to sensation. Without the symbol, the word, the image, there is no memory, there is no

thought. We know the sensation of so-called love, and we cling to that; and when it fails, we want some other expression of that same sensation. So, the more we cultivate sensation, the more we cultivate so-called knowledge, which is merely memory, the less there is of love.

As long as we are seeking love, there must be a self-enclosing process. Love implies vulnerability, love implies communion; and there can be no communion, no vulnerability, as long as there is the self-enclosing process of thought. The very process of thought is fear; and how can there be communion with another when there is fear, when we use thought as a means for further stimulation?

There can be love only when you understand the whole process of the mind. Love is not of the mind, and you cannot think about love. When you say, 'I want love', you are thinking about it, you are longing for it, which is a sensation, a means to an end. Therefore, it is not love that you want, but stimulation; you want a means through which you can fulfil yourself, whether it be a person, a job, a particular excitement, and so on. Surely, that is not love. Love can be only when the thought of the self is absent, and freedom from the self lies through self-knowledge. With self-knowledge there comes understanding; and when the total process of the mind is completely and fully revealed and understood, then you will know what it is to love. Then you will see that love has nothing to do with sensation, that it is not a means of fulfillment. Then love is by itself, without any result. Love is a state of being, and in that state, the 'me', with its identifications, anxieties, and possessions, is absent. Love cannot be, as long as the activities of the self, of the 'me', whether conscious or unconscious, continue to

exist. That is why it is important to understand the process of the self, the centre of recognition which is the `me'.

June 18, 1950

NEW YORK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 25TH JUNE 1950

If we could find a way out of our conflict, we would not take recourse to authority; but as we do not find a means of resolving our innumerable and multiplying conflicts, we turn either to inward or outward authority for guidance and comfort. So, authority becomes very important in our lives. Because we are unable to understand and resolve conflict, we use authority as a means of avoiding conflict; and the means then becomes all-important, and not the fathoming, the exploring of the process of conflict.

So, we have authority of innumerable kinds, inward as well as outward. Outward authority takes the form of knowledge, examples, teachers, and so on, and inwardly it is our own experiences and memories, to which we turn for guidance in moments of conflict and anxiety. So, authority, both outward and inward, offers us a hope of being free of our various troubles.

But can authority of any kind, inward or outward, resolve our problems? The more we seek authorities, ideals, conclusions, hopes, the more we depend on them; and dependence on authority becomes much more significant than the understanding of the conflict itself. The more we depend on authority, the more dependent we become, because dependence ultimately destroys confidence in our own understanding of problems. Most of us have no confidence in our own capacity to find out, to explore the many problems; and when we depend on authority, obviously that confidence is denied.

Confidence is not arrogance. The more one has experienced, the more one is inwardly certain, the more arrogant and obstinate one

becomes. Such self-confidence is only self-enclosure, a process of resistance. But there is, I think, a different kind of confidence which is not cumulative. To explore into the nature of conflict, one cannot bring to it that which one has accumulated; and if one explores with previous knowledge, it ceases to be exploration. Then you are merely moving from the known to the known, from certainty to certainty, from what you have experienced to what you hope to experience; and that is not exploration or experimentation. That is merely the cumulative process of knowledge, of experience, and the confidence it brings is assertive arrogance.

Now, I think there is a confidence which is much more subtle, much more worth while, and which comes when there is no sense of accumulation of any kind, but a constant exploration and discovery. It is this state of constant discovery, the capacity for constant exploration, that brings about an enduring confidence which is not arrogance. And that confidence, which is so essential, is denied when there is authority of any kind, when we depend on or look up to another for guidance in conduct. When we are dependent, it does give a certain self-assurance, even though it entails fear; but that assurance of following someone, belonging to a group, believing in an idea or in certain dogmas, is surely a self-enclosing process, is it not? The mind that is constantly isolating itself is bound to awaken fear, and so there is a wandering from one authority to another, from one emotional exhaustion to another; and in this process our problems are never resolved, they only multiply.

Now, is it possible to look at our conflicts without bringing in any authority, external or inward? Surely, one can be passively

aware of conflict without choice or condemnation; that is, one can be aware, not as an observer observing his experience or analyzing the thing in himself which he wishes to destroy, but aware with that passivity in which the observer is the observed. In that state of mind we will see that the problems are understood and resolved; whereas, if we choose the way of action with regard to a problem, or compare or condemn it, we only increase resistance, and therefore multiply the problems. This process of choice is going on at all levels of our being, and that is why, instead of decreasing problems, we are multiplying them. The multiplication of problems comes into being only when we seek an answer, a conclusion, and so depend on an authority, outward or inward. Dependence on authority actually prevents our understanding of any problem, which is always new. No problem is old; as long as it remains a problem, it is a challenge, and therefore it is always new. Problems are invariably self-projected, and therefore it is important to understand the whole process of oneself without authority, without following a pattern or looking up to an example, an ideal, or a leader.

Self-knowledge is the beginning of the end of all conflict, and it is only when conflict ceases that there can be creation. Creation cannot be verbalized, it is a state which comes into being when the process of thought is at an end; and only then will the unknowable come to you.

In considering these questions, let us take the journey of exploration together; let each one of us find the truth of every problem for himself. It is no use waiting for the particular answer which you or I might like, or adhering to any particular opinion. To

find out what is true, there must obviously be that passive alertness of mind which gives the capacity to explore each problem deeply.

Question: I have many friends, but I am in constant fear of being rejected by them. What should I do?

Krishnamurti: What is the problem? Is the problem one of rejection and fear, or is it a question of dependence? Why do we want to have friends? Not that we should not have friends; but when we feel the necessity of having friends, when there is this dependence on others, what does it indicate? Does it not indicate insufficiency in oneself? Does not loneliness indicate an inward poverty? And being lonely, inwardly poor, insufficient, we turn to friends, to love, to activity, to ideas, to possessions, to knowledge and technique. That is, being inwardly poor, we depend on outward things; so, the outward things become very important to us. When we use something as a means of escape from ourselves, obviously it becomes very important. We cling to things, to ideas, and to people, because psychologically we depend on them; and when they are taken away, as when our friends reject us, we are lost, we are afraid. So, dependence indicates inward uncertainty, inward poverty; and as long as we use or depend on others, there must be fear of loss.

Now, can this loneliness, this inward poverty or emptiness, be filled through any action of the mind? If I may suggest, please listen and follow it out by watching your own mind, and you will find the answer for yourself. I am only describing the experience as we go along; but to experience it for yourself, you must be passively alert, and not merely follow words.

So, being inwardly poor, we try to escape from this poverty

through work, through knowledge, through love, through many forms of activity. We listen to the radio, read the latest book, pursue an idea or a virtue, accept a belief - anything to escape from our selves. Our thinking is a process of escape from what is; and can that inward emptiness ever be covered up or filled? One can know the truth of that only when one does not escape - which is extremely arduous. One must be aware that one is escaping, and see that all escapes are similar, that there is no 'noble' escape. All escapes, from drunkenness to God, are the same, because one is escaping from what is, which is oneself, one's own inward poverty. It is only when one really ceases to escape that one is face to face with the problem of loneliness, of inward insufficiency, which no knowledge, no experience, can cover up; and only then is there a possibility of understanding and so dissolving it. This loneliness, this inward insufficiency, is not merely the problem of people who have leisure, who have nothing else to do in life except study themselves; it is the problem of every one in the world, the rich and the poor, the man who is brilliant and the man who is dull.

So, can inward emptiness ever be covered up? If you have tried and failed to cover it up by means of one escape, surely you know that all escapes are futile, do you not? You don't have to go from one escape to another to see that psychological insufficiency can never be filled, covered up, or enriched. By thoroughly understanding one escape, the whole process of escape is understood, is it not? Then what happens? One is left with emptiness, with loneliness; and then the problem arises, is that loneliness different from the entity that feels lonely? Obviously not. It is not that the entity feels empty, but that he himself is

emptiness; and the separation between the entity that feels empty, and the state which he calls emptiness, arises only in giving that state a name, a term, a label. When you do not name that state, then you will see there is no separation between the observer and the observed: the observer is the observed, which is insufficiency. In other words, when there is no naming or terming, an integration takes place between the experiencer and the experienced; and then you can proceed further to find out if that state which you have been avoiding as lonely, insufficient, is really so, or is merely a reaction to the word 'lonely', which awakens fear.

Is it the word or the fact that awakens fear? Is any fact ever fearful, or is it an idea about the fact that makes for fear? If you have followed this whole process, you will see that when there is no desire to escape from what is, there is no fear; and then there is a transformation of what is, because then the mind is no longer afraid to be what it is. In that state there is no sense of being lonely, insufficient: it is what it is. If you proceed deeper, you will see that the mind no longer rejects or accepts that state, and is therefore quiet; and only then is it possible to be free from that which is qualified as being lonely or insufficient. But to come to that, you must understand this whole process of inward insufficiency, escape and dependence; you must see how escape and the means of escape become much more important than the thing from which you are escaping; you must discover this division between the thinker and the condition which he calls lonely, and find out for yourself whether it is merely verbal, or an actual state. If it is verbal, then that separation goes on; but if you do not give it a name, then there is only that state which you no longer term lonely; and only then is

it possible for the mind to go beyond and discover further.

Question: What is the place of the individual in society?

Krishnamurti: Is the individual different from society? Are you different from your environment? The environment has conditioned us to be Christians, capitalists, communists, socialists, or what you will; and the environment is in turn the projection of ourselves, is it not? Society is the projection of the individual, who is then further conditioned by that society. So, the individual and society are interrelated; they are not two separate states, or two separate entities. As long as you are conditioned by environment, is there a separate individuality? I am not saying that life is one - that is merely a theory. But it is important to discover whether the individual is separate from the environment, is it not? Though we may call ourselves individuals, are we not conditioned by society? Obviously we are. We are an integral part of society therefore, although we appear to be separate entities, we are not really individuals. Physically, you and I are separate, dissimilar; but there is an extraordinary inward similarity. Whatever may be the superficial difference of race and custom, we are all more or less shaped along the same lines, we are all conditioned by fear, by dependence, by belief, by the desire to be secure, and so on. Surely, as long as we are conditioned by environment, which is our own projection, we are not really individuals, though we may bear different names. There is individuality only when we can go beyond this conditioning. Individuality is a state of creativeness, a state of aloneness, in which there is freedom from the conditioning influences of desire.

So, as long as we are bound by desire, as long as thought is

merely the reaction of desire, which it is, there must be the conditioning influence of society, of the environment, and of our own experiences in reaction to society. We are an integral part of society; and if we try to establish a relationship between ourselves and society, as though we and society were two separate entities, then surely we shall misunderstand the whole process; then we shall merely resist or fight society. Until we understand how society influences, shapes, controls us, through our own instinctual responses of desire, we are obviously not unique individuals, though we may say, 'I am a separate soul', and all the rest of it. That is merely the assertion of a dogma, a belief - which will inevitably be denied by those who belong to another kind of society; so, we shall be conditioned in one way, and they will be conditioned in another. As long as we consider ourselves as entities separate from society, we shall never understand either society or ourselves, and we shall always be in conflict with society. But if we can understand the process of desire which creates the environmental influences which condition us, then we can go beyond and discover that aloneness which is true individuality, that uniqueness which is a state of creation.

The important thing, then, is not to inquire what is the individual's place in society, but to be aware of how we are conditioned by our beliefs, our desires, our motives. To be aware of the conscious as well as of the unconscious or collective response of the past to the present, to know both the superficial and the deeper layers of one's own thinking - surely, that is of far greater importance than to inquire what is the relationship between the individual and society. If we really see that, then the

reformation of society becomes a minor thing. To reform society without understanding ourselves merely creates the need of further reform - and so there is no end to reformation. Whereas, if we can go beyond the limitations of desire, then there is the revolution of individuality; and it is that inward revolution that is so essential to bring about a new world. Merely reforming the world according to a particular ideology has no significance, because revolution based on an idea is no revolution at all. An idea is merely a reaction of the past to the present. There is inward revolution or transformation only when there is the understanding of desire; and it is this inward revolution which is so essential, because it alone can bring about a different world.

Question: I love my children, and how am I to educate them to become integrated human beings?

Krishnamurti: I wonder if we do love our children? We say so, and we take it for granted that we love them. But do we? If we loved our children, would there be wars? If we loved them, would we be nationalistic, divided into separate groups, constantly destroying each other? Would we belong to any particular race or religion in opposition to another? This whole process of separation in life ultimately brings about disintegration, does it not? Surely, war, the ceaseless conflict in society between different groups and different classes, is an indication that we do not love our children. If we really loved them, we would want to save them, would we not? We would want to protect them, we would want them to live as happy, integrated human beings, we would not want them to live in outward insecurity, or be destroyed. But since we have created a world of conflict and misery, in which outward security is

nonexistent, it indicates, does it not?, that we do not really love our children at all. If we loved them, we would obviously have a different world. Don't let us become sentimental. But we would have a different world if we really loved our children, because then we would quickly see how to prevent wars; then we would not leave it to the clever politicians, who will never prevent wars; but we would assume direct responsibility for it because we really have the intention of saving the children.

Surely, then, our whole outlook in education, our entire social structure, must be utterly revolutionized, must it not? That means we can no longer use the children for our personal or psychological gratification, as we are doing at present - and that is why we are so easily satisfied, so superficial in what we call 'love'. But if we do not use the children as a means of self perpetuation, to carry on our name, if we do not use them in any way for our personal gratification, then we will obviously regard them quite differently. Then our concern will be, not to educate the children, but to educate the educator. At present, education is merely to make the children efficient, to teach them a technique, the manner of earning a livelihood; and efficiency obviously brings about ruthlessness. Not that one must be inefficient; but this drive to be efficient, this constant attention to success, must entail struggle, strife, contention.

Now, we cannot have integrated human beings unless we understand the process of disintegration. Integration is not the pursuit of a pattern, the adjustment to an idea, or the following of a particular example. Integration can come about only when one understands the total process of oneself; and there cannot be the

understanding of oneself as long as we are living superficially. Our whole process of thought is superficial, the process of the so called intellect, and to the cultivation of this intellect we give great emphasis. So, intellectually, which is verbally, we are very far advanced; but inwardly we are insufficient, poor, uncertain, groping, clinging to any form of security. This whole process of thought is a process of disintegration, because thought invariably separates; ideas, like beliefs, never bring people together except in conflicting groups. So, as long as we depend on thought as a means of integration, there must be disintegration. To understand the process of thought is to understand the ways of the self, and then only is there a possibility of integration, which is not imitation.

So, there must not only be the educating of the educator, but we, as mature human beings, must understand our relationship with the children, must we not? And if we really love them, obviously we will see to it that there will be no war, that there will be no struggle in society between the rich and the poor, nor the depredations of the ambitious and the acquisitive who seek power, position, and prestige. But if we want our children to be powerful, to have bigger and better positions, to become more and more successful, surely it indicates that we do not love them: we merely love the acclaim, the glamour, the position, the reflected glory which we hope they will afford us. Therefore, we are encouraging confusion, destruction, and utter misery. I know you are listening to all this, but you will probably return home and continue with those very ways which engender war. Most of us are really not interested in these things. We are interested in immediate answers. We do not want to explore and discover the truth. It is not an economic revolution, but

only the discovery of truth, that will free us, that will bring about a new world.

So, the whole question resolves itself into this: not how to educate the children, but how to educate ourselves, and thereby bring about a different society. To do that, one must understand oneself, the ways of one's desire, the ways of one's thought. We must be aware of everything: of the things about us and in us, of colours, of people, of ideas, of the words we use, of our memories, both personal and collective. It is only when one is fully aware of this whole process that one is alone, a unique individual, and only such people can bring about a new civilization, a new culture.

Question: Can prayer form the link between life and religion?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by prayer, and what do we mean by life and religion? Is life different from religion? Apparently with most of us it is, so we use prayer as a means of linking life and religion. Why is life separate from religion? What is religion, and what is life? Is religion the pursuit of an idea? When you say religion is the pursuit of God, surely your God is an idea, is it not? Therefore your God is self-projected. Or, if you deny God and accept another ideology, whether of the left or of the right, it is still a form of religion. So, is religion merely the following of a certain pattern of ideas which promises a reward in the present or in the future? And is religion different from life, from action, from relationship?

What do we mean by life? Life is relationship, is it not? Can there be life without relationship - relationship to people, to ideas, to things, to property, to nature? Can there be life in isolation? And yet, that is what each one of us is pursuing, is it not? In our ideas,

in our relationship to everything about us, we are enclosing, isolating ourselves; and being isolated, we want to find a relationship or link with what we call religion - which is merely an other form of isolation. That is, because in our relationships we are seeking inward security, we make outward security impossible; and in religion we are also seeking security. Our God is the ultimate happiness, absolute peace. Surely, such a God is an invention of our minds so as to assure ourselves of permanency in the form of ultimate security; and then we ask, "Can prayer form the link between life and religion?" Obviously it can, can it not? Like everything else in our lives, prayer will help us to be more and more isolated - because that is what we want. In our relationships, in our possessions, we are seeking isolation, which is a form of security; and in religion also we seek security, permanency. Our God, our virtue, our morality, like our daily activities, are all self-enclosing, self-isolating; so, we use prayer as a means of uniting the various isolation's.

What do we mean by prayer? And when do we pray? Surely, we pray only when we are suffering, when we are in misfortune, when there is conflict, confusion, when we are in pain. Do we ever pray when we are happy, when there is rejoicing, when our hearts are full? Obviously not. We pray only when we are in confusion, when we are uncertain, when we don't know what to do; and then we turn to somebody for help.

Prayer, then, is generally supplication, is it not? It is a petition, a demand, a psychological extending of the hand for it to be held, to be filled. And when you ask, you receive, do you not? But what you get is what you want - it is never what you don't want; so, what

you get is your own projection. That which you receive in response to prayer is shaped by your own fancy, your own limitation, your own conditioning. The more you ask, the more you receive of your own projection, and with that you are satisfied.

But is prayer a process of self-gratification? What happens when you pray? You repeat certain words, certain phrases, you take a certain posture; and when there is a constant repetition of words and phrases, obviously the mind becomes quiet, does it not? Try it and you will see. The repetition of words makes the mind still. But that is only a trick, is it not? The mind is not really still, it is acquisitive; but you have made it still in order to receive what you want. You want to be helped because you are confused, you are uncertain, and you will receive what you want. But that response to supplication is not the voice of reality: it is the response of your own projection, and also of the collective projection. Because, we all want an answer, do we not? We all want somebody to tell us what wonderful people we are; we all want someone to guide us, to help us in our confusion in our misery. So, what we want; but what we want is petty, trivial.

So, prayer, which is a supplication, a petition, can never find that reality which is not the outcome of a demand. We demand, supplicate, pray, only when we are in confusion, in sorrow, and not understanding that confusion and sorrow, we turn to somebody else. The answer to prayer is our own projection; in one way or another it is always satisfactory, gratifying, otherwise we would reject it. So, when one has learned the trick of quieting the mind through repetition, one keeps on with that habit; but the answer to supplication must obviously be shaped according to the desire of

the person who supplicates.

Now, prayer, supplication, petition, can never uncover that which is not the projection of the mind. To find that which is not the fabrication of the mind, the mind must be quiet - not made quiet by the repetition of words, which is self-hypnosis, nor by any other means of inducing the mind to be still. Stillness that is induced, enforced, is not stillness at all. It is like putting a child in the corner: superficially he may be quiet, but inwardly he is boiling. So, a mind that is made quiet by discipline is never really quiet, and stillness that is induced can never uncover that creative state in which reality comes into being.

So, when we use prayer as a means of linking life and religion, we are only discovering more ways of self-isolation, more ways of disintegration. To put yourself in a state of receptivity through prayer is a process of disintegration, because you want to receive. You may say, 'I do not ask anything, I only put myself in a state of receptivity through prayer; but that is merely a subtle form of forcing the mind. Enforcement of any kind can never bring about tranquillity. Tranquillity of mind comes into being only with the cessation of thought; and thought ceases when one understands the thinker, the person who asks, demands. Therefore, self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom; and without self-knowledge, merely to pray has very little significance. Prayer cannot open the door to self-knowledge. What opens the door to self-knowledge is constant awareness - not practicing awareness, but being aware from moment to moment and discovering. Discovery can never be cumulative. If it is cumulative, it is not discovery. Discovery is new from moment to moment, it is not a continuous state. A man

cannot discover if he is accumulating, for accumulation is continuity. Discovery from moment to moment is freedom from the desire which is understood from moment to moment. There is spontaneity of the mind only when you understand the desire that seeks security, permanency, and that desire is the self, the 'me', at all levels. As long as you do not understand yourself wholly, there must be every form of escape, every form of confusion and destruction, and prayers do not help; they merely offer another means of escape. But if you begin to understand the desire that creates confusion, pain, conflict, then you will see that in understanding there comes spontaneity of the mind; then the mind is really tranquil, without wanting to be or not to be, and only such a mind can understand that which is real.

June 25, 1950

NEW YORK 5TH PUBLIC TALK 2ND JULY 1950

I think it is quite apparent that there must be a fundamental transformation in society, and it can only begin with a radical revolution within each one of us; for society is not very different from ourselves. What we are, society is. The problems of the world are not separate from our problems. We ourselves have projected them, and therefore we are responsible for them; and the fundamental revolution in outward circumstances, however essential and necessary, can be brought about only when there is a radical revolution in ourselves. A radical revolution, a transformation, a psychological upheaval in ourselves, cannot be brought about through any idea or according to any pattern. Revolution based on an ideology is no longer a revolution - it is merely the modified continuity of an old pattern. Thought can never be revolutionary, because thought is the response of memory. Ideas can never bring about a transformation in ourselves, because ideas are merely the continuation of that response, either verbalized, or in the form of symbols, images, and so on. When we desire to bring about a transformation in ourselves according to a pattern pre-established by thought, such a transformation is only the modified continuation of memory; being a projection of ourselves in a different form, it is a continuation of the conditioned state, and therefore it is no transformation at all. Revolution based on an ideology, however inclusive, is not a revolution, because an idea is the projection of thought, which is memory. The response of memory can never bring about transformation. What can bring about transformation in ourselves,

and therefore in society, is to understand the whole process of thinking, which is not different from feeling. Feeling is thinking - though we like to keep them separate and rely either on the one or the other, they are interrelated, they are not dualistic, but a unitary process.

So, as long as we do not understand the whole process of thinking and feeling, obviously there can be no radical revolution within and so without. The understanding of thought, which is feeling, is self-knowledge; and self knowledge cannot be bought. No study o,r books no going to lectures, will give self-knowledge. Self-knowledge comes only when we are aware of ourselves from moment to moment, naturally, spontaneously, easily, without any sense of enforcement; aware, not only of our conscious thinking, but also of the unconscious, with all its content. It is like looking at a map and allowing it to unfold; and the moment we block it by discipline, by any form of practice, the unfolding of self-knowledge comes to an end.

What is important, surely, is to be aware without choice, because choice brings about conflict. The chooser is in confusion, therefore he chooses; if he is not in confusion, there is no choice. Only the person who is confused chooses what he shall do or shall not do. The man who is clear and simple does not choose: what is, is. Action based on an idea is obviously the action of choice, and such action is not liberating; on the contrary, it only creates further resistance, further conflict, according to that conditioned thinking.

So, then, the important thing is to be aware from moment to moment without accumulating the experience which awareness brings; because, the moment you accumulate, you are aware only

according to that accumulation, according to that pattern, according to that experience. That is, your awareness is conditioned by your accumulation, and therefore there is no longer observation, but merely translation. Where there is translation, there is choice, and choice creates conflict; and in conflict there can be no understanding.

As we have been discussing for the last four weeks, the difficulty in understanding ourselves exists because we have never given thought to it. We do not see the importance, the significance, of exploring ourselves directly, not according to any idea, pattern, or teacher. The necessity of understanding ourselves is perceived only when we see that without self-knowledge there can be no basis for thought, for action, for feeling; but self-knowledge is not the outcome of the desire to achieve an end. If we begin to inquire into the process of self-knowledge through fear, through resistance, through authority, or with the desire to gain a result, we shall have what we desire; but it will not be the understanding of the self and the ways of the self. You may place the self at any level, calling it the higher self or the lower self, but it is still the process of thinking; and if the thinker is not understood, obviously his thinking is a process of escape.

Thought and the thinker are one; but it is thought that creates the thinker, and without thought there is no thinker. So, one has to be aware of the process of conditioning, which is thought; and when there is awareness of that process without choice, when there is no sense of resistance, when there is neither condemnation nor justification of what is observed, then we see that the mind is the centre of conflict. In understanding the mind and the ways of the

mind, the conscious as well as the unconscious, through dreams, through every word, through every process of thought and action, the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet; and that tranquillity of the mind is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom cannot be bought, it cannot be learned; it comes into being only when the mind is quiet, utterly still - not made still by compulsion, coercion or discipline. Only when the mind is spontaneously silent is it possible to understand that which is beyond time.

In considering these questions, as I have often reminded you, there is neither denial nor acceptance. We are going to explore each question, and the answer is not apart from the question. In going into the question as fully and deeply as we can, we shall see the truth of it; and it is that truth that will free us from the problem.

Question: You have shown me the superficiality and the futility of the life I am leading. I should like to change, but I am trapped by habit and environment. Should I leave every- thing and everyone, and follow you?

Krishnamurti: Do you think our problems are solved when we follow another? To follow another, no matter who it is, is to deny the understanding of yourself. And it is very easy to follow somebody. The greater the personality, the greater the power, the easier it is to follow; and in the very following you are destroying that understanding, because the follower destroys, he is never the creator, he never brings about understanding. To follow is to deny all understanding, and therefore to deny truth.

Now, if you do not follow, what are you to do? Since, as the questioner says, one is trapped by habit and environment, what is one to do? Surely, all that you can do is to understand the trap of

habit and environment, the superficiality and the futility of your life. We are always in relationship, are we not? To be, is to be related; and if you regard relationship as a trap from which you want to escape, then you will only fall into another trap - the trap of the teacher whom you follow. It may be a little more arduous, a little more inconvenient, a little less comfortable, but it will still be a trap; because, that also is relationship, and there too there are jealousies, envy, the desire to be the nearest disciple, and all the rest of the nonsense.

So, we are trapped because we do not understand relationship; and it is difficult to understand relationship if we are condemning, identifying ourselves with something, or if we are using relationship as a means of escape from ourselves, from that which we are. After all, relationship is a mirror, is it not? Relationship is a mirror in which I can see myself as I am. But to see ourselves directly as we are is very unpleasant, and so we avoid it by condemning it, justifying it, or merely identifying ourselves with it. Without relationship there is no life, is there? Nothing can exist in isolation. And yet all our efforts are towards being isolated; relationship for most of us is a process of self-isolation, self enclosure, and therefore there is friction. When there is friction, misery, pain, suffering, unhappiness, we want to run away, we want to follow some one else, to live in the shadow of an other; and so we turn to the church, to a monastery, or to the latest teacher. They are all the same because they are all escapes, and our turning to them is obviously prompted by the desire to avoid that which is; and in the very running away we create further misery, further confusion.

So, most of us are trapped, whether we like it or not, because that is our world, that is our society; and awareness in relationship is the mirror in which we can see ourselves very clearly. To see clearly, there must obviously be no condemnation, acceptance, justification, or identification. If we are simply aware without choice, then we can observe, not only the superficial reactions of the mind, but also the deep and hidden reactions, which come out in the shape of dreams, or in moments when the superficial mind is quiet and there is spontaneity of response. But if the mind is conditioned, shaped, and bound by a particular belief, surely there can be no spontaneity, and therefore no direct perception of the responses of relationship.

It is important to see, is it not?, that no one can give us freedom from the conflict of relationship. We can hide behind the screen of words, or follow a teacher, or run to a church, or lose ourselves in a cinema or a book, or keep on attending talks; but it is only when the fundamental process of thinking is uncovered through awareness in relationship that it is possible to understand and be free of that friction which we instinctively seek to avoid. Most of us use relationship as a means of escape from ourselves, from our own loneliness, from our own inward uncertainty and poverty; and so we cling to the outer things of relationship, which become very important to us. But if, instead of escaping through relationship, we can look into relationship as a mirror and see very clearly, without any prejudice, exactly what is, then that very perception brings about a transformation of what is, without any effort to transform it. There is nothing to transform about a fact; it is what it is. But we approach the fact with hesitation, with fear, with a sense of

prejudice, and so we are always acting upon the fact and therefore never perceiving the fact as it is. When we see the fact as it is, then that very fact is the truth which resolves the problem.

So, in all this the important thing is, not what another says, however great or stupid he may be, but to be aware of oneself, to see the fact of what is, from moment to moment, without accumulating. When you accumulate, you cannot see the fact; then you see the accumulation, and not the fact. But when you can see the fact independently of the accumulation, independently of the thought process, which is the response of accumulated experience, then it is possible to go beyond the fact. It is the avoidance of the fact that brings about conflict; but when you recognize the truth of the fact, then there is a quietness of mind in which conflict ceases.

So, do what you will, you cannot escape through relationship; and if you do escape, you will only create further isolation, further misery and confusion; because, to use relationship as a means of self-fulfilment, is to deny relationship. If we look at this problem very clearly, we can see that life is a process of relationship; and if, instead of understanding relationship, we seek to withdraw from it, enclosing ourselves in ideas, in superstitions, in various forms of addiction, these self-enclosures only create more of the very conflict we are trying to avoid.

Question: What is wisdom? Is it dissimilar from knowledge?

Krishnamurti: What is knowledge? Surely, knowledge is the accumulating principle in all of us, which is memory. The acquisitive process is knowledge, is it not? Knowledge is experience and memory. The more we accumulate experience, the more we know. Knowing is a process of verbalizing; and that

which has been accumulated, which is experience, memory, or knowledge, can never bring wisdom. Knowledge is the result of experience, and there is experience only when there is an experiencer who is accumulating. The experiencer is the result of his own accumulations, experiences, and knowledge; and what he experiences is according to his conditioning. Therefore, the more he experiences, the more he is conditioned, weighed down. When he experiences, he can only experience according to his background; so, the background dictates the knowledge, the translation of experience. Experience, the translation of a fact, cannot bring understanding. Understanding comes only with the suppression of knowledge.

After all, we experience according to our belief. If I believe that there is no God, obviously I experience according to my belief, because the background, the conditioning, the training, dictates and translates my experiences; and if I believe in God, then my experience is according to my conditioning as a believer. So, experiencing is a process of the response of the conditioned mind; and where there is knowledge, or the accumulation of experience, of memory, of words, symbols, images, there can be no understanding. Understanding can come only when there is freedom from knowledge. After all, when you have a problem, the more you think about it, worry over it, the less you understand it; but if you can look at it freely, without translating it, without bringing in all the background of your tradition, of your experiences, then you will see that understanding comes out of it.

So, understanding is not the result of accumulation, and wisdom is not knowledge. Wisdom is independent, it is dissimilar from

knowledge. Wisdom is from moment to moment, whereas knowledge can never be free from the past, from time. Wisdom is free from time, and knowledge is the very process of time, and the two cannot possibly be joined together. The man who knows can never be wise, because the very knowledge of what he has, denies wisdom. Knowledge is the process of time, which is the accumulation of experience; and wisdom is freedom from time, which is experience from moment to moment without the process of accumulation.

Question: Though I am young, I am haunted by the fear of death. How am I to overcome this fear?

Krishnamurti: Surely, anything that is overcome has to be overcome again, does it not? When you conquer your enemy, you have to reconquer him again and again. That is why wars continue. The moment you vanquish one desire, there is another desire to be vanquished. So, that which is overcome can never be understood. Overcoming is merely a form of suppression, and you can never be free of that which is suppressed. So, the overcoming of fear is merely the postponement of fear.

Our problem, then, is not how to overcome fear of death, but to understand the whole process of death; and understanding it, is not a matter of being young or old. There are various forms of death, for the old as well as for the young. All of us are conditioned by our past, by conformity, by the desire for our own advancement, by the subtle accumulation of power; and though we are outwardly active, we may be inwardly dead. So, to understand this process of death needs a great deal of exploration, and not merely adhering to a particular form of belief - that there is, or is not, a continuity after

death. Belief in life after death may give you an ideological consolation; and there may be, and probably is, a form of continuity. But then what? What continues? Can that which continues ever be creative? And where there is continuity is there not always the fear of ending? So, death is a process of time, is it not?

What do we mean by time? There is chronological time, but there is also another kind of time, is there not? It is the psychological process of continuity. That is, we want to continue; and the very desire to continue creates the process of time and the fear of not continuing. It is this fear of not continuing that we are concerned with; it is ending of which we are afraid. We are afraid of death because we think that through continuity we shall achieve something, we shall be happy.

After all, what is it that continues? If we can really understand that, if we can actually experience it as we are sitting here, and not merely listen to words, then perhaps we shall know what it is to die from moment to moment; and knowing death, we shall know life, because the two are not very different. If we do not know how to live, we are afraid of death; if we know how to live, then there is no death. Most of us do not know what living is, and so we regard death as a negation of life; and therefore we are afraid of death. But if we can understand what living is, then we shall know of death in the very process of living. To find that out, we must understand what we mean by continuity.

What is this extraordinary craving to continue that each one of us has? And what is it that continues? Surely, that which continues is name, form, experience, knowledge, and various memories. That is what we are, is it not? To divide yourself into the higher and the

lower self is irrelevant - you are still merely the sum total of all that. Though you may say, 'No, I am more than that, I am a spiritual entity', that very assertion is part of the process of thinking, which is the conditioned and conditioning response of memory. There are others who are conditioned to say, 'We are not spiritual, we are just the product of environment'. So, you are your memories, your experiences, your thoughts. At whatever level you place the thought process, you are still that; and you are afraid that when death comes, that process, which is the 'you', will come to an end. Or, you rationalize it and say, 'I will continue in some form after death, and come back in the next life'.

Now, a spiritual entity obviously cannot continue, because it is beyond time. Continuity implies time - yesterday, today, and tomorrow; therefore, that which is timeless can have no continuity. To say, 'I am a spiritual entity', is a comforting thought; but the very process of thinking about it catches it in the net of time; therefore, it cannot be timeless, and therefore it is not spiritual.

So, what we have is only our thinking which is also feeling. We have nothing but our name, our form, our family, our clothes and furniture, our memories and experiences, our responses, traditions, vanities, and prejudices. That is all we have; and that we want to continue. We are afraid it will all come to an end, that we shall be unable to say, 'This for which I have struggled is all mine'. Now, can that which continues ever renew itself? Obviously not. That which continues can not be reborn, renewed; it can merely have a continuity. Only that which comes to an end can renew itself. There is creation only when there is an ending. But we are afraid to end, we are afraid to die. We want to carry on from yesterday,

through today, to tomorrow. We are building Utopias and sacrificing the present to the future, liquidating people because of the desire for continuity. If we examine very closely what it is that continues, we will see that it is only memory in various forms; and because the mind clings to memory, it is afraid of death. But surely, only in dying, in not accumulating, is there that which is beyond time. The mind cannot possibly conceive, formulate, or experience, that which is not of time. It can experience only that which is of time; because, the mind is the result of time, of the past.

So, as long as the mind is afraid of coming to an end, it clings to its own continuity; and that which continues must obviously decay. Our difficulty is to die to all the things that we have accumulated, to all the experiences of yesterday. After all, that is death, is it not? - to be uncertain, to be in a state of vulnerability. The man who is certain can never know that which is immortal, that which is beyond time. The man of knowledge can never know death, which is beyond time, the unknown. It is only when we die from moment to moment to the things of yesterday and understand the whole significance of continuity, that there is the unknown, a new thing. That which continues can never know the truth, the unknown, the new; it can only know its own projection. Most of us live through accumulation; therefore, yesterday and tomorrow become far more important than the present.

There must obviously be chronological time, otherwise you will miss your train; but as long as we are caught in the projection of the mind, which is psychological time, there is no ending; and that which has continuity is not immortal. Only that which comes to an

end is timeless, and that alone can know the immortal.

Question: There are several systems of meditation, both Occidental and Oriental. Which do you recommend?

Krishnamurti: To understand what is right meditation is really a very complex problem, and to know how to meditate, how to be in the state of meditation, is important; but to follow any system, whether Occidental or Oriental, is not to meditate. When you follow a system, all that you learn is to conform, to shape the mind to a particular pattern or drive it along a particular groove. If you pursue it ardently enough, you will produce the result that the system guarantees; but surely, that is not meditation. There is a lot of nonsense taught about meditation, especially by those people who come from the Orient. (Laughter.) Please don't laugh or clap - this is not that kind of meeting. We are trying to find out what meditation is.

You can see that those who pursue a system, who drive the mind into certain practices, obviously condition the mind according to that formula. Therefore, the mind is not free. It is only the free mind that can discover, not a mind conditioned according to any system, whether Oriental or Occidental. Conditioning is the same, by whatever name you may call it. To see the truth there must be freedom, and a mind that is conditioned according to a system can never see the truth.

Now, to see the truth that there can be no freedom through the discipline of any system, requires the understanding of the process of the mind; because, the mind clings to systems, to beliefs, to particular formulas. To discover the truth of that, surely you have to see that you are caught in a system; and to be aware of the

process by which the mind gets caught in a system, is meditation. To be aware of the whole process of thinking is self-knowledge, is it not? So, meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge. Without knowing the process of your own thinking, merely to sit in a corner and go off into silence, or whatever you do, is not meditation - it is just a wish to become, to acquire, to gain something. And obviously, concentration is not meditation. Merely focusing the mind on an idea, an image, or a phrase, and excluding all other thoughts, is not meditation, is it? You may learn concentration in that way, but concentration is exclusion; and when the mind excludes, it is not free.

Why do we want to focus the mind on an image, or an idea, or practise a system of so-called meditation - the more mysterious the better? Because we think that by concentration, or through prayer, the constant repetition of certain words, the mind will be made quiet. As I said, concentration is a process of exclusion. We choose a particular idea or thought and dwell on it, and while we are forcing the mind to concentrate on it, other thoughts come in; so, there is a conflict going on, and we spend our energy in this wasteful battle. But if we can be open to each thought as it arises and understand it, then we shall see that the mind does not revert to any particular thought. The mind reverts to a thought because it has not understood it; that is, what is not understood is repeated over and over again, and mere exclusion will not prevent it. So, concentration, which is exclusion, is not meditation. Most of us want to live exclusively, with our private memories, private experiences, private knowledge; and concentration, which we call meditation, is merely a further process of self-enclosure, self-

isolation. But the mind can never be free through isolation, however wide your projected idea may be.

Now, you can force the mind to be quiet through what is called prayer, the constant repetition of words; but when the mind is hypnotized into quietness, is that a state of meditation? Surely, that only dulls the mind, does it not? Though the mind may be pacified through discipline, which is based on the desire for particular results, such a mind is obviously not a free mind. Freedom can never come through discipline. Though we think we must discipline ourselves in order to be free, the beginning determines the end; and if the mind is disciplined at the beginning, it will be disciplined at the end; therefore, it can never be free. But if we can understand the whole process of discipline, control, suppression, sublimation, substitution, then there will be freedom from the very beginning; for the means and the end are one, they are not two separate processes, either politically or religiously.

So, discipline through concentration is not meditation, nor are the various forms of prayer. Those are all tricks by which the mind is forced to be still; and a mind that is made still through will, through desire, can never be free. If we really look at all these things - concentration, prayer, systems of meditation, and all the various tricks that we learn to quiet, to hypnotize the mind - , we shall discover that they are the ways of thought, the ways of the self; and this discovery is the beginning of meditation, which is the beginning of self-knowledge. Without knowing yourself, merely to concentrate, to conform to a pattern, to follow a system, to quiet the mind through a discipline, only leads to further misery, further confusion. But if you begin to know the ways of your own thought

by being choicelessly aware of yourself in relationship, in your talking, in your walking, when you are observing a bird or looking at somebody else, then, in that awareness, the responses of your conditioned state come into being; and in that spontaneity there is the discovery of yourself as yourself. And the more you are aware of yourself without choice, without justification or condemnation, the more there is freedom. It is this freedom that is the process of meditation. But you cannot cultivate freedom, any more than you can cultivate love. Freedom comes into being, not through the search for it, but when you understand the whole process and structure of yourself.

Meditation, then, is the beginning of self-knowledge. When you begin very near, you can go very far; and then you will see that thought, which is the projection of the mind, comes to an end of itself without being compelled, forced. Then there is silence - not the silence that is willed, created by the mind, but a silence that is not of time; and in that silence there is the state of creation, the timelessness which is reality.

So, without understanding the ways of thought, merely to force the mind to meditate is an utter waste of time and energy, and only creates more confusion, more misery. But to understand the process of the self as the thinker, to know the ways of the self as thought, is the beginning of wisdom. For wisdom to be, there must be the understanding of the accumulating process which is the thinker. Without understanding the thinker, meditation has no meaning; because, whatever he projects is according to his own conditioning, and that is obviously not reality. Only when the mind understands the whole process of itself as thought, is it capable of

being free, and only then does the timeless come into being.

July 2, 1950

PARIS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 9TH APRIL 1950

Most of us are confronted with many problems, not only individual but collective; there are problems that not only touch our personal lives, but also affect us as citizens of a particular country, as part of a collective group, and so on. We have problems that are not only sociological and economic, but also, if I may use the word, spiritual. We are confronted with problems of every kind; and the more we deal with these problems, the more they seem to increase and multiply and become confused.

This translation business is going to be rather difficult, but perhaps it will go fairly smoothly as we get used to it. I have not done this kind of thing for many years, so I hope you will have a little patience if there is hesitation on my part.

As I was saying, the more we deal with these problems, the more they seem to increase; and with the increase of problems there arises greater suffering, greater misery and greater confusion. Surely, what is important is, not how to solve any one particular problem but to find out how to deal with the problems as they arise, so as not to increase or multiply them. That is, we must obviously deal with the problems of existence, not on any one particular level, but at all levels; because, if we deal with a problem merely on its own level, surely such a problem cannot be solved. If we deal with the economic problem, whether individual or collective, apart from the spiritual or psychological problem, the economic problem can never be solved. In order to solve a particular problem, we have to understand the creator of the problem and to understand the creator is surely much more

important than to understand the problem itself; because, when once we understand the creator or maker of the problem, then we can resolve the problem. So, our difficulty is to understand, not only superficially but also fundamentally, the creator of Problems - which is oneself. Therefore the study of oneself is not an avoidance of the problem, whether superficial or profound; on the contrary, to understand oneself is of far greater importance than to bring about a result by dealing with the problem, by transforming or being active about the problem.

Now, as I said, the important thing is not to seek a mere solution to the problem whether economic or any other, whether individual or collective, but to understand the maker of the problem; and to understand the maker is much more difficult it requires much greater awareness, greater attention, than merely to study the problem. The creator of the problem is oneself, and the understanding of oneself does not imply a process of isolation, a process of withdrawal. We seem to think that we must be agitated, active about the problem, for then we can at least feel that we are doing something about it; but any concern with the study, with the understanding of the maker of the problem, we regard as a process of isolation, of enclosure, and therefore a denial of action. So, it is important to see that the study of oneself is not a withdrawal, is not a process of isolation or inactivity; on the contrary, it is a process of extraordinary attention of alert awareness, which demands not only superficial but also inward clarity.

After all, when we talk of action, we really mean reaction, do we not? Most of us react to any outside influence, and in this process of reaction we are caught; and this reaction we call dealing

with the problem. So, the understanding of reaction is the beginning of the understanding of oneself. As I pointed out, what is important is not so much the understanding of the problem itself, but the understanding of the reactions that each one has in response to any particular stimulus, to any particular influence or condition. The study of oneself is far more significant than the study of the problem - to which most of us have devoted our lives. We have studied the problems from every angle, but we have never studied profoundly or deeply the maker of the problems; and to understand the maker of the problems, we have to understand our relationships, because the maker of the problems exists only in relationship. Therefore, the study of relationships in order to understand the maker of the problems is our main question and the understanding of relationships is the beginning of self-knowledge. I do not see how we can understand life, or any of our problems, without understanding ourselves; because, without knowing oneself there is no basis for thinking, there is no basis for action, there is no basis for any kind of transformation or revolution.

So, the beginning of the understanding of relationships, by which one discovers the maker of the problems, is of the highest importance; and the maker of the problems is the mind. To understand the maker of the problems, which is the mind, is not merely to be very clever, but to study the whole process of psychological reaction in oneself; and without understanding the total process of the mind, do what we will with regard to the many problems, whether individual or collective the economic problem, the problems of war, of nationalism, and so on - without understanding the mind, we have no way out of all these problems.

Our question, then, is really not war, not the economic problem, but the study, the understanding of the mind; because, it is the mind that creates the problems in relationship, whether that relationship be with people, with ideas, or with things. And the mind cannot be understood as something apart to be studied in a laboratory, but only in the action of relationship.

The mind is, after all, the result of the past. What you and I are is the outcome of many yesterdays, we are the total summation of the past, and without understanding that past we cannot proceed. Now, to understand that past, must we study the whole content, the background of the past? That is, to study the past, we can either dig into it, delve deeply into all the memories of the race, of the group, of the individual which implies studying the analyzer; or, we can go into the problem of whether the analyzer is different from the analyzed, whether the observer is different from the observed. Because, as long as there is an analyzer examining the past, surely that analyzer is also a result of the past; therefore, whatever he analyzes, examines, must be conditioned, and hence inadequate. The analyzer is part of the analyzed, the two are not separate - which is an obvious fact when we look at it. There is no thinker apart from the thought; and as long as there is a thinker apart from the thought, a thinker examining the thought, then whatever the outcome of that examination may be, it is inevitably conditioned and therefore inadequate. That is why, before we try to understand the problem of war the economic or any other problem, we must first understand the thinker who is analyzing the problem. Because, the problem is not different from the thinker, the thinker is not separate from the thought - it is the thought that creates the thinker.

If we can see that, then we will discover that there is only thinking, and not a thinker there is only thinking, and not a thinker an observer, an experiencer. There is only thinking, and not a thinker. The moment we see that, our approach to the problem, whatever it be, is entirely different, because then there is no thinker trying to dissect, to analyze or shape a particular thought: there is only thinking. Therefore it is possible for thought to come to an end without the process of struggle, without the process of analyzing. As long as there is a thinker as the 'me' and the 'mine', there is a centre from which action is always taking place: That centre is obviously the result of our thinking, and our thinking is the outcome of conditioning; and when the thinker merely detaches himself from the conditioning and tries to bring about action, change, or revolution, there is always the centre which remains as permanent. So, the real question is to understand and dissolve that centre which is the thinker.

The difficulty with most of us is, is it not?, that our thinking is so conditioned. We are either French, or English, or German, or Russian, or Hindu, with particular religious political, and economic backgrounds, and through this screen of conditioning we try to meet the problems of life, and thereby increase the problems. We do not meet life without conditioning; we meet it as an entity with a particular background and training, with particular experience. Being conditioned, we meet life according to our particular patterns, and this reaction according to pattern only creates more problems. Obviously, then, we have to understand and remove these conditioning's which increase our problems; but most of us are unaware that we are conditioned and that our conditioning is

the result of our own desire, of our own longing for security. After all, the society about us is the outcome of our desire to be secure, to be safe, to be permanent in our own particular form of conditioning; and being unaware of our conditioning, we continue to create more problems. We have such an accumulation of knowledge, so many prejudices, so many ideologies, so many beliefs to which we cling, and these backgrounds, these conditioning's, prevent us from actually meeting life as it is. We are always meeting life, which is a challenge, with our inadequate responses, and so we never understand life except through our particular conditioning's. The challenge is life, which is in constant transformation, in constant flux; and we have to understand, not the challenge, but our reaction to the challenge.

Now, our conditioning is the mind; the mind is the seat of all our conditioning - conditioning being knowledge, experience, belief, tradition, identification with a particular party with a particular group or nation. The mind is the result of conditioning, the mind is the conditioned state; therefore, any problems that the mind tackles must further increase those problems. As long as the mind deals with any problem, at any level, it can only create more trouble, more misery, and more confusion. Is it possible, then, to meet the challenge of life without the process of thinking, without this accumulated experience which is the mind? That is, is it possible to meet the challenge of life without the reaction of the mind, which is the conditioning of the past? When there is a challenge, we have a reaction the mind immediately responds; and, as one watches, one sees that the response of the mind is always conditioned. Therefore, when there is a challenge, the mind which

responds can only create more problems, more confusion, and always does.

So, though we have innumerable problems at all levels of our existence, as long as the mind meets them, as long as thought reacts to them, there must be further confusion; and is it possible to meet life without the reaction of the conditioned mind? We can meet the challenge without thought responding to it only when there is a crisis. When there is an acute crisis we will see that thought has no response; the background does not react. It is only in that state, when the mind does not react to the problem as a process of thought - only then can we resolve the problems that confront each one of us.

I have been given some questions, and I shall answer them.

Question: The only weapon you give to the victims of social injustice is self-knowledge. This, to me, is derision. History teaches us that people have never freed themselves except through violence. The state of society conditions me, therefore I have to smash it.

Krishnamurti: Before we begin to break up society, we must understand what society is, and how one is to act, to respond, to that society in which one is caught. So what is important is, not how to break society to be free from it, but to understand the structure of society; because, the moment I understand the structure of society in relation to myself, I shall be able to act in the right way with regard to it.

What is society? Is it not the product of our relationship, the relationship between you and me and another? Our relationship is society, and society is not something apart from us. Therefore, to

alter the structure of the present society without understanding relationship is merely to continue the present society in a modified form. The present society is pretty rotten, it is a process of corruption, of violence, in which there is always intolerance, conflict, and pain; and to bring about a fundamental alteration in this society of which we are a part, there must be the understanding of ourselves. Surely, this understanding of ourselves is not a derision, nor is it in opposition to the present order. There is opposition only as a reaction. A fundamental alteration in society can come about, not through ideas, not through a revolution based on ideas, but through the transformation of myself in my relationship with another. Society obviously needs transformation - all societies always need transformation. Should that transformation be based on an idea, that is, on thought, on calculation, on clever dialectic assertions and denials, and all the rest of it? Or, since patterns only create opposition, should such a revolution take place not according to any particular pattern? A revolution can come into being only when the idea of 'me', as an entity apart from society, ceases; and that 'me' exists only as long as thought, which is the conditioned desire to be secure in different forms, continues.

We all know and admit that there must be some kind of radical change in the structure of society. There are those who say such a transformation, such a change, must be based on an idea, on an ideology; but an idea invariably creates opposition, and therefore you have a revolution according to the left or to the right. Now, is revolution possible, is it a true revolution, when it is based on an idea, on a belief? That is, when revolution is the outcome of a

process of thought, which is merely a reaction of the background giving a modified continuity to the past, is that a revolution at all? Surely, a revolution based on an idea is not a revolution, it is merely a modified continuity of the past, however intelligent, however cunning. Therefore, revolution in the right sense of the word is possible only when the mind is not the centre of action, when belief, idea, is not the dominant influence. That is why to bring about a radical transformation in society, one must understand oneself - the 'oneself' being the conditioned background of idea, experience, knowledge, memory.

Question: My husband was killed during one war, my children died during another, and my house has been destroyed. You say that life is an eternal state of creation; but every spring is broken in me, and I do not find it possible to partake of that renewal.

Krishnamurti: What is it that prevents this constant renewal in our life, that prevents the new from coming into being? Is it not that we do not know how to die each day? Because we live in a state of continuity, a constant process of carrying over from day to day our memories, our knowledge, our experiences our worries, our pain and suffering, we never come to a new day without yesterday's memory. To us, continuity is life. To know that 'I' continue as memory identified with a particular group, with particular knowledge, with particular experience - to us that is life; and that which has continuity, which is carried on through memory - how can that ever renew? Surely, renewal is possible only when we understand the whole process of the desire to continue; and only when that continuity as an entity, as the 'I' in thought, comes to an end, is there a renewal. After all, we are a collection of

memories: the memories of experience, the memories which we have gathered through life, through education; and the `I' is the result of identification with all that. We are the result of identifying ourselves with a particular group whether French, Dutch, German, or Hindu. Without identification with a group, with a house, with a piano, with an idea, or with a person, we feel lost; so, we cling to memory, to identification, and this identification gives us continuity, and continuity prevents renewal. Surely, it is possible to renew ourselves only when we know how to die and to be reborn each day, that is, to be free from all identification, which gives continuity.

Creation is not a state of memory, is it? It is not a state in which the mind is active. Creation is a state of mind in which thought is absent; and as long as thought is functioning, there can be no creation. Thought is continuous, it is the result of continuity, and for that which has continuity there cannot be creation, renewal; it can only proceed from the known to the known, and therefore it can never be the unknown. Therefore, the understanding of thought and how to bring thought to an end, is important. This ending of thought is not a process of living in an ivory-tower of abstraction; on the contrary, the ending of thought is the highest form of understanding. The ending of thought brings about creation, and in that there is renewal; but as long as thought continues, there can be no renewal. That is why, to understand how we are thinking is much more important than to consider how to renew ourselves. Only when I understand the ways of my own thinking, see all its reactions, not only on the superficial level, but on the deeper unconscious levels - only then, in the understanding of myself,

does thought come to an end.

The ending of thought is the beginning of creation, the ending of thought is the beginning of silence; but the ending of thought cannot come through compulsion, through any form of discipline, through any enforcement. After all, we must have had moments when the mind was very quiet - spontaneously quiet, without any sense of compulsion, without any motive without any desire to make it silent. We must have experienced moments when the mind was utterly still. Now, that stillness is not the result of a continuity, that stillness can never be the outcome of a particular form of identification. The mind in that state comes to an end; that is thinking as the reaction of a particular conditioning comes to an end. That ending of thought is renewal, it is the freshness in which the mind can begin anew.

So, the understanding of the mind, not as the thinker, but only as thought, the direct awareness of the mind as thought without any sense of condemnation or justification, without any choice, brings about the ending of thought. Then you will see, if you will experiment with it, that with the ending of thought, there is no thinker; and when there is no thinker, the mind is quiet. The thinker is the entity that has continuity. Thought, seeing itself to be transient, creates the thinker as a permanent entity, and gives to the thinker continuity; and then the thinker becomes the agitator, maintaining the mind in a state of constant agitation, constant search, inquiry, longing. Only when the mind understands the total process of itself, without any form of compulsion, is there tranquility, and therefore a possibility of renewal.

Surely, then, in all these matters the important thing is to

understand the process of the mind; and to understand the process of the mind is not a self-isolating or introspective action, it is not a denial of life, a withdrawal into a hermitage or monastery, or an enclosing of oneself in a particular religious belief. On the contrary, any belief conditions the mind. Belief creates antagonism; and a mind that believes can never be quiet, a mind that is caught in dogma can never know what it is to be creative. So, our problems can be resolved only when we understand the process of the mind, which is the creator of the problems; and the creator can come to an end only when we understand relationship. Relationship is society, and to bring about a revolution in society we have to understand our reactions in relationship. Renewal, that creative state, comes into being only when the mind is utterly tranquil, not enclosed in any particular activity or belief. When the mind is quiet utterly still, because thinking has come to an end - only then is there creation.

April 9, 1950

PARIS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 16TH APRIL 1950

Surely, one of our great difficulties is that in trying to find security, not only in the economic world, but also in the psychological or so-called spiritual world, we destroy physical security. In the search for economic and psychological security we create certain ideas, we cling to certain beliefs, we have certain anxieties, certain acquisitive instincts, and that very search ultimately destroys physical security for most of us. So, is it not important to find out why it is that the mind attaches itself so strongly to ideas, to beliefs, to conclusions, to systems and formulae? Because, obviously, this attachment to ideas and beliefs with the hope of inward security in view ultimately destroys outward or physical security. Physical security is made impossible by the desire, by the anxiety, by the psychological necessity, of seeking inward security; therefore it is surely important to find out why the mind, why each one of us, so ardently pursues inward security.

Now, it is obvious that we must have physical security, food, clothing, and shelter; and it is important to find out, is it not?, how the mind, in seeking inward security, destroys security outwardly. In order to bring about physical security we have to investigate this desire for inward security, this inward attachment to ideas, to beliefs, to conclusions. Why does the mind seek inward security? Why do we attach such enormous importance to ideas, to property, to certain people? Why do we take refuge in belief, in seclusion, which ultimately destroys outward security? Why does the mind hold so strongly, so determinedly, to ideas? Nationalism, belief in God, belief in a formula of one sort or another, is merely

attachment to an idea; and we see that ideas beliefs, divide people. Why are we attached so strongly to ideas? If we can be free from the desire to be secure inwardly, then perhaps it will be possible to organize outward security; because, it is the desire for inward security that divides us, not the desire for outward security. We must have outward security, that is obvious; but outward security is prevented by the desire to be inwardly secure. Until this problem is solved, not superficially, but radically, fundamentally and seriously, there can be no outward security.

So, our problem is not to seek a formula or system which will bring about outward security, but to find out why the mind is constantly seeking inward isolation, inward gratification, psychological security. It is easy to put the question, but to discover the right answer, which must be true, is very arduous. Because most of us want to be certain, we avoid uncertainty; we want to be certain in our affections, we want to be certain in our knowledge, we want to be certain in our experiences, because that certainty gives us a sense of assurance, a sense of well being, in which there is no disturbance, no shock of experience, the shock of a new quality coming into being. It is this very desire for certainty which prevents us from enquiring into the need for freedom from all inward security. We obviously find great satisfaction in our capacity to do things with our hands or with our mind, which is accumulated knowledge, experience; and in that capacity we seek certainty, because in that state the mind need never be disturbed, there is no anxiety, no fear, no new experience.

So, the mind, seeking inward certainty through property, through people, through ideas, does not desire to be disturbed and

made uncertain. Have you not often noticed how the mind rebels against anything new - a new idea, a new experience, a new state? When it does experience a new state, the mind immediately brings it into the field of itself, into the field of the known. The mind is always functioning, is it not?, within the field of certainty within the field of the known, within the field of security, which is its own projection, and therefore it can never experience something beyond itself. The state of creation, surely, is the experiencing of something beyond the mind, and that state of creation cannot come into being as long as the mind is attached to any particular form of security, inward or outward. Obviously, then, what is important is for each one to find out where one is attached, where one is seeking security; and if one is really interested, one can easily find this out for oneself, one can discover in what manner, through what experience through what belief, the mind is seeking security, certainty. When one discovers that, not theoretically but actually, when one directly experiences attachment to belief, to a particular form of affection, to a particular idea or formula, then one will see that there comes a freedom from that particular form of security. And in that state of uncertainty, which is not isolation, which is not fear, there is creative being. Uncertainty is essential for creative being.

We see in the world that beliefs, ideas and ideologies are dividing people, are bringing about catastrophes, miseries, and confusion. Holding on to our beliefs being divided by our personal opinions and experiences which we cling to as being the ultimate truth, we then try to bring about collective action - which is obviously impossible. There can be collective action only when

there is freedom from all desire to take refuge in any ideology, in any belief, in any system, in any group, in any one person, in any particular teacher or teaching. It is only when there is freedom from all desire to be inwardly secure that there is a possibility of being outwardly secure, having the physical things that are necessary for human survival.

I am going to answer some of these questions, but please bear in mind that there is no categorical 'yes' and 'no' to any human problem. One must think out each problem, go into it, see the truth of it, and only then does the problem reveal its own answer.

Question: What is thought ? From whence does it come? And what is the relation of the thinker to thought?

Krishnamurti: Now who puts this question? Does the thinker put the question? Or, is the question the outcome of thought? If the thinker puts the question then the thinker is an entity separate from thought, he is merely the observer of thought, he is the experiencer outside the experience. So, when you put this question, you have to find out whether the thinker is separate from the thought. Are you putting the question as though you were outside of, apart from the process of thinking? If you are, then you have to find out if the thinker is really separate from thought. Thought is a process of reaction, is it not? That is, if there is a challenge and a response; and the response is the process of thinking. If there is no challenge of any kind, conscious or unconscious, violent or very subtle, there is no response, there is no thinking. So, thinking is a process of response, reaction, to any form of stimulus or challenge. There is

Now, is that all? Is the thinker the outcome of thought, or is he an entity in his own right, not created by thought, but outside all

thought and apart from time? Because, thought is a process of time; thought is the response of the background and the response of the background is the process of time. So, is the thinker apart from time? Or, is the thinker part of the process of time, which is thought?

This is a difficult problem to deal with in two languages, and it would be much simpler if I could speak in French. As I cannot - although I talk and understand it a little - , let us proceed, and we will see.

The question is, what is thought, and what is the thinker? Is the thinker separate from thought, or is he the outcome of thinking? If he is separate from thought, then he can operate on thought' he can control, change, modify thought; but if he is part of thinking, then he cannot operate on it. Though he may think he can control thought, change or modify it, he is not capable of doing that because he is himself the product of thinking. So, we have to find out whether thought produces the thinker, or whether the thinker, being separate, apart, is independent of thought, and therefore can control it.

Now we can see very well that the thinker is the result of thought; because, there is no thinker if there is no thought, there is no experiencer if there is no experiencing. The experiencing, the observing, the thinking, produces the experiencer, the observer, the thinker. The experiencer is not separate from the experience, the thinker is not separate from the thought. Why, then, has thought made the thinker into a separate entity? When we know that our daily thinking, which is a response to challenge, produces the thinker, why do we believe that there is an entity separate from our

daily thinking? Thought has created the thinker as a separate entity because thought is always changing, modifying, and it sees its own impermanence. Being transient, thought desires permanency, and so creates the thinker as an entity who is permanent who is not caught in the net of time. So, we create the thinker - which is merely a belief. That is, the mind, seeking security, holds to the belief that there is a thinker separate from thought, a 'me' that is apart from my daily activities, from my daily thoughts, from my daily functions. So, the thinker becomes an entity apart from thought; and then the thinker proceeds to control, modify, dominate thought, which creates conflict between the thinker and the thought, between the actor and the action.

Now, if we see the truth of that - that the thinker is thought, that there is no thinker separate from thought, but only the process of thinking - , then what happens? If we see that there is only thinking and not a thinker trying to modify thought, what is the result? I hope I am making myself clear. So far, we know that the thinker is operating upon thought, and this creates conflict between the thinker and the thought; but if we see the truth that there is only thought and not a thinker, that the thinker is arbitrary, artificial and entirely fictitious - then what happens? Is not the process of conflict removed? At present our life is a conflict, a series of battles between the thinker and the thought - what to do and what not to do, what should be and what should not be. The thinker is always separating himself as the 'me' remaining outside of action. But when we see that there is only thought, have we not then removed the cause of conflict? Then we are able to be choicelessly aware of thought and not as the thinker observing thought from

outside. When we remove the entity that creates conflict, surely then there is a possibility of understanding thought. When there is no thinker observing, judging, moulding thought, but only choiceless awareness of the whole process of thinking, without any resistance, without battle, without conflict, then the thought process comes to an end.

So, the mind, in understanding that there is no thinker, but only thought, eliminates conflict, and therefore there is merely the process of thinking; and when there is an awareness of thinking without any choice, because the chooser has been eliminated then you will see that thought comes to an end. Then the mind is very quiet, it is not agitated; and in that quietness, in that stillness, the problem is understood,

Question: Considering the world's present condition, there must be immediate action on the part of some who are not caught in any system either of the left or of the right. How is this group to be created, and how will it act with regard to the present crisis?

Krishnamurti: How is this group to be created, the group that does not belong to the left or to the right, or to any particular belief? How is such a group to be formed? How do you think it is to be formed? What is a group? Surely, it is you and I, isn't it? To form such a group, you and I must free ourselves from the desire to be secure, to be identified with any particular idea, belief, conclusion, system, or country. That is, you and I must begin to free ourselves from seeking shelter in an idea, in a belief, in knowledge; then, obviously, you and I are the group who are free from the exclusiveness of belonging to something. But are we such a group? Are you and I such entities? If we are not free from belief,

from conclusion, from system, from idea, we may form a group, but we will create again the same confusion, the same misery, the same leadership, the same liquidation of those who disagree, and so on and on. So, before we form a group at all, we must first be free of the desire to be secure, to take shelter in any belief, in any idea, in any system. Are you and I free of that desire? If we are not, then let us not think in terms of groups and future action; but what is important, surely, is to find out, not merely verbally, but inwardly and deeply, both in the conscious as well as in the hidden parts of our own minds and hearts, whether we are really free from any sense of identification with a particular group, with a particular nation, with a particular belief or dogma. If we are not, then in starting a group we are bound to create the same mess, the same misery.

Now you will probably say, "It will take a long time for me to be free from my own beliefs, from the dogmas which I have projected and which are the result of my own thinking; therefore I cannot operate, I cannot do anything, I will have to wait." That is your reaction is it not? You say, "As I am not free, what am I to do? I can't act." Isn't that your question? And while you wait, the world is going on creating more confusion, more misery, more horrors and destruction. Or, being anxious to help, you plunge in with your own beliefs, with your own dogmas, and so create greater confusion. Surely what is important is to see that there can be no right action as long as the mind is holding on to a particular conclusion or belief, either of the left or of the right; because, if you really see the truth of that, then obviously you will be in a position to act. And that does not take time, it is not a matter of

progress, gradual evolution. Seeing a fact is not a process of evolution, is it? But you are not interested you do not want to see the truth of it. You just say, "Well, it is a matter of time for me to be free" - and there you drop it.

The question, then, is this: Is it possible for an ordinary person like you and me, a person who is not very intellectual and all the rest of it, to be free immediately of the desire to hold on to a particular belief or a particular dogma? Is it possible to be free immediately from belief? When you put that question seriously to yourself, is there any doubt left? Is it a matter of time for you to think about it? When you see that belief divides people, when you actually see and inwardly understand it, doesn't belief fall away from you? That does not require an effort, a struggle, a process of time. But we are not willing to see that fact - and that is our trouble. We want to act, so we join groups which are perhaps a little more cultured, a little more kindly, a little more pleasant. Such a group may act, but it can only produce the same chaos in another direction. But if you and I see the truth that each one of us can be free from dogma, from belief, then surely, whether we form a group or not, we will act; and it is this action that is needed, not action based on an idea.

So, the important point in this question is, is it not?, whether there can be action without idea, without belief. We see throughout the world that action based on a belief, on a dogma, on a conclusion, on a system, on a formula, has led to division, to conflict, and to disintegration. Is it possible, then, to act without idea, without belief? You have to find that out, have you not? - not accept or reject it. You have to discover for yourself whether such

action is possible; and you will discover it only in experiencing not in believing or rejecting it. When you see that all action based on belief, on dogma, on conclusion, on calculation, must inevitably create separation, and therefore disintegration - when you see that, then you will experience action without the imposition of an idea.

Question: What is the relationship of the individual to society? Has he any responsibility towards it? If he has, should he modify it, or disown it?

Krishnamurti: Now, what is the individual, and what is society? What are you and I? Are we not the product of our background, of our education, of our social environmental influences, of our religious training? We are the result of everything about us, and the things about us are in turn created by us, are they not? The society that exists at the present time is the product of our desires, of our responses, of our actions. We project the society, and then become the instruments of that society. So, are you not the product of the society which you yourself have created? Surely, there is no extraordinary division or line of demarcation between the individual and society. Individuality comes into being later, much later, when we begin to free ourselves from the social influences.

So, are you an individual? Though you may have a particular name, own a piece of land, a private house, have a personal relationship a separate bank account, are you really an individual, or merely a product of the environment? Though all this makes you think that you are separate, are you not part of the whole? And how can you have a relationship to it unless you are separate from it? After all, our mind is the result of the past, is it not? All our thoughts are founded upon the past, and the past, both the

conscious and the unconscious, is the result of the thoughts, efforts, struggles, intentions, and desires of all human beings. So we are the sum total, are we not?, of the entire human struggle; and since we are the result of the mass, of society, we cannot say that we are separate, that we are definitely apart from it. We are society; we are part of the whole, we are not separate. The separation takes place only when the mind begins to see where the false is, and therefore rejects it. Then only is there an individuality which is not resisting, which is not in opposition to society, an individuality not based on opposition, on resistance, on acquisition but which has understood the false and has therefore separated itself from it. Only such an entity can operate on society, and therefore its responsibility to society is entirely different. Then it will act, not in terms of disowning or modifying society, but out of its own understanding, its own vitality, which comes through the discovery of that which is false. So, as long as you and I are without self-knowledge, as long as we do not understand the whole process of ourselves, merely to modify or to disown society has no meaning. In order to bring about a fundamental revolution in society, self-knowledge is essential, and self-knowledge is to become aware of the false. Out of that awareness there comes the understanding of aloneness - that aloneness which is not a withdrawal, not an isolation, but which is essential if we are to act truly; because, only that which is alone is creative. Creation does not come when all the influences of the past are impinging upon the present; creation comes only when there is an aloneness which is not loneliness, which is not a state of apparent, division. It is an aloneness which comes through understanding both the hidden as well as the

conscious; and in that state of aloneness there can be action which will be effective in the transformation of society.

Question: What relation has death to life?

Krishnamurti: Is there a division between life and death? Why do we regard death as something apart from life? Why are we afraid of death? And why have so many books been written about death? Why is there this line of demarcation between life and death? And is that separation real, or merely arbitrary, a thing of the mind?

Now, when we talk about life, we mean living as a process of continuity in which there is identification. Me and my house, me and my wife, me and my bank account, me and my past experiences - that is what we mean by life, is it not? Living is a process of continuity in memory, conscious as well as unconscious, with its various struggles, quarrels, incidents, experiences and so on. All that is what we call life; and in opposition to that there is death, which is putting an end to all that. So, having created the opposite, which is death, and being afraid of it, we proceed to look for the relationship between life and death; and if we can bridge the gap with some explanation, with belief in continuity, in the hereafter, we are satisfied. We believe in reincarnation, or in some other form of continuity of thought, and then we try to establish a relationship between the known and the unknown. We try to bridge the known and the unknown, and thereby try to find the relationship between the past and the future. That is what we are doing, is it not?, when we enquire if there is any relationship between life and death. We want to know how to bridge the living and the ending - surely that is our fundamental thinking.

Now, can the end, which is death, be known while living? That is, if we can know what death is while we are living, then we shall have no problem. It is because we cannot experience the unknown while we are living that we are afraid of it. So, our struggle is to establish a relationship between ourselves, which is the result of the known, and the unknown, which we call death. And can there be a relationship between the past and something which the mind cannot conceive, which we call death? And why do we separate the two? Is it not because our mind can function only within the field of the known, within the field of the continuous? One only knows oneself as a thinker, as an actor with certain memories of misery, of pleasure of love, affection, of various kinds of experience; one only knows oneself as being continuous - otherwise one would have no recollection of oneself as being something. Now, when that something comes to the end, which we call death, there is fear of the unknown; so, we want to draw the unknown into the known, and our whole effort is to give continuity to the unknown. That is, we do not want to know life which includes death, but we want to know how to continue and not come to an end. We do not want to know life and death, we only want to know how to continue without ending. Now, that which continues has no renewal. There can be nothing new, there can be nothing creative in that which has continuance - this is fairly obvious. It is only when continuity ends that there is a possibility of that which is ever new. But it is this ending that we dread, and we don't see that only in ending can there be renewal, the creative, the unknown - and not in carrying over from day to day our experiences, our memories and misfortunes. It is only when we die each day to all that is old, that

there can be the new. The new cannot be where there is continuity - the new being the creative, the unknown, the eternal, God, or what you will. The person, the continuous entity, who seeks the unknown, the real, the eternal, will never find it, because he can find only that which he projects out of himself, and that which he projects is not the real. So, only in ending, in dying, can the new be known; and the man who seeks to find a relationship between life and death to bridge the continuous with that which he thinks is beyond, is living in a fictitious, unreal world, which is a projection of himself.

Now, is it possible, while living, to die - which means coming to an end, being as nothing? Is it possible, while living in this world where everything is becoming more and more or becoming less and less, where everything is a process of climbing, achieving, succeeding - is it our possible, in such a world, to know death? That is, is it possible to end all memories - not the memory of facts, the way to your house, and so on but the inward attachment through memory to psychological security, the memories that one has accumulated, stored up, and in which one seeks security, happiness? Is it possible to put an end to all that - which means dying every day so that there may be a renewal tomorrow? It is only then that one knows death while living. Only in that dying, in that coming to an end, putting an end to continuity, is there renewal, that creation which is eternal.

April 16, 1950

PARIS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 23RD APRIL 1950

Is it not very important that those who would know what truth is should discover it through their own experience, and not merely accept or believe according to any particular pattern? Surely it is essential to discover for oneself what reality is, what God is - the name you give to it is not of great importance - because, that is the only thing that is really creative, that is the only door through which one can find that happiness which is not merely transient, which is not dependent. Most of us are seeking happiness in one form or another, and we try to find it through knowledge, through experience, through constant struggle. But surely, happiness that depends on something is not happiness. The moment we depend for happiness on possessions, on people, or on ideas, those things become very important, and happiness passes us by. The very things on which we depend for our happiness become more important than happiness itself. If you and I depend on certain people for happiness, then those people become important; and if we depend on ideas for our happiness, then ideas become important. The same thing happens with regard to property, name, position, power - the moment we depend for our happiness on any of these things, they become all-consumingly essential in our lives.

So, dependence is the denial of happiness; and the moment one depends on ideas, on people, or on things, obviously that relationship must isolate one. The very dependence implies isolation, and where there is isolation, there cannot be true relationship. Only in understanding true relationship is it possible to liberate oneself from the dependence which brings out isolation;

and that is why I think it is important to go very deeply and fully into the question of relationship. If relationship is merely a dependence, then obviously it leads to isolation, and such a relationship must inevitably create various forms of fear, of self-enclosure, possessiveness, jealousy, and so on. When we seek happiness through relationship, whether it be with property, with people, or with ideas, invariably we possess those things; we must possess them, because through them we derive our happiness - at least, we think so. But from the very possession of the things on which we depend, there arises the process of self-enclosure; and so relationship, which should lead to the destruction of the self, of the 'me', of the narrowing influences of life, becomes more and more stringent, more and more restricted, limited and destroys the very happiness we seek.

So, as long as we merely depend for our happiness on things, on people, or on ideas, relationship is a process of self-enclosure, of isolation - and I think it is very important to realize this. At present, all relationship tends to limit our action, our thought, our feelings; and until we realize that dependence is hampering our action and destroying our happiness, until we really see the truth of that, there is no possibility of wider, freer movement of thought and feeling. After all, we go to books, to Masters, to teachers, we turn to disciplines, or to experience and knowledge, in order to find a lasting happiness, a safe refuge, a protection ; and so we multiply Masters, books, ideas, knowledge. But surely, no one can give us that happiness, no one can free us from our own desires, from our own narrowing influences; and therefore it is important, is it not? to know oneself completely, not only the conscious, but also the

inward part of oneself. That self-knowledge comes only through relationship, because the understanding of relationship discloses the process of the self, of the `me'. It is only when we understand the full extent of the `me' and its activities, not only at the superficial level but on all the deeper levels, that there is freedom from dependence, and therefore a possibility of realizing what happiness is. Happiness is not an end in itself, any more than virtue is; and if we make happiness or virtue an end, then we must depend upon things, upon people or ideas, upon Masters or knowledge. But none except ourselves, through understanding relationship in our daily life, can give us freedom from our own narrowing confusion, conflicts and limitations.

We seem to think that the understanding of the self is extremely difficult. We have the impression that to discover the process of the self, the ways of one's thought in the secret places of one's own mind and heart, we must go to somebody else and be told or given a method. Surely, we have made the study of the self extremely complicated have we not? But is the study of the self so very difficult? Does it need the aid of another, however advanced, at whatever level the Master may be? Surely, no one can teach us the understanding of the self. We have to discover the whole total process of the self; but to discover it, there must be spontaneity. One cannot impose upon oneself a discipline, a mode of operation; one can only be aware from moment to moment of every movement of thought, of every feeling, in relationship. And for most of us, it is that which is difficult - to be choicelessly aware of every word, of every thought of every feeling. But to be aware does not require that you should follow anyone; you do not require

a Master, you do not require a sage, you do not require a belief. To know the whole process of the mind what you need is only the intention to watch, to be aware, without condemnation or justification. You can know yourself only when you are aware in relationship, in your relationship with your wife, with your children, with your neighbour, with society, with the knowledge which you have acquired, the experiences you have gathered. It is because we are lazy, slothful, that we turn to someone, to a leader, to a Master, who will instruct us or give us a mode of conduct. But surely, this desire to look to another for help only makes us dependent; and the more we are dependent, the further we are away from self-knowledge. It is only through self-knowledge, through understanding the complete process of oneself, that there is liberation; and in liberating oneself from one's own enclosing, narrowing isolating process, there is happiness.

So, it is important, is it not? that one should understand oneself thoroughly, deeply, and comprehensively. If I do not know myself, if you do not know yourself, what basis have we for thought, for action? If I do not know myself, not only superficially, but also at the profound levels from which spring all the motives, the responses, the accumulated desires and impulses, how can I think, act, live, be? So, is it not important to know oneself as completely as possible? If I do not know myself, how can I go to another and search out the truth? I can go to another, I can choose a leader, out of my confusion; but because I have chosen him out of my confusion, the leader, the teacher, the Master, must also be confused. So, as long as there is choice, there can be no understanding. Understanding does not come through choice;

understanding does not come through comparison nor through criticism, nor through justification. Understanding comes only when the mind has become completely aware of the whole process of itself and so has become quiet. When the mind is completely silent, without any demand - only in that stillness is there understanding, is there a possibility of experiencing that which is beyond time.

Before I answer some of these questions, may I point out, if you don't mind that it is important to discover the answer for oneself. That is, you and I are going to investigate the truth of each problem, and discover it for ourselves, experience it for ourselves; otherwise it will be merely on the verbal level, and therefore utterly valueless. If we can experience the truth of every question every problem, then perhaps that problem will be resolved completely; but merely to remain on the verbal level, merely to discuss to argue with each other through words, will not bring about the solution of the problem. So, in considering these questions, I am not merely giving an expression to words, but you and I are trying to find out the truth of the matter; and to find the truth, we must be free from our anchors, from our commitments, from the influence of ideas, and proceed step by step to enquire into the truth of the matter.

Question: As creative individuals may disrupt society according to their own particular idiosyncrasies and capacities, should not creativeness be at the command of society?

Krishnamurti: Now, what do we mean by creativeness? Is it creative to invent the atomic bomb, or to discover how to kill another? Is it creative to have capacity, a gift? Is it creative to be able to speak very cleverly, to write very intelligent books, to solve

problems? Is it creative to discover the process of nature, the hidden processes of life? Is any of that a state of creativeness? Or, is creativeness something entirely different from creative expression? I may have the capacity to translate into marble a certain vision, a certain feeling; or, being a scientist, I may be able to discover something, according to my tendencies and capacities. But is that creativeness? Is the expression of a feeling, the making of a discovery, the writing of a book or a poem, the painting of a picture - is any of that necessarily creative? Or, is creativeness something utterly different which is not dependent on expression? To us, expression seems to matter so enormously, does it not? To be able to say something in words, in a picture, in a poem, to be able to concentrate on the discovery of a particular scientific fact - is that a process of creation? Or, is creation something which is not of the mind at all? After all, when the mind demands, it will find an answer; but is its answer the creative answer? Or, is there creativeness only when the mind is completely silent - not asking, not demanding, not searching out?

Now, we are the result of society, we are the depositories of society; and we either conform to society, or break away from society. The breaking away from society depends upon our background, our conditioning; therefore, our breaking away from society does not indicate that we are free - it may be merely the reaction of the background to certain incidents. So, a man who is creative merely in the accepted sense of the word may be dangerous, disruptive, without transforming in any fundamental way the respectable, exploiting society which is ours; and the questioner wants to know whether society should not command his

creativity. But who is going to represent society? The leaders, the people in power, the people who are respectable and who have the means of controlling others? Or, must the problem be approached quite differently? That is, society is the outcome of our own projections, of our own intentions, and therefore we are not separate from society; and since the man who goes against society is not necessarily a revolutionary, is it not important to understand what we mean by revolution? Surely as long as we base revolution on an idea, it is not a revolution, is it? A revolution based on a belief, on a dogma, on knowledge, is obviously no revolution at all: it is merely a modified continuation of the old. That is, a reaction of the background against the conditioning influence of society is an escape, it is obviously not a revolution.

There is real revolution, which is not dependent on idea, only when one understands the whole total process of oneself. As long as we accept the pattern of society, as long as we produce the influences which create a society based on violence, intolerance and static progress - as long as that process exists, society will try to control the individual. And as long as the individual is attempting to be creative within the field of his conditioning obviously he cannot be creative. There is creativity only when the mind is completely understood, and then the mind does not depend on mere expression - the expression is of secondary importance.

Surely, then, the important thing is to discover what it is to be creative; and creativity can be discovered and understood, the truth of it seen, only when I understand the whole total process of myself. As long as there is a projection of the mind, whether at the

verbal or any other level, there cannot be a creative state. Only when every movement of thought is understood and therefore comes to an end - only then is there creativeness.

Question: I have prayed for my friend's health, and it has produced certain results. If I now pray to have peace in my heart, can I come in direct contact with God?

Krishnamurti: Obviously a demand, a supplication, a petition, brings results. You ask and you receive - that is an obvious psychological fact which you can test out for yourselves. Psychologically you pray, you demand, you petition, and you will have a reply; but is it the reply of reality? To find reality there must be no demand, no petition, no supplication. After all, you pray only when you are confused, when you are in trouble and misery, do you not? Otherwise you do not pray. It is only when you are confused, when you are miserable, that you want somebody's help; and prayer, which is a process of demand, must necessarily have an answer. The answer may be the outcome of the deep unconscious layers of oneself, or it may be the result of the collective; but it is obviously not the reply, the response, of reality. And one can see that through prayer, through posture, through the constant repetition of certain words and phrases, the mind is made quiet. When the mind is quiet, after struggling with a problem, obviously there is an answer; but the answer is surely not from that which is beyond time. Your demand is within the field of time, and therefore the reply must also be within the field of time. So, that is one part of the question: as long as we pray, which is a petition, a demand, there must be an answer; but the answer is not the response of reality. Now, the questioner wants to know whether

through prayer it is possible to come directly into contact with reality, with God. Through making the mind still, through forcing the mind, through discipline, through the repetition of words, through taking certain postures, through constant control and subjugation - is it possible in that way to come into contact with reality? Obviously not. A mind that is shaped by circumstances, by environment, by desire, by discipline, can never be free. It is only the free mind that can discover, it is only the free mind that can come into contact with reality. But a mind that is seeking, that is demanding, a mind that is trying to be happy, to become virtuous - such a mind can never be quiet, and therefore it can never come into contact with that which is beyond all experience. After all, experience is within the field of the transient, is it not? To say, "I have experienced", is to put that experience within the net of time. And is truth something to be experienced? Is truth something to be repeated? Is truth a thing of memory, of the mind? Or, is truth something which is beyond the mind, and therefore beyond the state of experiencing? When one experiences, there is memory of that experience; and that memory, which is repetition, is obviously not true. Truth is something which is from moment to moment, not to be experienced as a thing of the experiencer.

So, the mind must be free to come into contact with reality; but that freedom does not come through discipline, through demand, through prayer. The mind can be made quiet through desire, through various forms of compulsion, effort; but the mind that is made quiet is not a still mind - it is only a disciplined mind, a mind that is in prison, shaped, under control. He who would come into contact with reality need not pray. On the contrary, he must

understand life - life being relationship. To be, is to be related; and without understanding its relationship with things, with people, and with ideas, the mind will inevitably be in conflict, in a state of agitation. You may for the time being suppress that agitation; but such suppression is not freedom. Freedom comes in understanding yourself, and only then is it possible to come into contact with that which is not the projection of the mind.

Question: Is the individual the result of society, or the instrument of society?

Krishnamurti: This is an important question, is it not? On this question the world is being divided by two opposing ideologies - whether the individual is the instrument of society, or the result of society. The experts, the authorities on one side say that the individual is the result of society; and those on the other maintain that he is the instrument of society. Now, is it not important for you and me to find out for ourselves what is the truth of this matter, and not depend on specialists, on authorities, whether of the left or of the right? It is the truth, and not opinion, not knowledge, that will liberate us from the false; and it is important, is it not?, for each one of us to discover the truth, and not merely depend on words or on the opinion of another.

So, how are you to find the truth of it? To find the truth of it, it is obvious that there must be no dependence on the expert, on the specialist, on the leader. And to know the truth of it for yourself, you cannot depend on previous knowledge. When you depend on previous knowledge you are lost, because each authority contradicts the other, each translates history according to his particular prejudice or idiosyncrasy. So, the first obvious thing is to

be free from the external influences of knowledge, of the specialists, of the power-politicians, and so on.

Now, to discover the truth of this matter, you may reject outer authorities and rely on your own experience, on your own knowledge, on your own study; but will your own experience give you the truth of it? You may say that you have nothing else to go on; that to judge whether the individual is the instrument of society, or the result, the product of society - to find the truth of that you will have to rely on your own experience. Now, is the discovery of truth dependent on experience? After all, what is your experience? It is the result of accumulated beliefs, influences, memories, conditions, and so on. It is the past - experience is the accumulated knowledge of the past; and through the past you are trying to find the truth of this matter. So, can you rely on your experience? And if you cannot, then by what will you judge?

I hope I am making the problem clear. To see, to find the truth of this matter, you must know what your experience is. What is your experience? Your experience is the response of your conditioning, obviously; and your conditioning is the result of the society about you. So, you are looking for the truth of this matter according to your conditioning, are you not? You would like to think that you are only the result of society - it's easier and therefore more pleasant; but you actually think you are spiritual that you are God incarnate, the manifestation of something ultimate, and so on - which is all a result of the conditioning influences of your society, of your religion. So, according to that, you will judge. But is that the true measure of truth? Is the measure of truth ever dependent on experience? Is not experience itself a

barrier to the understanding of truth? At the present time you are both the product and the instrument of society, are you not? All education is conditioning the child to this end. If you look at it very factually, you are the product of society, you are a Frenchman an Englishman, a Hindu, believing this or that. And also, you are the instrument of society. When society says, "Go to war", you all troop to war; when society says, "You belong to this particular religion", you repeat the formula, the phrases, the dogma. So, you are both the instrument of society, and the product of society - which is an obvious fact. Whether you like it or not, that is so.

Now, to find out what is beyond, to find out if there is something more to life than merely to be shaped by society for society - to find the truth of that, all influences must come to an end, all experience, which is the measure, must cease. To discover truth, there must be no measurement, because the measurement is the result of your conditioning; and that which is conditioned can see only its own projection, and therefore it can never perceive that which is real. It is important to find out for yourself the truth of this matter, because only the truth can deliver you; and then you will be a real revolutionary, not a mere repeater of words.

Question: Why do you speak of the stillness of the mind, and what is this stillness?

Krishnamurti: Is it not necessary, if we would understand anything, that the mind should be still? If we have a problem, we worry over it, don't we? We go into it, we analyze it, we tear it to pieces, in the hope of understanding it. Now, do we understand through effort, through analysis, through comparison through any form of mental struggle? Surely, understanding comes only when

the mind is very quiet. I do not know if you have experimented with it; but if you will, you can easily find out for yourself. We say that the more we struggle with the question of starvation, of war, or any other human problem, the more we come into conflict with it, the better we shall understand it. Now, is that true? Wars have been going on for centuries, the conflict between individuals, between societies; war, inward and outward, is constantly there. Do we resolve that war, that conflict by further conflict, by further struggle, by cunning endeavour? Or, do we understand the problem only when we are directly in front of it, when we are faced with the fact? And we can face the fact only when there is no interfering agitation between the mind and the fact. So, is it not important, if we are to understand, that the mind be quiet? But you will invariably ask, "How can the mind be made still?" That is the immediate response, is it not? You say, "My mind is agitated, and how can I keep it quiet?" Now, can any system make the mind quiet? Can a formula, a discipline, make the mind still? It can; but when the mind is made still, is that quietness, is that stillness? Or, is the mind only enclosed within an idea, within a formula, within a phrase? And such a mind is dead, is it not? That is why most people who try to be spiritual, so-called spiritual, are dead - because they have trained their minds to be quiet, they have enclosed themselves within a formula for being quiet. Obviously, such a mind is never quiet; it is only suppressed, held down.

Now, the mind is quiet when it sees the truth that understanding comes only when it is quiet; that if I would understand you I must be quiet, I cannot have reactions against you, I must not be prejudiced, I must put away all my conclusions, my experiences,

and meet you face to face. Only then, when the mind is free from my conditioning, do I understand. When I see the truth of that, the mind is quiet - and then there is no question of how to make the mind quiet. Only the truth can liberate the mind from its own ideation; and to see the truth, the mind must realize the fact that as long as it is agitated, it can have no understanding. So, quietness of mind, tranquillity of mind, is not a thing to be produced by will-power, by any action of desire; if it is, then such a mind is enclosed, isolated, it is a dead mind, and therefore it is incapable of adaptability, of pliability, of swiftness, Such a mind is not creative.

Our question, then, is not how to make the mind still, but to see the truth of every problem as it presents itself to us. It is like the pool that becomes quiet when the wind stops. Our mind is agitated because we have problems; and to avoid the problems, we make the mind still. Now, the mind has projected these problems, and there are no problems apart from the mind; and as long as the mind projects any conception of sensitivity, practises any form of stillness, it can never be still. But when the mind realizes that only by being still is there understanding - then it becomes very quiet. That quietness is not imposed, not disciplined, it is a quietness that cannot be understood by an agitated mind.

Many who seek quietness of mind withdraw from active life to a village, to a monastery, to the mountains. Or, they withdraw into ideas, enclose themselves in a belief, or avoid people who give them trouble. But such isolation is not stillness of mind. The enclosure of the mind in an idea, or the avoidance of people who make life complicated, does not bring about stillness of mind. Stillness of mind comes only when there is no process of isolation

through accumulation, but complete understanding of the whole process of relationship. Accumulation makes the mind old; and only when the mind is new, when the mind is fresh, without the process of accumulation - only then is there a possibility of having tranquillity of mind. Such a mind is not dead, it is most active. The still mind is the most active mind; but if you will experiment with it, go into it deeply, you will see that in that stillness there is no projection of thought. Thought, at all levels, is obviously the reaction of memory; and thought can never be in a state of creation. It may express creativeness, but thought in itself can never be creative. But when there is silence, that tranquillity of mind which is not a result, then we shall see that in that quietness there is extraordinary activity, an extraordinary action which a mind agitated by thought can never know. In that stillness, there is no formulation, there is no idea, there is no memory; and that stillness is a state of creation that can be experienced only when there is complete understanding of the whole process of the 'me'. Otherwise, stillness has no meaning. Only in that stillness which is not a result is the eternal discovered which is beyond time.

April 23, 1950

PARIS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 30TH APRIL 1950

The problem of effort, struggle, of striving after something, should be thoroughly understood; because, it seems to me that the more we strive, the more we struggle to become something the greater becomes the complexity of the problem. We have never really gone into this question of striving after something. We make great efforts, spiritually, physically, and in every department of life; our whole existence, positively or negatively, is a process of constant effort - effort, either to become something, or to avoid something. Our whole social structure, as well as our religious and philosophical existence, is based, is it not?, on striving to achieve a result or to avoid an outcome.

Now, do we understand anything through struggle through strife, through conflict? Is there a possibility of adjustment, of pliability, through conflict, through struggle? And, is the effort that we are making practically the whole of the time, consciously and unconsciously - is that effort really essential? I know, obviously, that the present structure of society is based on struggle, on effort, on becoming successful or avoiding a result which one does not desire. It is a constant psychological battle. Through psychological effort, in trying to become something, do we understand? I think that is a problem we should really face and go into rather deeply. Perhaps it may not be possible this morning to go into details; but one can see quite clearly that there is effort of every kind, and that the effort of adjustment in relationship is the most prominent effort that we make. Struggle, conflict, exists in relationship: we are always trying to adjust ourselves to a different category of society,

or to an idea; and will this constant striving really lead anywhere?

Now, striving creates a centre in one's consciousness around which we build the whole structure of the 'me' and the 'mine' - my position, my achievement, my will, my success; and as long as the 'me' exists, surely there is no possibility of really understanding the total process of oneself. And is it not possible to live a life without struggle, without conflict, without the centre of the 'me'? Surely, such a manner of living is not mere oriental escapism - to call it that would be really absurd, that would be merely brushing it aside. On the contrary let us consider whether it is possible to live in the world and build a new society, whether this whole process of becoming successful, becoming virtuous, achieving or avoiding something, can be completely set aside. And is it not important that we should set aside this constant striving after something, if we would really understand what living is? After all, can we grasp the significance of anything through effort, through struggle, through conflict with it? Or, do we understand it only when we have the capacity to look at it directly, without this battle, this conflict between the observer and the observed?

We can see in everyday experience that if we would really understand something, there must be a certain sense of quietness, a certain tranquillity - not enforced not disciplined or controlled, but a spontaneous tranquillity in which one sees the significance of any problem. After all, when we have a problem, we struggle with it, we analyze it, we dissect it, we tear it to pieces, trying to find out how to resolve it. Now, what happens when we give up struggling with it? In that quiet state of relaxed tranquillity the problem has a different aspect - one understands it more clearly. Similarly, is it

not possible to live in that state of alertness, in that state of choiceless observation, which brings about tranquillity and in which alone there can be understanding?

After all, our conditioning - social, economic, religious, and so on - is all based on the worship of success. We all want to be successful; we all want to achieve a result. If we fail in this world, we hope to make a success of it in the next. If we are not very successful politically, economically, we want to be successful spiritually. We worship success. And in becoming successful, there must be effort - which means constant conflict, within and without. Surely, one can never understand anything through conflict, can one? Is not the very nature of the self, the `me' a process of conflict, a process of becoming something? And is it not necessary to understand this `me', which is the field of conflict, in order to think, to feel directly? And can one understand this whole structure of oneself without the conflict of trying to alter what is? In other words, can one look at, consider, what one is, essentially, factually, and not try to alter it? Surely, it is only when we are capable of looking at the fact as it is, that we can deal with it; but as long as we are struggling with the fact, trying to alter it, make it into something else, we are incapable of understanding what is. Only when we understand what is, we go beyond it.

So, in order to understand the structure of myself, which is the central problem of all existence it is essential, is it not?, to be aware of the whole process of the `me' - the `me' that seeks success, the `me' that is cruel, the `me' that is acquisitive, the `me' that separates all action, all thought, as `mine'. In order to understand that `me', must you not look at it as it is, factually,

without struggling with it, trying to alter it? Surely, only then is it possible to go beyond. Therefore, self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom is not bought in books; wisdom is not experience; wisdom is not the accumulation of any kind of virtue, or the avoidance of evil. Wisdom comes only through self-knowledge through the understanding of the whole structure, the whole process, of the `me'.

For the `me' to be understood clearly, it must be seen, experienced, in relationship. It is only in the mirror of relationship that I discover the whole process of myself, conscious as well as unconscious; and obviously, all effort to transform it is a process of avoidance, process of resistance, which prevents understanding. So, if one is really serious, and not merely living on the verbal level, one must understand this process of the `me' - not theoretically, not according to any philosophy or doctrine but actually, in relationship; and that process can be discovered and understood completely only when there is no effort to change or alter it. That is, understanding can come only when there is observation without choice.

I do not think most of us realize that the problems of the world are not something apart from us. The problems of the world exist because of you and me; the world's problems are our problems, because the world is not different from you and me. And if one would really, seriously and earnestly, understand the whole problem of existence, surely one must begin with oneself - but not in isolation, not as an individuality opposing the mass or withdrawing from society the problem of the mass is the problem of the `me'; and it is essential, if we could understand the world and

bring about a new structure of society, that we should understand ourselves. I don't think we seriously realize the capacity that each one has to transform himself. We look to leaders, to teachers, to saviours; but I am afraid they will not transform the world, they will not bring about a new world order. No teacher can ever do it, but only you and I, in understanding ourselves; and I don't think we see the immensity of that. We think that as individuals we are so small, so unimportant, so ordinary, that we can not do anything in this world. Surely, great things are started in little ways.

Fundamental revolution takes place, not outwardly, but inwardly, psychologically; and that fundamental, lasting revolution can come about only when you and I understand ourselves.

So, this understanding of oneself is not a withdrawal from life into a monastery, or into some religious meditation. On the contrary, to understand oneself is to understand one's relationship with things, with people, and with ideas. without relationship, we are not; we exist only in relationship; to be, is to be related. Relationship is with property, with people, with ideas; and as long as we do not understand the total process of the `me' in relationship, we are bound to create conflict within - which projects outwardly and makes misery in the world. So, it is essential to understand oneself; and the understanding of oneself does not lie through any book, through any philosophy. It can be understood only from moment to moment, in all the daily relationships. Relationship is life; and without understanding relationship, our life is a conflict, a constant struggle to transform what is into what we desire. Without understanding the `me', merely to transform or reform the world outside only leads to

further misery, further conflict, and further destruction.

I have been given some questions, and I shall answer them. But before I answer them, may I say that, while it is easy to ask questions, to follow the question and discover the answer for oneself is extremely difficult. Most of us, when we ask a question, hope for an answer; but life is not made up of questions and answers. It is what is true; and when one puts a question, one must follow it through, go to the very end of it, and find the true answer. So, in considering these questions, I hope that you and I will try to find the truth of the matter, and not merely live on the verbal level.

Question: Why are we afraid of death? And how are we to overcome this fear?

Krishnamurti: Fear is not an abstraction; it obviously exists only in relationship to something. Now, what is it in death that we are afraid of? Of not being, of not continuing - surely, that is the primary thing. We are afraid of not having continuity, are we not? - which means basically, we are afraid of not knowing the future, the unknown. If there is an assurance of continuity, that is, if we can know the future, if we can know the unknown, then there is no fear.

Now, can we know the unknown - that which is beyond all the fabrications, all the projections of the mind? We can know the projections of the mind; but that is not the unknown. We can withhold the projections and try to feel out the unknown; but that is still a form of projection. So, as long as we are trying to find out intellectually, verbally, through desire, how to conquer the unknown, surely there must be fear. We are afraid essentially, because of the future, of the unknown; and if another can

guarantee, assure us, that there is continuity, then we are no longer afraid. But does continuity in any form bring about understanding of the unknown? Can continuity bring creativeness, or creative feeling? Surely, the moment there is continuity, there is no ending; and only in ending, in dying, is there creativeness, is there the new. We do not want to die, and so we make life a process of continuity; but only in death can we know living.

So, our problem is, is it not? can the mind ever conceive, ever formulate, the unknown? And is not the mind the result of the past, of time? Is it not a mere accumulation of experiences, know ledge, and so a storehouse of time, of the past? So, can the mind, which is the result of time, know the timeless, that which is beyond time? Obviously not. Whatever the mind projects is still within the field of time; and there will be fear as long as the mind is projecting itself, or trying to understand the future, the unknown. There will be the cessation of fear only when I see the truth of this: that continuity means the projection of myself - the `myself' being conflict, the constant swing between pleasure and pain. As long as there is a continuity of the `me', there must be pain, there must be fear; and the mind, which is the centre of the `me', can never find that which is beyond the field of time.

Our difficulty is, is it not?, that we really don't know how to live. Because we have not understood life, we think we want to understand death; but if we can understand the process of living then there will be no fear of death. It is because we do not know how to live that we are afraid of death. Look at the books that have been written on death, look at all the effort made to understand what is beyond! Surely, fear of what is beyond comes only when I

do not know how to live in the present, when I do not know the whole significance of life.

Our life is a process of struggle of pain and pleasure, a constant movement from one thing to another, from the known to the known; it is a battle of adjustment, a battle of achievement, a battle of change. That is our whole life - with occasional rays of clarity. And since we do not understand life, we are afraid of death. Now, need life be a battle, a struggle, a constant becoming? Or, can there be freedom from this becoming, so that one can live without conflict? - which means dying each day, dying to all the things that one has accumulated, all the things that one has gathered, as experience as knowledge. Then there is a quality of newness, because life is no longer a movement from the known to the known, but a freedom from the known to meet the unknown. Then only is there a possibility of being free from the fear of death.

Question: What is the process of experience? Is it different from self-consciousness?

Krishnamurti: First, let us see what is experience. Surely, experience is the response to challenge, and the recognition of the response, is it not? Stimulus, response, and recognition of the response - that is experience, is it not? If you do not respond to a challenge, to a stimulus, or if you do not recognize that response, is there experience? So experience, surely, is the recognition of the response to a challenge - the recognition being the naming, the terming, giving it the appropriate value. That is, experience is the response to a challenge and the recognition of that response, giving it a term, either verbally or symbolically, consciously or unconsciously. Without the process of recognition, there is no

experience.

So, this process of response to a challenge, and recognition of the response, is surely experience. And is that different from self-consciousness? As long as the response to the challenge is adequate, complete, obviously there can be no friction, there can be no conflict, between the response and the challenge. So, self-consciousness comes into being, does it not?, only when there is conflict between challenge and response. You can work this out for yourself, it is very simple; and you will see that it is not a question of believing or discarding, but only of experimenting and being aware, seeing actually what happens.

As long as you have no conflict, no battle, no struggle, is there self-consciousness? Are you aware that you are happy? The moment you are aware that you are happy, happiness ceases, does it not? And the desire for something, the desire for happiness, is the conflict which makes for self-consciousness. When there is conflict, when there is disturbance, there is recognition; and the very recognition is the process of self-consciousness.

So, experience, which is the recognition of the response to challenge, is the beginning of self-consciousness. There is no difference, then, between experiencing, which is recognizing, and self-consciousness. To understand this it is not necessary, surely, to read books about consciousness, or to study very deeply, or listen to others. One can discover it by actually observing the whole total process of one's own experiencing, one's own consciousness. That is exactly what we are trying to do. I am not propounding a new philosophy - I hope not - , nor am I putting something over to you. All that we are trying to do is to see what is consciousness. Surely,

consciousness is experience, then the naming of that experience as good or bad, pleasant or unpleasant, and the desire for more of it or less of it; and the very naming, the very terming, gives it strength gives it permanence. So, consciousness is a process of experiencing, naming or terming, and storing as memory, recollection. This total process is either conscious or unconscious; and as long as we give a name, a term, to the experience, it must be made permanent, it must be fixed in the mind, held in the net of time. This whole total process is self-consciousness - whether it is on the verbal level, or very deep, covered up.

Now, as long as we give a name, a term, a symbol, to an experience, that experience can never be new; because, the moment we recognize an experience, it is already old. When there is an experience and the naming of it, it is merely the process of recording, remembering. That is, every reaction, every experience, is translated by the mind and put away in the mind as memory; and with that memory we meet the new, which is the challenge. In meeting the new with the old, we transform the new into the old - and so there is no understanding of the new at all.

The understanding of the new is possible only when the mind is capable of not giving it a name; and it is only then that experience can be fully, completely understood and gone beyond, so that every meeting of the challenge has a new quality and is not merely recognized and put into the record. There is freedom from self-consciousness, from the `me', only when we understand this whole total process of experiencing, naming and recording. Only when that process ceases, which is the process of the `me' and the `mine', is there a possibility of going beyond and discovering things which

are not of the mind.

Question: I cannot conceive of a love which is neither felt nor thought of. You are probably using the word 'love' to indicate something else. Is it not so?

Krishnamurti: When we say 'love', what do we mean by it? Actually, not theoretically, what do we mean? It is a process of sensation and thought, is it not? That is what we mean by love: a process of thought, a process of sensation.

Now, is thought, love? When I think of you, is that love? Or, when I say that love must be impersonal, universal - is that love? Surely, thought is the result of a feeling, of sensation; and as long as love is held within the field of sensation and thought, obviously there must be conflict in that process. And must we not find out if there is something beyond the field of thought? That is what we are trying to do. We know what love is in the ordinary sense - a process of thought and sensation. If we do not think of a person, we think we do not love him; if we do not feel, we think there is no love. But is that all? Or, is love something beyond? And to find out, must not thought, as sensation, come to an end? After all, when we love somebody, we think about them, we have a picture of them. That is, what we call love is a thinking process, a sensation, which is memory: the memory of what we did or did not do with him or her. So, memory, which is the result of sensation, which becomes verbalized thought, is what we call love. And even when we say that love is impersonal, cosmic, or what you will, it is still a process of thought.

Now, is love a process of thought? Can we think about love? We can think about the person, or think of memories with regard to

that person; but is that love? Surely, love is a flame without smoke. The smoke is that with which we are familiar - the smoke of jealousy, of anger, of dependence, of calling it personal or impersonal, the smoke of attachment. We have not the flame, but we are fully acquainted with the smoke; and it is possible to have that flame only when the smoke is not. Therefore our concern is not with love, whether it is something beyond the mind, or beyond sensation, but to be free of the smoke: the smoke of jealousy, of envy, the smoke of separation, of sorrow and pain. Only when the smoke is not shall we know, experience, that which is the flame. And the flame is neither personal nor impersonal, neither universal nor particular - it is just a flame; and there is the reality of that flame only when the mind, the whole process of thought, has been understood. So, there can be love only when the smoke of conflict of competition, struggle, envy, comes to an end; because that process breeds opposition, in which there is fear. As long as there is fear, there is no communion, for one cannot commune through the screen of smoke.

So, it is clear that love is possible only without the smoke; and as we are acquainted with the smoke, let us go into it completely, understand it fully, so as to be free of it. Then only shall we know that flame which is neither personal nor impersonal, which has no name. That which is new cannot be given a name. Our question is not what love is, but what are the things that are preventing the fullness of that flame. We don't know how to love - we only know how to think about love. In the very process of thinking we create the smoke of the 'me' and the 'mine' - and in that we are caught. Only when we are capable of freeing ourselves from the process of

thinking about love and all the complications that arise out of it - only then is there a possibility of having that flame.

Question: What is good and what is evil?

Krishnamurti: As I said, it is easy to ask a question, but it is much more difficult to go into it fully. But let us try.

Why do we always think in terms of duality, in terms of the opposite? Why is it that we are so conditioned by the thought that there is good and that there is evil? Why this division, why this dual process always at work within us? Surely, if we can understand the process of desire, we shall understand this problem, shall we not? The division of good and evil is a contradiction in us. We are attached to the good, because it is more pleasurable; and we are conditioned to avoid the evil, which is painful. Now, if we can understand the process of desire, which makes life a contradiction, then perhaps we shall be able to be free from the conflict of the opposites.

So the problem is not what is good and what is evil, but why this contradiction exists in our daily life. I want something; and in that very wanting there is the opposite. Now, is good the avoidance of evil? Is beauty the avoidance of the ugly? As long as I avoid something, do I not of necessity bring about resistance against it, and therefore create its opposite? So, is there a clear line of demarcation between good and evil? Or, is it that when I understand the process of desire, then perhaps I shall know what virtue is? Because, the man who is trying to become virtuous can obviously never be virtuous. The man who is trying to become kindly, loving, tolerant, can never be virtuous; he is merely trying to achieve something and virtue is not a process of achievement.

The avoidance of evil is a process of achievement; but if I can understand the desire which creates duality, the conflict of the opposites, then I shall know what virtue is.

Virtue is not putting an end to desire, but understanding desire. Putting an end to desire is merely another form of desire. In the very desire to end desire, I create the opposite; and therefore I perpetuate the conflict, the battle, between the ideal and what I am. So, the man who pursues the ideal only creates conflict, and the man who is becoming virtuous can never know virtue - he is merely entangled in the battle of opposites. This conflict between himself and what he thinks he should be gives him a sense of living; but the man of ideals is really a man of escape.

Now if one can understand what virtue is, which means if one can understand desire, then there is freedom from the opposites; and one can understand desire only when one looks at it factually, sees it as it is, without any sense of comparison, without condemnation, without resistance. Then only is there freedom from desire. As long as one is condemning desire, there must be the conflict of the opposites as good and evil, as important and unimportant; as long as one is resisting desire, there must be the conflict of duality. But when one looks at desire as it is, without any sense of comparison, condemnation or justification, then one will see that desire comes to an end.

So, the beginning of virtue is the understanding of desire. To be caught in the conflict of the opposites is merely to strengthen desire; and most of us do not want to understand desire fully, we enjoy the conflict of the opposites. The conflict of the opposites we call virtue, becoming spiritual, but it is only another form of

strengthening the continuity of `myself; and in the continuity of `myself' there can be no virtue. It is only when there is no fear that there is freedom, and fear ceases with the understanding of desire.

There is one more question. Shall I answer it, or not?

Audience: Yes, yes.

Question: You say that if I am creative, all the problems will be solved. How am I to change myself so as to be creative?

Krishnamurti: This question is as important as the first question, and I hope you are not too tired to go into it as fully as we can within a few minutes.

We see that in trying to resolve one problem, we create many other problems - which is an obvious fact. In trying to resolve the economic problem, we come upon a multitude of other problems, not only outward, external, but also inward problems. When I have a problem, I try to solve it; and in the very solution of it, I find other problems on my hands. So, that is what we know of the problem: that it is never finally resolved, but is constantly increasing.

Now, that being the case, how is it possible to approach the problem of living, or any other problem, without multiplying it? That means, is it possible to approach the problem anew? Surely, that is the question, is it not? If I can approach any problem anew, which is to approach it creatively, then perhaps I shall not only resolve that particular problem, but also not introduce many other problems. So, how is it possible to be creative? What are the things that are hindering this sense of creativity, the sense of newness? And I think that is the best question: how is it possible to approach everything anew, with a fresh mind, a mind that is not loaded with

experience, with knowledge, with imitation?

What is it that is preventing us from being creative? Obviously, technique. We always know what to do; we have the means. All our education is a process of learning a technique - which means a process of imitation, a process of copy. After all, knowledge is imitation, copy; and isn't that one of the major burdens that prevent us from meeting things anew? Is not authority in any form, spiritual or mundane, external or inward, an impediment to creative understanding? And why do we have authorities? Because, without authority we think we are lost. We must have some anchor. So, in the desire to be secure inwardly and outwardly, we create authority; and that very authority, which obviously means imitation, destroys creativeness, newness.

Is truth, God, that state of creativeness, something that can come through imitation, through copy, through authority, through compulsion? Must one not be free from authority, from all sense of imitation and copy? You will say, "No, we must begin with authority in order to be free; we must begin through imitation, through compulsion, in order ultimately to arrive at freedom." If you take the wrong means, can you come to the right end? If the end is freedom, must not the beginning also be free? Because, if you use a wrong means, obviously the end must be equally wrong; and if you have no freedom at the beginning, you will have no freedom at the end. If at the beginning your mind is controlled, shaped, disciplined, moulded according to authority, obviously it will still be encompassed, held in a frame, at the end; and such a mind, surely, can never be in a state of creativeness. So, the beginning is the end; the end and the means are one.

Surely, if we are to understand creativeness, the beginning matters enormously - which means understanding all those things that impede the mind and prevent its freedom. Freedom comes only when we understand the desire to be secure. It is the desire to be secure that creates authority, that creates discipline, the pattern of imitation, the pursuit of the ideal, the whole process of conformity. The loftier the ideal, the nobler, the holier, the more spiritual we think it is; but it is still merely a pattern; and a mind caught in a pattern is obviously not capable of being creative. But seeing that the mind is caught in a pattern, merely to reject it, as a reaction, is obviously not freedom. In understanding why the mind creates a pattern and holds to it, why the mind is caught in technique, in the addiction to knowledge, why the mind always moves from the known to the known, from security to security, from imitation to imitation - in the direct understanding of all that, and not merely reacting against it, there is freedom from the desire for security and hence from the sense of fear. As long as there is a centre of the 'me', from which there is action and reaction, denial and acceptance, obviously there must be a process of imitation and copy. As long as we are mere repeaters, reading books, quoting authorities, pursuing ideals, conforming to a formula or to a dogma holding on to a particular religion or joining new cults, seeking new teachers, in the hope of being happy - as long as that process exists, obviously there can be no freedom.

So, creativeness comes only when the mind is free from all imitation, from experience, which is merely the continuity of the 'me'. The mind is free when there is no centre which is experiencing; and that centre in the mind disappears only when the

whole process of desire is understood. Then only is there quietness of mind - not an imposed quietness, a disciplined stillness, or the tranquillity of conformity, but that spontaneous quietness which comes through understanding. And when the mind is still, there is creativeness there is the creative state of being. Stillness is not a process of imitation, of conformity; you cannot think about stillness. Tranquillity does not come through any projection of the mind. Only when thought is silent, not merely on the upper level, but right through unconscious only when the thought process comes to an end, is there a state of tranquillity, a stillness. In that silence there is a creation which is not mere technique, but which has its own vitality, its own way of expression. As long as you are concerned with expression, with technique, with knowledge, with any form of addiction, there can be no creativeness, because that creativeness comes only when the mind is utterly still. That stillness is not a process of avoidance, it does not come through learning a technique of meditation. Those who learn a technique of how to meditate will never know what silence is, will never be creative - their state will be a state of death and denial. There can be creation only when thought has come to an end - not only at the conscious upper level, but at those levels that are deep down, concealed, hidden. When the mind is utterly still, then there is creation.

April 30, 1950

PARIS 5TH PUBLIC TALK 7TH MAY 1950

We seem to think that by pursuing a particular course of philosophy, or a belief, or a system of thought, we shall be able to clear up the confusion not only in ourselves, but also about us. We have innumerable beliefs, doctrines, and hopes; and in trying to follow them, in trying to be sincere in regard to our ideals, we hope to clear the path to happiness, or the path to knowledge and comprehension. Surely, there is a difference between sincerity and earnestness. One can be faithful to an idea; to a hope, to a doctrine, to a particular system; but merely copying, pursuing an idea, or conforming oneself to a particular doctrine - all of which may be called sincerity - , will surely not help us to clear up the confusion in ourselves, and so the confusion about us.

So, it seems to me that what is necessary is earnestness - not the earnestness that comes from merely following a particular tendency, a particular path but that earnestness which is essential in the understanding of ourselves. To understand ourselves, there need be no particular system, no particular idea. One is sincere only in regard to a thing, to a particular attitude, to a particular belief, but such sincerity cannot help us; because, we can be sincere and yet be confused, foolish and ignorant. Sincerity is a hindrance when it is mere copying, trying to follow a particular ideal; but earnestness is quite a different thing. To be earnest is essential - not in the pursuit of anything, but in the understanding of the process of ourselves. In the understanding of the process of ourselves there need be no belief, no doctrine no particular philosophy. On the contrary, if we have a philosophy a doctrine, it

will become an impediment to the understanding of ourselves.

The understanding of ourselves has nothing to do with following a doctrine, a philosophy, a formula, or trying to imitate a particular ideal. Surely, all that is the process of the `me', the `I'. And in the understanding of our various conditioning's, sincerity is not necessary - but it is essential to be earnest, which is quite different. Earnestness does not depend on a mood, it is the beginning of the understanding of ourselves. Because, without being earnest, without being really serious, one cannot go very far. But our seriousness our earnestness, is generally applied to the following of a particular idea a particular belief or hope; and what is important is to understand ourselves. The understanding of ourselves does not demand imitation, copy, the approximation to an ideal. On the contrary, we have to understand ourselves as we are from moment to moment, whatever it be; and for that there must be earnestness which does not depend on any particular mood or tendency.

Now, it is clear that we cannot resolve any human problem, either external or inward, without understanding ourselves; and the understanding of ourselves is possible only when we do not condemn or justify that of which we are aware. To be aware, without condemnation, justification, or comparison, of every thought, of every mood, of every reaction, does not demand the approximation to an idea. What it does require is earnestness - a sense of going into it fully, completely. But most of us do not want to understand any problem deeply, fully; we would rather escape from it through an idea, through approximation, through comparison or condemnation - and thereby we never solve the

particular issue in front of us.

So, it is important, is it not?, in order to understand ourselves, that we be aware of every reaction, every feeling, as it arises; and awareness does not depend on any formula, on any doctrine or belief - which are merely self-projected escapes. To understand every mood every sense of reaction, surely one must be aware without choice; because, the moment we choose, we set into motion a process of conflict. That is, when we choose, there is resistance, and in resistance there is no understanding. Choice is merely fixing the mind on a particular interest and resisting other interests, other demands, other pursuits; and obviously, such choice will not help us to resolve or understand the whole process of ourselves. Each one of us is made up of many entities, conscious as well as unconscious; and to choose one particular entity, one particular desire, and pursue that is surely an impediment to the understanding of ourselves.

So, seeing the whole process of ourselves is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom is not something that can be bought in books, that can be learned through another, that can be gathered even through experience. Experience is merely memory; and the accumulation of memory or knowledge is not wisdom. Wisdom is surely the experiencing of each moment without condemnation or justification; it is understanding each particular experience or reaction, fully, completely, so that the mind comes to every problem anew. After all, the `me' is the centre of recognition; and if we do not understand that centre, but merely recognize every experience or reaction and give it a name, a term, it does not mean that we have understood that particular reaction or experience; on

the contrary, when we name, or recognise a particular experience, we only strengthen the 'me' - that isolated consciousness which is the centre of recognition. So, merely recognizing every experience, every reaction, is not the understanding of oneself. The understanding of oneself comes only when we are aware of the process of recognition, and allow a gap between experience and recognition - which means, a state of mind in which there is stillness.

Surely, if we would understand anything, any problem, there must be quietness of mind, must there not? But the mind cannot be forced to be quiet; and silence that is cultivated is mere resistance, isolation. The mind is spontaneously quiet only when it sees the necessity, the truth of being quiet, and therefore begins to understand the process of recognition, which is the whole consciousness of the 'me'. Without understanding oneself, obviously there is no basis for thought; and without knowing oneself, merely to know the outward problems, to acquire external knowledge, will only lead us to further confusion and misery. But the more we know ourselves, both the conscious and the unconscious, the more we see the whole process of the 'me', the more we are able to understand and resolve our problems, and therefore bring about a better society, a different world. So, we must begin with ourselves. You may say that to begin with oneself is a very small affair; but if we would tackle great things, we must begin very near. The world's problem is our problem; and without understanding ourselves, any problem with which we come face to face in the world will never be resolved. So, the beginning of wisdom is self-knowledge; and without self-knowledge we cannot

resolve any human problem.

Before I answer some of these questions, may I suggest that when listening to the answers, you and I should both experience what is being said. That is, let us take a journey together in understanding these problems, which I am going to try to explain verbally. So, please do not remain on the verbal level or merely try to understand intellectually - whatever that word may mean. Because, the intellect cannot understand: it can only project its own particular accumulations. It can accept, deny, or resist, which is the process of recognition and verbalization; but the intellect cannot understand any human problem - it can only make it more confusing, more conflicting, more sorrowful. If, instead of trying to understand merely on the verbal level, we go beyond the intellect, then perhaps we shall be able to see the truth of these questions. To go beyond the intellect is not to become sentimental, emotional, which would be the opposite; and in the conflict of the opposites there is no comprehension, obviously. But if we can see that the process of the intellect, of the mind, can only bring about further argumentation's, further conflict - if we can see the truth of that, then perhaps we shall discover the truth of every question, of every human problem, that confronts us. Question: Beyond all superficial fears there is a deep anguish, which eludes me. It seems to be the very fear of life - or perhaps of death. Or is it the vast emptiness of life?

Krishnamurti: I think most of us feel this; most of us feel a great sense of emptiness, a great sense of loneliness. We try to avoid it, we try to run away from it, we try to find security, permanency, away from this anguish. Or, we try to be free of it by analyzing the

various dreams, the various reactions. But it is always there, eluding us, and not to be resolved so easily and so superficially. Most of us are aware of this emptiness, of this loneliness, of this anguish. And, being afraid of it, we seek security, a sense of permanency, in things or property, in people or relationship, or in ideas, beliefs, dogmas, in name, position, and power. But can this emptiness be banished by merely running away from ourselves? And is not this running away from ourselves one of the causes of confusion, pain, misery, in our relationships and therefore in the world?

So this is a question not to be brushed aside as being bourgeois, or stupid, or merely for those who are not active socially, religiously. We must examine it very carefully and go into it fully. As I said, most of us are aware of this emptiness, and we try to run away from it. In running away from it, we establish certain securities; and then those securities become all-important to us, because they are the means of escape from our particular loneliness, emptiness or anguish. Your escape may be a Master, it may be thinking yourself very important, it may be giving all your love, your wealth, jewels, everything to your wife, to your family; or it may be social or philanthropic activity. Any form of escape from this inward emptiness becomes all-important, and therefore we cling to it desperately. Those who are religiously-minded cling to their belief in God, which covers up their emptiness, their anguish; and so their belief, their dogma, becomes essential - and for these they are willing to fight, to destroy each other.

Obviously, then, any escape from this anguish, from this loneliness, will not solve the problem. On the contrary, it merely

increases the problem, and brings about further confusion. So, one must first realize the escapes. All escapes are on the same level; there are no superior or inferior escapes, there are no spiritual escapes apart from the mundane. All escapes are essentially similar; and if we recognise that the mind is constantly escaping from the central problem of anguish, of emptiness, then we are capable of looking at emptiness without condemning it or being afraid of it. As long as I am escaping from a fact, I am afraid of that fact; and when there is fear, I can have no communication with it. So, to understand the fact of emptiness, there must be no fear. Fear comes only when I am trying to escape from it; because, in escaping, I can never look at it directly. But the moment I cease to escape, I am left with the fact, I can look at it without fear; and then I am able to deal with the fact.

So, that is the first step to face the fact, which means not to escape through money, through amusement, through the radio, through beliefs, through assertions, or through any other means. Because, that emptiness cannot be filled by words, by activities, by beliefs. Do what we will, that anguish cannot be wiped away by any tricks of the mind; and whatever the mind does with regard to it, will only be an avoidance. But when there is no avoidance of any kind, then the fact is there; and the understanding of the fact does not depend on the inventions on the projections or calculations of the mind. When one is confronted with the fact of loneliness, with that immense anguish, the vast emptiness of existence, then one will see whether that emptiness is a reality - or merely the result of naming, of terming, of self-projection. Because, by giving it a term, we have condemned it, have we not?

We say it is emptiness, it is loneliness, it is death, and these words - death, loneliness, emptiness - imply a condemnation, a resistance; and through resistance, through condemnation, we do not understand the fact.

To understand the fact which we call emptiness, there must be no condemnation, no naming, of that fact. After all, the recognition of the fact creates the centre of the `me'; and the `me' is empty, the `me' is only words. When I do not name the fact, give it a term, when I do not recognize it as this or that, is there loneliness? After all, loneliness is a process of isolation, is it not? Surely in all our relationships, in all our efforts in life, we are always isolating ourselves. That process of isolation must obviously lead to emptiness; and without understanding the whole process of isolation, we shall not be able to resolve this emptiness, this loneliness. But when we understand the process of isolation, we shall see that emptiness is merely a thing of words, mere recognition; and the moment there is no recognition, no naming of it, and hence no fear, emptiness becomes something else, it goes beyond itself. Then it is not emptiness, it is aloneness - something much vaster than the process of isolation.

Now, must we not be alone? At present we are not alone - we are merely a bundle of influences. We are the result of all kinds of influences - social, religious, economic, hereditary, climatic. Through all those influences, we try to find something beyond; and if we cannot find it, we invent it, and cling to our inventions. But when we understand the whole process of influence at all the different levels of our consciousness, then, by becoming free of it, there is an aloneness which is uninfluenced; that is, the mind and

heart are no longer shaped by outward events or inward experiences. It is only when there is this aloneness that there is a possibility of finding the real. But a mind that is merely isolating itself through fear, can have only anguish; and such a mind can never go beyond itself.

With most of us, the difficulty is that we are unaware of our escapes. We are so conditioned, so accustomed to our escapes, that we take them as realities. But if we will look more deeply into our selves, we will see how extraordinarily lonely, how extraordinarily empty we are under the superficial covering of our escapes. Being aware of that emptiness, we are constantly covering it up with various activities, whether artistic, social, religious or political. But emptiness can never finally be covered: it must be understood. To understand it, we must be aware of these escapes; and when we understand the escapes, then we shall be able to face our emptiness. Then we shall see that the emptiness is not different from ourselves, that the observer is the observed. In that experience, in that integration of the thinker and the thought, this loneliness, this anguish, disappears.

Question: Is it possible for westerners to meditate?

Krishnamurti: I think this is one of the romantic ideas of westerners - that only easterners can meditate. So, let us find out, not how to meditate, but what we mean by meditation. Let us experiment together to find out what meditation means what are the implications of meditation. Merely to learn how to meditate, to acquire a technique, is obviously not meditation. Going to a yogi, a swami, reading about meditation in books, and trying to imitate, sitting in certain postures with your eyes closed, breathing in a

certain way, repeating words - surely, all that is not meditation; it is merely pursuing a pattern of conformity, making the mind repetitive, habitual. The mere cultivation of a habit, whether noble or trivial, is not meditation. This practice of cultivating a particular habit is known both in the east and in the west, and we think that it is a process of meditation.

Now, let us find out what is meditation. Is concentration meditation? Concentration on a particular interest chosen from among many other interests, focusing the mind on an object or an entity - is that meditation? in the process of concentration, obviously there is resistance to other forms of interest; therefore, concentration is a process of exclusion, is it not? I do not know if you have tried to meditate, tried to fix your mind on a particular thought. When you do that, other thoughts come pouring in, because you are also interested in those other thoughts, not only in the particular thought you have chosen. You have chosen one particular thought, thinking it is noble, spiritual, and that you should concentrate on it and resist other thoughts. But the very resistance creates conflict between the thought that you have chosen to think about, and other interests; so you spend your time concentrating on one thought and keeping off the others, and this battle between thoughts is considered meditation. If you can succeed in completely identifying yourself with one thought and resisting all others, you think you have learned how to meditate. Now, such concentration is a process of exclusion, and therefore a process of gratification, is it not? You have chosen a particular interest that you think will ultimately give you satisfaction, and you go after it by repeating a phrase, by concentrating upon an

image, by breathing, and so on. That whole process implies advancement, becoming something, achieving a result. That is what we are all interested in: we want to be successful in meditation. And the more successful we are, the more we think we have advanced. So obviously, such forms of concentration which we call meditation, are mere gratification; they are not meditation at all. So, mere concentration on an idea is not meditation.

What, then, is meditation? Is prayer meditation? Is devotion meditation? Is the cultivation of a virtue meditation? The cultivation of a virtue only strengthens the `me', does it not? It is I who am becoming virtuous, Can the `I', the `me', ever become virtuous? That is, can the centre of resistance, of recognition, which is a process of isolation, can that ever be virtuous? Surely, there is virtue only when there is freedom from the `I', from the `me'; so, the cultivation of virtue through meditation is obviously a false process. But it is a very convenient process, because it strengthens the `me'; and as long as I am strengthening the `me', I think I am advancing, becoming successful spiritually. But obviously, that is not meditation, is it? Nor is prayer - prayer being mere supplication, petition, which is again a demand of the self, a projection of the self towards greater and wider satisfaction. Nor is meditation the immolation of oneself to an image, to an idea, which we call devotion; because, we always choose the image, the formula, the ideal, according to our own satisfaction. What we choose may be beautiful, but we are still seeking gratification.

So, none of these processes - concentration, repeating certain phrases, breathing in a special manner, and all the rest of it - can really help us to understand what meditation is. They are very

popular, because they always produce results; but they are all obviously foolish ways of trying to meditate.

Now, what is meditation? The understanding of the ways of the mind is meditation, is it not? Meditation is the understanding of myself, it is being aware of every reaction, conscious as well as unconscious - which is self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge, how can there be meditation? Surely, meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge; because, if I do not know myself whatever I do must be merely an escape from myself. If I do not know the structure the ways of my own thinking, feeling, reacting of what value is it to imitate, to try to concentrate, to learn how to breathe in a particular way, or to lose myself in devotion? Surely, in that way I will never understand myself; on the contrary, I am merely escaping from myself.

Meditation, then, is the beginning of self-knowledge. In that there is no success, there are no spectacular processes. It is most arduous. As we do not want to know ourselves, but only to find an escape, we turn to Masters, religious books, prayers, yogis, and all the rest of it; and then we think we have learned how to meditate. Only in understanding ourselves does the mind become quiet; and without understanding ourselves, the tranquillity of the mind is not possible. When the mind is quiet, not made quiet through discipline; when the mind is not controlled, not encased in condemnation and resistance, but is spontaneously still - only then is it possible to find out what is true and what is beyond the projections of the mind.

Surely, if I want to know if there is reality, God, or what you will, my mind must be absolutely quiet, must it not? Because

whatever the mind seeks out will not be real - it will merely be the projection of its own memories, of the things it has accumulated; and the projection of memory is obviously not reality or God. So, the mind must be still, but not made still; it must be naturally, easily, spontaneously still. Only then is it possible for the mind to discover something beyond itself.

Question: Is truth absolute?

Krishnamurti: Is truth something final, absolute, fixed? We would like it to be absolute, because then we could take shelter in it. We would like it to be permanent, because then we could hold on to it, find happiness in it. But is truth absolute, continuous, to be experienced over and over again? The repetition of experience is the mere cultivation of memory is it not? In moments of quietness, I may experience a certain truth; but if I cling to that experience through memory and make it absolute, fixed - is that truth? Is truth the continuation, the cultivation of memory? Or, is truth to be found only when the mind is utterly still? When the mind is not caught in memories, not cultivating memory as the centre of recognition, but is aware of everything I am saying, everything I am doing in my relationships, in my activities, seeing the truth of everything as it is from moment to moment - surely, that is the way of meditation, is it not? There is comprehension only when the mind is still; and the mind cannot be still as long as it is ignorant of itself. That ignorance is not dispelled through any form of discipline, through pursuing any authority ancient or modern. Belief only creates resistance, isolation; and where there is isolation, there is no possibility of tranquillity. Tranquillity comes only when I understand the whole process of myself - the various

entities, in conflict with each other, which compose the `me'. As that is an arduous task, we turn to others to learn various tricks which we call meditation. The tricks of the mind are not meditation. Meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge; and without meditation, there is no self-knowledge. Meditation is watching observing being aware of oneself, not only at one particular hour of the day but all the time when we are walking, eating, talking reading in relationship - all that is the process in which we discover the ways of the `me'.

When I understand myself then there is quietness, then there is stillness of the mind. In that stillness, reality can come to me. That stillness is not stagnation, it is not a denial of action. On the contrary, it is the highest form of action. In that stillness there is creation - not the mere expression of a particular creative activity, but the feeling of creation itself.

So, meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge; and merely to cling to formulas, to repetitions, to words, does not reveal the process of the self. It is only when the mind is not agitated, not compelled, not forced, that there is a spontaneous stillness in which truth can come into being.

May 7, 1950

SEATTLE 1ST PUBLIC TALK 16TH JULY 1950

I think it is important to learn the art of hearing. Most of us listen only to that which is convenient, pleasurable; we do not hear those things that might affect us deeply, that are disturbing, that contradict our particular beliefs and opinions. And surely, it is important that we should know how to listen without making a tremendous effort to understand. When we make an effort to understand, our energy goes into the effort rather than into the process of understanding. Very few can listen without resistance, without creating barriers between themselves and the speaker; but if we can put aside our particular opinions, our accumulated knowledge and experience, and listen easily, without effort, then perhaps we shall be able to understand the nature of the fundamental and radical transformation that is so essential in a crisis of the present kind.

Now, it is obvious that there must be some kind of change. We are at the edge of a precipice; and the crisis is not limited to a particular group, religion, or people, but it is a crisis that involves us all. Whether you are an American or a Korean, a Japanese or a German, a Russian or a Hindu, you are affected by this crisis. It is a world crisis; and to understand it fully, if one is at all serious about it, one has obviously to begin with a fundamental understanding of oneself. The world is not different from each one of us. The world's problems are your problems and mine. This is not a histrionic assertion, but an actual fact. If you examine the matter closely, go into it fully, you will see that the collective problems are the problems that confront each one of us

individually. I do not think there is a division between the collective problems and those of the individual. The world is what we are; what we are, we project, and that to us becomes the world problem.

So, to understand this extraordinarily complex and everincreasing problem that we see in the world, we have to understand ourselves - which does not mean that we must become so subjective, so inward-turned, that we lose contact with external affairs. Such an action, such a process, is meaningless, it has no validity at all. But if we can see that the world crisis - the confusion, the tragedy, the appalling murders and disasters that are taking place and are going to take place, this whole beastly mess - if we can see that all this is the result of our own daily life and action, of our particular beliefs, both religious and national; if we can see that this world cataclysm is a projection of our selves and is not independent of us, then our examination of the problem will be neither subjective nor objective, but will come about through quite a different approach.

Now, we generally approach a problem of this kind either objectively or subjectively, do we not? We try to understand it either on the objective or on the subjective level; and the difficulty is that the problem is neither purely subjective nor purely objective, but is a combination of the two. It is both a social and a psychological process, and that is why no specialist, no economist, no psychologist, no follower of a system, whether of the right or of the left, can ever solve this problem. The specialists and experts can attack the problem only in their own particular fields, they never treat it as a total process; and to understand it, one must

approach it in its totality. So, our approach to the problem can obviously be neither subjective nor objective, but we must be capable of seeing it as a total process.

To understand the world crisis as a total process, one has to begin with oneself. Outwardly there is constant war, conflict, confusion, misery, and strife; and through it all there is the search for security, for happiness. Surely, these outward problems are the result, the projection, of our own inward confusion, conflict, and misery. Therefore, in order to solve the external problems, which are not independent of our inward struggles and pains, we must obviously begin to understand the process of our own thinking; that is, there must be self-knowledge. Without knowing ourselves fundamentally, both the conscious and the unconscious, there is no basis for thinking, is there? If I do not know myself deeply, at all the different levels, what basis is there for my thinking, for my action? Though this has been said over and over again by every preacher since the beginning of time, we go on disregarding it because we think that by environmental change, by altering outward circumstances, by bringing about an economic revolution, we can transform fundamentally the process of our thinking. But surely, if we can look at the problem a little more closely and ardently, we will see that mere external alterations can never bring about a fundamental revolution. Without understanding the whole process of the self, of the 'me', the process of our own thinking, the inward confusion in which we live will always overcome the cunning reconstruction of outer circumstances.

So, it is important, is it not?, for those who are really serious, who are in earnest, who are not just flippant or pursuing some

sectarian belief - surely, it is important for such people to begin to understand the process of their own thinking. Because, after all, our thought is the response of our particular conditioning; and there would be no thought if there were no conditioning. That is, whether you are a socialist, a communist, a capitalist, a catholic, a protestant, a Hindu, or what you will, your thinking is the response of that conditioning; and without understanding that conditioning or background, which is the `you', whatever you do, whatever you think, must obviously be the response of that conditioning. So, to bring about a fundamental revolution, a transformation in oneself, there must be the understanding of the background, of the conditioning influences which create the process of thinking; and this self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom.

Most of us, unfortunately, seek wisdom through books, through listening to somebody; we think we will understand life by following experts or by joining philosophical societies or religious organizations. Surely, they are all escapes, are they not? Because, after all, we have to understand ourselves; and the understanding of oneself is a very complex process. We do not exist at only one level; our structure of being is at several levels, with different entities all in conflict with each other. Without understanding that whole process of the self, we cannot finally solve any problem, whether political, economic, or social. The basic problem is one of human relationship, and to solve that, we must begin to understand the total process of ourselves. To bring about a change in the world, which is obviously essential, we must lie aware of all our psychological responses, must we not? To be aware of our responses is to observe them without choice, without

condemnation or justification - just to see the whole process of our own thinking in the midst of relationship, in the midst of action.

Then we begin to examine the problem in its totality, that is, we are aware of its full scope; and then we shall see how our responses are conditioned by our particular background, and how those conditioned responses are contributing to the chaos in the world. So, self - knowledge is the beginning of freedom.

Now, to discover anything, to understand what is truth, reality, or God, there must be freedom. Freedom can never come through a belief; on the contrary, there is freedom only when the conditioning influences of belief, and of the process of memory, are understood. When there is that understanding of its own process, then the mind is really still, spontaneously silent; and in that silence, which cannot come through any enforcement, there is freedom. Then only is there a possibility of discovering what is real. So, there can be freedom only with the understanding of the self, of the `me', of the whole process of our thinking.

There are some questions, and in considering them, may I suggest that you and I should both try to discover the truth of the matter, and not merely wait for an answer. Life has no categorical answer of `yes' or `no'. We must go into each problem very deeply; and to go into it deeply, we must begin very near and follow it closely without missing a step. And if we can take the journey together and discover the truth of these problems, then no expert, no pressure of public opinion, no immature thinking, can ever obscure that which has been discovered.

Question: What is my responsibility towards the present world crisis?

Krishnamurti: First of all, is the world crisis something apart from you? Is the present world catastrophe different from the conflict for our daily existence? After all, this disastrous world situation is the collective result of our separative beliefs, of our narrow patriotism's, of our religious bigotries, petty antagonisms, and economic frontiers. It is the result of our daily competition, of our ruthless efficiency, is it not?

So, the world crisis is a projection of ourselves; it is not separate from us. And to bring about a fundamental change in the world, surely we must individually break down and be free from those limitations, barriers, and conditioning influences, which create this universal horror and confusion. But our difficulty is that we do not see that we are responsible. We do not really see that nationalism divides people, that so-called religions, with their dogmas, beliefs, and rituals, are separating influences. Though they preach the unity of man, they themselves are a means of setting man against man. We do not see the truth of that, nor of the fact that our own limited thoughts, experiences, and knowledge, are again a separative process; and where there is separation, obviously there is disintegration and ultimately war.

Our life, then, is actually a process of disintegration; in it there is nothing creative. We are like gramophone records, repeating certain experiences, certain slogans, and reproducing the knowledge which we have acquired. In repeating, we make a lot of noise, and we think we are living; but this mechanical repetition is obviously a process of disintegration which, when projected, becomes a world crisis of ultimate destruction. So, the world crisis is a projection of our daily existence. What we are makes the world

around us. Therefore, for those who are really serious, it is of the highest importance to bring about a fundamental change in what we are; because, only in the transformation of ourselves can there be the cessation of this horror that is going on. But unfortunately, most of us are lazy. We want others to do the work for us, to tell us what to do. We are satisfied with our little knowledge, with our little experience, with trite newspaper slogans; and gradually we become set in our narrow ways, we lose the vitality of change, the quickness, the alertness of mind.

So, the problem is not to find out your responsibility towards the world crisis, but to see that what you are, the world is. Without a fundamental transformation in yourself, world crises will go on multiplying, becoming more and more disastrous. The problem, then, is how to bring about a fundamental transformation in oneself; and we shall discuss this during the next four weeks as we go along. It is not an easy problem. Transformation is not mere change, a mere modification in one's attitude. Such change is superficial, it can never be fundamental. So, we must think about the whole problem quite differently, which we will do in the course of the coming weeks.

Question: Is the individual the instrument of society, or does society exist for the individual?

Krishnamurti: This is an important question, is it not? Let us think it out together and find the truth of the matter without depending on the opinion of any authority or any expert. Authorities and experts change their views according to their convenience, according to their latest discoveries, and so on; but if we can discover the truth of the matter for ourselves, then we shall

not be dependent on others.

Now, this question implies that the world is divided, does it not? There are those who assert, with enormous knowledge in addition to their personal inclination and idiosyncrasy, that the individual is the instrument of society - which means that the individual is not important at all. There is a tremendous group of people who maintain this, and who therefore give all their energies to the reconstruction of society. And there are those who believe with equal emphasis that the individual is above society, that society exists for the individual.

So, you and I have to find out what the truth of this matter is. How are we going to find out? Surely, not by being persuaded to accept this or that opinion, but by going into the whole problem very deeply. That is, our problem is not whether society exists for the individual, or the individual for society, but to find out what is the individual. I hope I am making myself clear. There are those who assert that the individual is not important, and that only society is important; and there are others who maintain that the individual is beyond society. But to find out the truth of the matter, surely we must inquire into the problem of what is individuality.

Are you an individual? You may think you are an individual, because you have your own house, your own name, your own family, your own bank account; you have the particular experiences, the memories, both private and collective, of a separate person. But does that constitute individuality? Because, after all, you are conditioned by your environment, are you not? You are an American, or a Russian, or a Hindu, with all its implications; you have a certain ideology imposed upon you by

your society, either of the left or of the right. You are educated in certain ways by your society. Your religious beliefs are a result of your education, of your environmental influence. You believe in God, or disbelieve in God, according to your conditioning. So, you, as an entity, are the result of social or environmental conditioning, are you not? That is, you are a conditioned entity; and is a conditioned entity a true individual? Individuality is unique, is it not? Otherwise it is not individuality. And that which is unique is creative, it is beyond all conditioning, it is not limited, controlled by thought. So, there can be individuality only when there is freedom from conditioning; and as long as you are conditioned as a Hindu, a Buddhist, a communist, a capitalist, a Russian, or what you will, there can be no individuality.

Now, society is only concerned with creating an entity which is efficient for its own purposes, including war; it is obviously not concerned with bringing about an individual who is unique, creative. So, the problem is, not whether the individual is or is not the instrument of society, but whether we ourselves are individuals; and to find out if we are individuals, surely we must be aware of our conditioning. As long as we are not free from our particular conditioning, there cannot be the creative uniqueness of individuality. There can be individuality only when there is freedom from all conditioning, whether of the left or of the right; and that freedom alone brings about the creative uniqueness of the individual.

You may say that I am giving quite a different significance to that word 'individual'. But I don't think we are individuals, are we? And by recognizing that we are not individuals, that we merely

respond according to our conditioning - by recognizing that fact, we can go beyond it; but if we deny the fact, then it is obviously impossible to go beyond. And most of us will deny the fact, because we like what we are. We like to be comfortable in our own little backyard of thinking - and for that we will fight. But if we can understand our conditioning and the responses of that conditioning, which we so proudly call individuality, if we can be aware of all that, then there is a possibility of going beyond and discovering what is true creation.

Question: There are many concepts of God in the world today. What is your thought concerning God?

Krishnamurti: First of all, we must find out what we mean by a concept. What do we mean by the process of thinking? Because, after all, when we formulate a concept, let us say, of God, our formula or concept must be the result of our conditioning, must it not? If we believe in God, surely our belief is the result of our environment. There are those who are trained from childhood to deny God, and those who are trained to believe in God - as most of you have been. So, we formulate a concept of God according to our training, according to our background, according to our idiosyncrasies, likes and dislikes, hopes and fears. Obviously, then, as long as we do not understand the process of our own thinking, mere concepts of God have no value at all, have they? Because, thought can project anything it likes. It can create and deny God. Each person can invent or destroy God according to his inclinations, pleasures, and pains. Therefore, as long as thought is active, formulating, inventing, that which is beyond time can never be discovered. God, or reality, is to be discovered only when

thought comes to an end.

Now, when you ask, "What is your thought concerning God?", you have already formulated your own thought, have you not? Thought can create God, and experience that which it has created; but surely, that is not true experience. It is only its own projection that thought experiences, and therefore it is not real. But if you and I can see the truth of this, then perhaps we shall experience something much greater than a mere projection of thought.

At the present time, when there is greater and greater insecurity outwardly, there is obviously a yearning for inward security. Since we cannot find security outside, we seek it in an idea, in thought; and so we create that which we call God, and that concept becomes our security. Now, a mind that seeks security surely cannot find the real, the true. To understand that which is beyond time, the fabrications of thought must come to an end. Thought cannot exist without words, symbols, images; and only when the mind is quiet, free of its own creations, is there a possibility of finding out what is real. So, merely to ask if there is or is not God, is an immature response to the problem, is it not? And to formulate opinions about God is really childish.

To experience, to realize, that which is beyond time, we must obviously understand the process of time. The mind is the result of time, it is based on the memories of yesterday; and is it possible to be free from the multiplication of yesterdays, which is the process of time? Surely, this is a very serious problem, it is not a matter of belief or disbelief. Believing and disbelieving is a process of ignorance; whereas, understanding the time-binding quality of thought brings freedom, in which alone there can be discovery. But

most of us want to believe, because it is much more convenient; it gives us a sense of security, a sense of belonging to the group. Surely, this very belief separates us; because, you believe in one thing, and I believe in another. So, belief acts as a barrier, it is a process of disintegration.

What is important, then, is not the cultivation of belief or disbelief, but to understand the process of the mind. It is the mind, it is thought, that creates time. Thought is time, and whatever thought projects must be of time; therefore, thought cannot possibly go beyond itself. To discover what is beyond time, thought must come to an end - and that is a most difficult thing; because, the ending of thought does not come about through discipline, through control, through denial or suppression. Thought ends only when we understand the whole process of thinking; and to understand thinking, there must be self-knowledge. Thought is the self, thought is the word which identifies itself as the `me; and at whatever level, high or low, the self is placed, it is still within the field of thought. To find God, that which is beyond time, we must understand the process of thought, that is, the process of oneself. And the self is very complex; it is not at any one level, but is made up of many thoughts, many entities, each in contradiction with the other. There must be a constant awareness of them all - an awareness in which there is no choice, no condemnation or comparison; that is, there must be the capacity to see things as they are without distorting or translating them. The moment we judge or translate what is seen, we distort it according to our background. To discover reality or God, there can be no belief, because acceptance or denial is a barrier to discovery. We all want to be

secure, both outwardly and inwardly; and the mind must understand that the search for security is an illusion. It is only the mind which is insecure, completely free from any form of possession, that can discover - and this is an arduous task. It does not mean retiring into the woods, or to a monastery, or isolating oneself in some peculiar belief; on the contrary, nothing can exist in isolation. To be, is to be related; and it is only in the midst of relationship that we can spontaneously discover ourselves as we are. It is this very discovery of ourselves as we are, without any sense of condemnation or justification, that brings about a fundamental transformation in what we are; and that is the beginning of wisdom.

July 16, 1950

SEATTLE 2ND PUBLIC TALK 23RD JULY 1950

With most of us, life is a constant struggle, a constant battle, within ourselves, and therefore outwardly. This battle, this conflict, seems never to end; and the difficulty with most of us is that we are always trying to conform our lives to certain standards, principles or ideals. Now, the cessation of conflict does not come about through a process of conformity, either to the past or to the future, but through understanding the events, the happenings, of our daily life as they arise from moment to moment; and we are incapable of that full comprehension of events as long as we hold to a particular outlook, opinion, experience or idea.

Life is relationship; and in relationship, most of us seek isolation. If we observe closely, we will see that our very thinking and action are self-enclosing, and this process of self-enclosing we call experience. Relationship is not only with people, but with ideas and things; and as long as we do not understand this self-enclosing process in relationship, we are bound to have conflict, because there must be conflict as long as there is isolation.

Isolation takes many and extraordinary forms. There is the isolation of memory, both personal and collective; there is isolation in the form of belief; and there is the isolation of the experiences that one has accumulated and to which the mind clings. This whole process of isolation, of separation, is obviously a disintegrating factor in our lives - and that is exactly what is happening at the present time in the world. Inwardly, as individuals, and outwardly, as nationalistic and religious groups, we are seeking isolation in self-enclosing ideals, beliefs, dogmas, and opinions; and as long as

this process of isolation continues, there must be conflict. Conflict can never be overcome; because, a thing that is overcome has to be conquered again and again. Conflict ceases only in understanding the process of relationship. We cannot live in understanding relationship obviously is to understand relationship - our relationship with people, with property, and with ideas.

Does understanding depend on experience? What do we mean by experience? Experience is a reaction, the response to a challenge, is it not? If the response is not adequate, there is conflict; and the response can never be adequate as long as we do not understand relationship. To understand relationship, we must understand the whole background and process of our thinking. Thought, the whole structure of our thinking, is based on the past and as long as we do not understand this background, relationship remains inevitably a process of conflict.

To understand thought, which is the process of the self at whatever level it may be placed, is arduous; because, thought has no break in continuity. That is why, to follow the movement, the reactions of thought, which is the self, the mind must be extraordinarily subtle, quick, and adaptable. The self, the 'me', is obviously made up of the qualities, the tendencies, the prejudices and idiosyncrasies of the mind; and without understanding that whole structure of thinking, merely to solve the outer problems of relationship is obviously futile.

So, understanding does not depend on the process of thought. Thought is never new, but relationship is always new; and thought approaches this thing that is vital, real, new, with the background of the old. That is, thought tries to understand relationship

according to the memories, patterns, and conditioning of the old - and hence there is conflict. Before we can understand relationship, we must understand the background of the thinker, which is to be aware of the whole process of thought without choice; that is, we must be capable of seeing things as they are without translating them according to our memories, our preconceived ideas, which are the outcome of past conditioning.

To understand conflict, we must understand relationship; and the understanding of relationship does not depend on memory, on habit, on what has been or what should be. It depends on choiceless awareness from moment to moment; and if we go into it deeply, we shall see that in that awareness there is no accumulative process at all. The moment there is accumulation, there is a point from which to examine, and that point is conditioned; and hence, when we regard relationship from a fixed point, there must be pain, there must be conflict.

Life, then, is a process of constant relationship with ideas, with people, and with things; and as long as we have a fixed point or centre of recognition, which is the consciousness of the 'me', there must be conflict. From the centre of recognition, that accumulative principle of the 'me', we examine all our relationships, and therefore there must be a constant isolation; and it is this isolation, this desire to be separate, that creates conflict and struggle.

So, our problem in life, in living, is to understand the desire to be separate. Nothing can live in isolation; but all our efforts based on desire must eventually be exclusive, separative. Therefore desire is the process of disintegration; and desire expresses itself in many ways, subtle and gross, conscious and unconscious. But if we

can be aware of desire - not as a discipline, but by being choicelessly aware of it from moment to moment - , then we shall see that there comes a swift spontaneity of discovery of that which is true; and it is truth that gives freedom, not all our efforts to be free.

Truth is not cumulative; it is to be seen and understood from moment to moment. The person who accumulates, whether knowledge, property, or ideas, who is caught up in the self-enclosing process of relationship, is incapable of seeing truth. The man of knowledge can never know truth, because the process of knowledge is cumulative; and the mind which accumulates is caught in time, and therefore cannot know the timeless.

Now, how are we to understand the process of the self, the 'me'? Without understanding this process, there is no basis for action, for thought. To understand the self, we must understand relationship; because, it is in the mirror of relationship that the self is seen. But the self can be seen clearly as it is, only when there is no condemnation, no comparison; that is, when we are capable of observation, alert passiveness, in which all choice has come to an end. As long as the mind is accumulating, it is not free; but when it is capable of perceiving without choice that which is, then that very perception is its own freedom. It is only when the mind is free that it is capable of discovery, and in that freedom there is the cessation of conflict and pain.

I have several questions, and in considering them, let us examine the problem and discover the truth of it together. To do that, the mind must be quick, pliable, actively aware. No problem has an answer, and if we seek an answer, it will lead us away from

the problem; but if we understand that problem, the problem comes to an end. As long as we seek an answer to any problem, that problem will continue, because the desire to find an answer prevents the understanding of the problem itself. So, our approach to the problem is extraordinarily important, is it not? The man who is looking for the solution to a problem has his whole concentration placed on the discovery of the answer, and so he is really incapable of looking directly at the problem. But if we can look at the problem without the desire to find an answer we shall see that the problem is quickly resolved, because then the problem reveals its whole content. So, if I may suggest, let us in that manner examine these questions together.

Question: What system would give man the greatest physical security?

Krishnamurti: There are several things involved in this question, are there not? What do we mean by a system? And what do we mean by physical security? By a system we mean an ideology, either of the left or of the right, do we not? And can any ideology guarantee physical security? Can a system, an idea, a doctrine, however promising, however cunningly and subtly thought out, however erudite, give security? A political structure built around ideas, knowledge, and experience - that is what we mean by a system, is it not? It is an ideology in opposition to other ideologies; and can that ever bring physical security?

What do we mean by idea? Idea is a process of thinking, is it not? One thinks, and idea is merely the result of accumulated knowledge and experience; and we look to idea as a means of physical security. That is, to put it differently, there are many

problems: starvation, war, unemployment, overpopulation, erosion of the soil and so on. Take starvation - though it is perhaps not the problem in this country that it is in the East. Two opposing systems, the left and the right, try to solve it. That is, we approach the problem of starvation with an idea, with a formula - and then fight over the formula. So, the formula, the system, becomes more important than the problem of starvation. The problem is starvation, not what idea, what formula to use. But we are more interested in the idea than in the problem of starvation; and so we group ourselves against each other, according to our ideas, and fight it out, liquidate each other; and starvation continues.

So, the important thing is to have the capacity to face the problem, to tackle it directly, and not look to a system; and by understanding the problem, we will naturally resolve it. That is entirely different from coming to it with a formula, is it not? After all, there is enough scientific knowledge to solve the problem of starvation. Why is it not done? Because of our nationalism, our power politics, and the innumerable other absurdities of which we are so proud. It is therefore a psychological problem, and not merely an economic problem. No expert can solve it, because the expert looks at it from his particular point of view, according to his formula. That is why it is important to understand the whole process of one's own thinking.

Now, can we have physical security as long as we are seeking psychological security? This is another problem which is also involved in this question. We have seen what is implied when we look to a system in order to have physical security; and now we are trying to find out what we mean by physical security, and if

physical security is independent of psychological security. Is physical security assured if we are seeking psychological security? That is, if we use property as a means of psychological security, are we not creating physical insecurity? Property becomes extraordinarily important to us because psychologically we are weak; it gives us power, position, prestige, and so we put a fence around it and call it 'mine'. To protect it, we create a police force, an army, and from that arise nationalism and war. So, in the very desire for psychological security, we bring about physical insecurity. Therefore, physical security is entirely dependent on whether or not we are seeking psychological security. If we do not seek psychological security in any form, then obviously there is a possibility of achieving physical security.

Physical security, then, depends upon the understanding of our own psychological process, the whole structure of our inner being; and as long as we do not understand ourselves, no system can give us physical security. A revolution based on an idea can never be a revolution, and can therefore never bring about physical security, because it is merely a modified continuation of what is.

Revolution, transformation, is not the outcome of thinking; it comes into being only when thought ceases. Our difficulty is that we are so caught up with Utopian promises that we are willing to sacrifice the present for the future; and in the very sacrificing of the present is the destruction of the future. Only when we understand the fact of what is, without translating it according to any ideology, is there a possibility of having the physical security which is so essential.

Question: I seek God, truth, understanding. How am I to

proceed in finding them?

Krishnamurti: Do not seek, for what you seek is obviously your own projection, is it not? When you say, "I seek God, truth, understanding", you have an idea of what truth or God is, and you are after that; and you will find what you seek - but it will not be God. It will merely be the image of your idea. Only the man who does not seek will find reality - which does not mean that we must become apathetic, lazy, sluggish. On the contrary, not to seek is extremely difficult; it requires great understanding, deep comprehension. When the mind is seeking, it is projecting, manufacturing, fabricating; and it is only when the mind is still not disciplined to be still, but spontaneously quiet - that there is a possibility of truth coming into being. The man who struggles and tries to seek is caught in the process of conflict, is he not? Because he is continuously seeking, searching out, his mind is agitated, it is never still; and how can such a mind ever be quiet? Such a mind wants a result, it is seeking an end, a goal, which means it wants to be successful, only it does not call it that; it calls it the search for God, for truth, for understanding. But the intention, the background of that search, is the desire to be successful, the desire to be certain, the desire to be secure, to avoid all conflict, to reach a place where all disturbance will cease. When such a mind says, 'I am seeking', what it wants is to be enclosed permanently in the security of an ideal, which is its own projection.

So, the man who seeks will never find; but if we can understand the process of our own search, the whole psychological structure of our desire to find, to arrive, to succeed, which is quite complex, then we shall see that when seeking comes to an end there is the

beginning of truth, the beginning of understanding. But there can be no understanding as long as the mind is in the process of grasping.

It is the very nature of the mind, is it not?, to acquire, to gain, to become; and in acquisition, in becoming, there is always agitation, conflict. Being in conflict, the mind seeks truth or God, and that search is merely avoidance, an escape from conflict. Escape is always the same, whether it is drink or God. So, a mind that is seeking can never find; but when the mind begins to understand its own process, then it is quiet it is content. That contentment is not the outcome of acquiring or becoming something, it is not the contentment of satisfaction, of arriving at a position. Contentment which is free of all grasping comes only with the understanding of what is; but to understand what is, requires diligence, an awareness without rejection or acceptance. Only when the mind is not struggling, acquiring, grasping, can it be still, and only then is there understanding.

Question: To me, discipline is necessary to the good life; but you say that discipline is a hindrance to the good life. Please explain.

Krishnamurti: We take for granted that discipline is essential to the good life. But is it? What do we mean by discipline? By discipline we mean conformity to a system, to an ideal, do we not? We are afraid to be what we are, so we discipline ourselves to be something else - which is a process of resistance, suppression, sublimation, substitution. Now, does conformity, resistance, suppression, lead to the good life? Are you good when you resist? Are you noble when you are afraid to see what you are and avoid

it? Are you virtuous when you are conforming? The man who has enclosed himself in discipline - is he leading a noble life? Surely, he is merely resisting something of which he is afraid, conforming to a pattern that will assure him of security. Is that goodness? Or is goodness something beyond fear, beyond conformity and resistance?

It is easy merely to resist something, is it not? It is easy to comply, to conform, to imitate; but can such a mind ever be noble? After all, virtue is freedom, is it not? Discipline is a process of becoming virtuous; and surely, a mind that is becoming virtuous is never virtuous. Virtue is freedom, and freedom comes through exploring and understanding the whole process of resistance, of conformity to social standards, that process by which the mind moves from the known to the known, and so is never in a state of insecurity. So, if we can understand the psychology of resistance, of conformity, of suppression, this whole process of becoming something which we call virtuous if we can understand all that, only then is there a good life. A good life is a free life, a comprehending life, not a life of resisting, fighting, conforming. To be free, we have to understand the process of our own conditioning which has trained us either to resist or to conform.

So, a mind that is disciplined can never be free. A mind that is disciplined at the beginning, will not be free at the end; because, the beginning is the end. The end and the beginning are not two separate states, they are one continuous process; and if you say, 'I will be free through discipline', you are denying freedom at the very beginning. But if at the very beginning you go deeply into and understand the process of discipline, control, shaping, conforming,

resisting, then you will see that freedom is now, not in the future.

Now, society makes use of discipline for its own purposes. A political party wants to have disciplined members for concerted action; but that action is never free, and therefore it creates resistance, the opposite, the other party; and so the two parties are in conflict with each other. But if we can understand the process which creates a party, whether of the left or of the right, the process of discipline arising from our conditioning - if we can understand this in its entirety, then we shall see that the good life does not come about through discipline, but comes only through understanding one's desire to conform, to resist, to suppress, to imitate; and that understanding is virtue.

Question: You have said in one of your talks that the thought process must cease for reality to be. How can we know anything if thought ceases?

Krishnamurti: First, let us examine what we mean by thinking, and what we mean by experiencing, which is recognizing. As the questioner says, if thought ceases, how can it recognize anything? Now, what do we mean by thinking? Please do not wait for my answer - we are exploring it together. When we say, 'I am thinking', what do we mean? If I ask you that, you respond, do you not? - whether correctly or incorrectly is irrelevant for the time being. So, thinking is a process of response to challenge. The challenge is always new, but the response is always the old; so, thinking is the response of memory, is it not? I ask you if you believe in God, and your immediate response is according to your memory or conditioning. Either you do or you do not believe. So, thinking is the process, the response of memory, which is habit.

That is, memory is the result of experience, and experience is knowledge; and according to your memory, experience, knowledge, you respond to any challenge. The challenge is new, and your response is modified according to the newness, the vitality of the challenge; but it is always the response of the background, is it not?

So, thinking is the response of the background, of the past, of accumulated experience; it is the response of memory at different levels, both individual and collective, particular and racial, conscious and unconscious. All that is our process of thinking. Therefore, our thinking can never be new. There can be no 'new' idea, because thinking can never renew itself; thinking can never be fresh, because it is always the response of the background - the background being our conditioning, our traditions, our experiences, our accumulations, collective and personal. So, when we look to thought as a means of discovering the new, we see the utter futility of it. Thought can only discover its own projection, it cannot discover anything new; thought can only recognize that which it has experienced, it cannot recognize that which it has not experienced.

Thought, then, is the process of recognition. Thought exists through verbalization, through symbols, through images, through words, otherwise there is no thought; therefore, thought can never be new, it can never be creative. When you say you are experiencing something, your experiencing is recognizing, is it not? If you did not recognize, you would not know you were experiencing. Now, can thought experience the new? Obviously not; because, thought can only recognize the old, that which it has

known, that which it has experienced before. The new can never be experienced by thought, because thought is the reaction of the old.

This is not something metaphysical, complicated, or abstract. If you will look at it a little more closely, you will see that as long as the `I' - the entity who is made up of all these memories - is experiencing, there can never be the discovery of the new.

Thought, which is the `I', can never experience God, because God or reality is the unknown, the unimaginable, the unformulated; it has no label, no word. The word `God' is not God. So, thought can never experience the new, the unknowable; it can only experience the known; for the mind can function only within the field of the known, it can- not function beyond it. The moment there is thought about the unknown, the mind is agitated; it is always seeking to bring the unknown into the known. But the unknown can never be brought into the known, and hence the conflict between the known and the unknown.

So, only when thought comes to an end is it possible for the unknown to be; and then there is no question of an `I' experiencing the unknown. The `I' can never experience the unknown, reality, God, or what you will. The `I', the mind, the self, is the bundle of the known, which is memory; and memory can only recognize its own projections, it cannot recognize the unknown. That is why thought must come to an end.

Thought as the `I' must cease to experience; there must be no feeling, no certainty, that `I have experienced'. When thought, which is the response of memory, comes to an end, and the mind is no longer functioning in the field of the known, only then is it possible for the unknown to be.

The experiencing of the unknown is not possible, because, when you `experience' the unknown, you are only experiencing the known as a new sensation. The unknown can never be recognized. The unknown is. But in that state the mind rebels, because it can only function within the field of the known.

That is why, for reality to be, you must understand the whole process of thinking, the process of the self. Thought can never discover or come to the unknown, the real; but when the mind is still, utterly silent - not made silent by any practice, by any discipline, by any system of control or meditation - , then, in that tranquillity, there is the reality which can never be experienced by the mind; for reality is beyond all projections of the self.

July 23, 1950

SEATTLE 3RD PUBLIC TALK 30TH JULY 1950

We ought to be able, I think, to discern the difference between necessity and desire. Desire can never be integrated, because desire always creates contradiction, its own opposite; whereas, if we can understand necessity, then we shall see that in it there is no contradiction. And surely, it is important to be aware of this problem of desire, which creates contradiction in each one of us; because, desire can never at any time bring about integration, and it is only in the state of integration, in the state of wholeness, that there is a possibility of going beyond the contradictions created in the mind by desire. After all, desire is sensation, and sensation is the basis of thought, of the mind. Sensation is the foundation of all our thinking; and as long as we do not understand the process of desire, we are bound to create in our life the conflict of contradiction.

So, the understanding of desire is essential, and that understanding does not come through merely transferring desire from one level to another. Desire at any level, however high we may place it, is inevitably contradictory, and therefore destructive. But if we can understand necessity, then we shall see that desire is binding, that it does not bring about freedom; and to discern what is needful, is quite an arduous task, because desire constantly interferes with our needs. When we self. understand need, there is no contradiction; but to understand need, we must understand desire. And our problem is, is it not?, that there is a constant battle going on between need and desire. Our whole social structure is based on this contradiction of desire. We think we are making

progress when we move from one desire to what we call a higher desire; but desire, whether high or low, is always a contradiction, a source of conflict and great suffering. So, if we can see how the whole process of desire works out in our daily life, then we shall understand the extraordinary importance of need, of necessity. Necessity is not a matter of choice, is it? When we can understand what is necessary, there is no contradiction, no battle either within or without; but to understand necessity, must we not examine the process of the mind that chooses what is necessary? The moment we bring in choice, does that not block the understanding of necessity? When we choose, do we ever discover what is necessary? Choice is always based, is it not?, on our conditioning; and that conditioning is the outcome of our contradictory desires. So, if we choose what is necessary, we are bound to create conflict, we are bound to bring about confusion. There is no thought without sensation; thought is the outcome of sensation, it is founded upon sensation; and if we can understand the ways of sensation, the ways of thought, and not choose what is necessary, then we shall see that necessity is a simple matter; and in that understanding there is no conflict, no contradiction.

Where there is desire, there is conflict and contradiction; and whether we are aware of it or not, contradiction invariably brings pain. So, desire is sorrow, whether we desire trivial things or great things. Desire inevitably brings its own opposite in its wake; and therefore, it is important, is it not?, to understand the whole process of thought, which is the `me' and the `mine'. The understanding of desire is the way of self-knowledge. Without understanding the self, there is no possibility of understanding what is essential,

necessary in life. Self-knowledge comes only through the understanding of relationship, which is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom cannot be bought, it cannot be gathered; it arises from moment to moment in relationship when the mind is aware, clear, and observing, without choice.

So, if we would understand the contradiction in which most of us live, there must be self-knowledge, which is the understanding of desire; and without understanding the whole process of desire, merely to follow one particular desire does not solve our problem. What solves our problem is to understand the nature of contradiction, which is desire. Desire can never be overcome; but when we see the truth that desire always creates its own opposite and therefore is a contradiction, then desire comes to an end; and only then is there a possibility of being content with necessity.

In considering these questions, it is important to find out in what way we are approaching them. If we come to a problem with a preconception, with a conclusion, with an opinion, obviously we cannot understand that problem. As I said, any problem is always new, fresh; and a mind that comes to a problem with a conclusion, with accumulated knowledge, cannot understand it. The mind can understand only when it comes to the problem afresh; and if we can this morning, let us examine each question directly and see the truth of it; for it is the discovery of the truth of the problem that liberates us from the problem itself.

Question: How many centuries will it take for the few who understand to bring about a fundamental transformation in the world?

Krishnamurti: It is important to find out, is it not?, from what

point of view this question is put. If we say it will take many centuries to bring about a fundamental transformation because there are very few individuals who really desire to transform themselves, we are obviously concerned with the problem of time. That is, we want immediate transformation because we see in the world such confusion, misery, conflict, starvation, economic problems, and wars; we see this unceasing sorrow, and so we are impatient, we desire transformation within a certain period of time. We say, 'The transformation of a few individuals will not bring about a fundamental and rapid change in the structure of society. Therefore, the transformation of the few is not very important. Though it is necessary, there must be a quicker way to bring about a fundamental revolution'.

Now, is there a rapid, an immediate way to transform man? And if we bring about a rapid change, will that be enduring? The world cannot be changed immediately. Even revolution cannot bring about an immediate and universal change; the millions cannot be fed overnight. But it is important, is it not?, to find out whether you and I can change, can bring about a fundamental transformation in ourselves, irrespective of its utilitarian aspect. And is the discovery and understanding of truth, useful? Has truth any use? Is it utilitarian? That is really what is implied in this question: whether truth is useful. Truth has no use whatever, has it? It cannot be used. It is. And the moment we approach truth with the desire to use it in the world of action, we destroy it. But if we can see the truth and allow it to operate without wanting to use it, then it brings about a fundamental transformation in our thinking, in our relationship. So, as long as we regard truth as a thing to be used, as a means of

transforming society or ourselves, it becomes merely an instrument - it is not an end in itself, without causation. But if it is an end in itself, without any utilitarian purpose, that is, if we allow it to operate within us, and without any interference from the mind, then unknowingly, unconsciously, it has a far-reaching effect.

So, what is important is not whether the few can bring about a fundamental change - even though fundamental changes generally are brought about by the few - , but to find out whether one is oneself really in earnest to discover this extraordinary liberating factor, this thing that we call truth or God, irrespective of any social or other value it may have. Because, the mind is always seeking values, is it not? And if it seeks truth as a `value', then that value is recognizable; but truth is not recognizable, it has no `value' for the mind. The mind cannot use it. But if the mind is quiet, then truth will operate; and this operation is extensive, unlimited, and therein lies freedom and happiness.

Question: Religions advocate prayer, and for centuries man has found in it his consolation. This concerted effort through the centuries is surely a significant and vital force. Do you deny its importance?

Krishnamurti: What is the function of prayer? Has prayer any significance? And what do we mean by prayer? Let us go into the whole question without any bias or prejudice. Obviously, man through the centuries has prayed; and it must bring results, it must in some way give him consolation, satisfaction, an answer in accordance with his demand, otherwise he would not continue to pray. Now, when do we pray? Surely, we pray when we are in trouble, do we not? We pray when we are in a state of uncertainty,

of contradiction, that is, when we are unhappy. We do not pray when we are happy, when we see things very clearly, simply, and directly, but only when we are confused. So, prayer is a form of petition, of supplication, is it not? And when we ask, we receive; and we receive according to our demand. When we pray, surely we are always asking for satisfaction in one form or another. One may pray for light, or guidance, another for the removal of pain, and so on; but the desire, the intention, is always to find peace, gratification. A mind that is seeking gratification at whatever level, high or low, is bound to be gratified, is it not? That is why, when we are confused, when we are in pain, when we are in uncertainty, we turn to prayer. Through prayer we hope to receive certainty, reassurance, the right answer to our problem. Please, I am not for or against prayer. We are examining the problem. I think there is a much greater thing than prayer; and we can discover that only when we understand the ways of prayer, this whole problem of supplication.

So, what happens when we pray? I am sure many of us have prayed. What is the way of prayer? We take a certain posture, repeat certain words or phrases, and gradually, through this repetition, the mind becomes quiet. The mind is made quiet by repetition of certain phrases, and in that quietness you receive an answer to your problem. But the answer is invariably gratifying, otherwise you would not accept it; though the answer may be painful, yet in the very acceptance of that painful answer there is gratification. That is, through the constant repetition of certain phrases, or the prolonged dwelling on certain ideas, the mind is made quiet; and when the mind is quiet, it is capable of receiving

an answer. But the answer depends on the petitioner; and the answer he receives is from the concentrated accumulation of innumerable desires, conscious and unconscious longings, and collective effort, of many people through many centuries. You can test this out for yourself. When you consciously ask for something in prayer, there is an unconscious response; and that response is from the accumulated and concentrated effort of centuries, modified according to the particular conditioning of the petitioner. But prayer does not ultimately help the individual to understand himself; and it is only in understanding oneself fundamentally, as a total process, that there is a possibility of going beyond the state of demanding, seeking, of striving to achieve a result. As I said, there is something far more important than prayer, which is meditation; and we shall discuss that at another time.

Now, it is important, is it not?, to understand this problem of prayer in relation to conflict, pain and suffering. Because, we never pray when we are happy, when we are joyous, when we have no problems; we pray only when we are in conflict, when we have a difficulty which we cannot solve. There are two different kinds of prayer, which are essentially the same. There is the prayer of active supplication, petition, and there is the prayer in which we simply remain open, but are unconsciously waiting to receive something. When we pray, we always have an outstretched hand, we are waiting, hoping, longing for an answer, for some consolation; and in that petitioning, we will find an answer according to our struggles, according to our conditioning. But prayer will never release the mind from creating the very problems that cause us to pray. What will free the mind from manufacturing its own

problems is the understanding of itself; and the understanding of itself is self-knowledge. But the whole process of knowing oneself is so complex that few of us are desirous of going into the problem; we would rather find a superficial answer, and so we turn to prayer. For centuries man has built up a concentrated reservoir, a store house of thought and desire, from which prayer may evoke an answer, a consolation; but that response is not the solution of the problem. The solution of the problem is to understand the total process of the mind itself.

Question: At various times in our lives, we have some kind of mystical experience. How do we know that these are not illusions? How can we recognize reality?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by illusion? What creates illusion? Surely, illusion is created, is it not?, when the mind is caught up in desire. As long as the mind interprets what is perceived according to its longings, wishes, and desires, according to its likes and dislikes, there must be illusion. As long as the mind does not understand desire, it translates experience and inevitably creates illusion. That is, if I have an experience which is called 'mystical' and do not understand the process of my own mind, that experience is bound to create illusion. And if I am attached to any particular form of experience, if I wish to gather more of it and continue in it, there must also be illusion; because, I am concerned, not with perceiving what is, but with gaining, guarding, accumulating.

Most of us have had some kind of mystical experience which has brought a certain clarity, a certain release, a certain happiness; and when it has passed, the memory of it becomes very important

to us. We cling to the memory of that experience, and the very fact that we cling to it indicates that we are caught in illusion. Memory is within the field of time, and what is true is beyond time; and when the mind holds to any particular experience, that experience becomes mere sensation, and sensation makes for illusions. So, when we cling to the memory of any so-called 'mystical experience' which we may have had, it indicates that we are concerned with the sensation that the experience has left behind, and therefore there is illusion. We cannot ever cling to the experience itself; we can never hold on to the state of experiencing. We can only accumulate memory, with its sensations; and when we do, we create a hindrance to further experiencing. Clinging to the past prevents the new, and so this attachment to the memories of a particular experience creates illusion.

The next part of this question is, "How can we recognize reality?" To go into that, we must understand the process of experiencing. We experience only when we recognize, do we not? If I meet you and recognize you, I have an experience; but if I do not recognize you, there is no experience. So, where there is recognition, there is the process of experiencing. Now, how do I recognize? Recognition is based on memory, is it not? And can memory, which is the residue of the past, ever recognize the new? Please, as this is an important question, let us go into it a little carefully.

Most of us move from the known to the known; our mind functions within the field of the known, and it cannot function outside. Now, can such a mind recognize what is true? Can it recognize the unknown? Can it recognize God? If God is the

unknown, how can we recognize it? We can only recognize something which we have experienced, which we have known before; and when we recognize something, is it the truth, is it the new? As long as there is the old, the new cannot be; only when the old ceases is there a possibility of the new. And when we ask, "How can we recognize reality?", we want to know whether the 'I', the accumulated past, the known, can give a name to the new. When we give a name to the new, has not the new ceased to be? So, God is not a thing to be recognized; truth is not something to be known through memory. It is only when the mind is entirely and absolutely still that the new can be - which is not a process of recognition. On the contrary, when the mind is translating the new in terms of the old, it is not still, and so truth cannot be. The mind cannot translate the new in terms of the old - it can only translate what is supposed to be the new in terms of what it has known.

So, the important thing is not whether you and I can recognize truth, but how to free the mind from desire so that it can be completely still. Stillness of the mind does not come about through any discipline. The mind cannot be made still by any compulsion, with any motive, or for any purpose; but it is spontaneously still when it understands its own conflicting desires, which create problems. The mind is still, only when it knows itself as a totality; but as long as it does not know itself completely, it goes on creating problems and can never be still. So, the mind must understand the ways of itself, and for that it must be alertly passive, aware without choice; and only then is there a possibility that the mind can be completely and totally still. We can make the mind superficially still through prayer, through various psychological

tricks, but such a mind is not fundamentally still. Stillness comes only when there is complete understanding of the whole process of recognition, demanding, and responding, which is the process of the self; and that is an arduous task.

Question: Will you please explain what you mean by creativeness?

Krishnamurti: Is creativeness a matter of capacity? Is creativeness mastery of a technique? Is creativeness a gift?

One can master a technique through constant practice, through the accumulation of knowledge and experience, both one's own and that of another. But does the perfection of a technique make for creativeness? You may practise the piano for hours and be able to play expertly, your technique may be perfect; but will that make you a creative musician? If you know how to write poetry, if you can make a perfect garland of words, are you there by a poet? Will technique bring about that freedom in which the `me', the self, is absent? It is only when the self, the `me', is absent, that there is creativeness; otherwise, technique merely emphasizes or distracts the self, modifying or enlarging it - and surely, that does not bring about creativeness.

As long as the mind is in conflict with what it has produced, is producing, or will produce, there cannot be a creative state, can there? Can there ever be creativeness as long as we are in conflict? Surely, conflict excludes every form of creative action; and creativity comes into being only when the mind is still, not in a state of conflict. As long as the mind is caught between thesis and antithesis, between the opposites, how can there be that state of alert passivity which alone is creative? We think that through

conflict, through battle, through probing, analyzing, we shall have a peaceful state; but is there ever a peaceful state through conflict? Is not that peaceful state independent of conflict? As long as there is the desire to achieve a result, the desire to be creative, obviously we must be in a state of conflict; and such a state denies creativeness.

So, how is one to have that creative state? How is it possible to achieve creativeness? It is not possible to achieve creativeness. All that we can do is to understand conflict, which denies creativeness; and the understanding of conflict is the understanding of oneself. You see, we think that to have a technique, to be able to draw, to write a poem or an article, to fulfil oneself in one form or another, is to be creative. But surely, that is not creativeness; that is merely self-expression, satisfying a certain appetite through technique. But if we can understand this whole process of conflict, this striving after attainment which brings in our lives such contradiction, such sorrow and pain, then we shall see that the mind becomes very quiet, without any striving; and when the mind is silent, free of the anxieties and demands of the self, only then is there a possibility for creative being. That creativeness may or may not express itself in words, in marble, in thought; or it may be utterly silent. But we want expression. To most of us, creativeness is a process of expression, it is the power to do something; and we consider that power of expression as far more important than to be free. We crave for expression because it gives us a sense of fulfillment, a sense of importance; it gives us the feeling of being somebody, of being socially useful. All this feeds our vanity in many ways, and so destroys the state of creativeness.

Actually, creativeness may not express itself at all, because the state of creativeness is silent. To seek expression is to deny creativeness, because that which is creative can never be cumulative. Creativeness is only from moment to moment, it is not a state of continuity. The moment it is a continuous state, it is within the field of time, and that which is within the field of time is not creative. Creativeness is timeless; but we would like to hold it within the field of time in order to be able to express it. As long as the mind is seeking to be creative, creativeness can never be, because all the efforts of the mind are within the field of time. Only when the mind is utterly still, silent with a silence that is not induced, is there a possibility of the timeless, the creative. So, what is important is not to verbalize about this creative state, but to understand the whole process of conflict in the mind. And as the pool is quiet when the winds stop, so there is creativeness when the problems which the mind creates come to an end.

July 30, 1950

SEATTLE 4TH PUBLIC TALK 6TH AUGUST 1950

Most of us seek some kind of result, and we never think of action without result. We do not have the sense of moving, acting, unless there is an end in view. As long as we seek a result, the result is psychologically much more important to us than the means; and the corruption of the means is inevitable when we give a greater significance to the result. Action then is guided by the desire for a result, rather than by consideration of the means and action is thereby stultified. That is, as long as there is the psychological seeking of a result from action, we stultify that action, because we are chiefly concerned with the result, and only incidentally with the action. There fore, as we see throughout the world I at the present time, action breeds further confusion, further misery. This outward conflict and suffering can be brought to an end only when we see how the mind is constantly seeking a result in action, that is, security for itself, and is therefore not concerned with the means of action. The means and the end are not two different states, they are a unitary process. The means is the end; and if we understand the means, the right end is inevitable. But as I said, most of us are not concerned with the means. We are mostly concerned with the end; and hoping for a right end, we use wrong methods. But the method produces the result, and if we want peace, we must use peaceful means. Therefore, the means is much more important than the end.

Now, the understanding of the means without searching for an end, is a fundamental and necessary revolution in our whole approach to life. Because, thought invariably seeks a reward, in each one of us there is a psychological demand for gratification;

and the result is that all action, whether political, economic, or social, leads to endless controversy and ultimately to violence. There is no clarity of perception because fundamentally we are not concerned with the means, but only with the result, with the goal, with the end; and we do not see that the end and the means are not separate, that they are one. The end is in the means, and if psychologically we seek a result independent of the means, physical action must inevitably produce confusion. That is, when we use the result as a means of inward or psychological security, our working for that result has a conditioning effect on the mind; and this process can be understood fully only when we see the significance of action.

At present, we know action only in terms of achieving a result, a goal. We work towards a goal, in the psychological as well as the physical sense. To us, action is a process of achieving something, not of understanding action itself - which alone will produce the right means, and hence the right end, without the search for a result; and the understanding of action is surely the understanding of the whole process of our thinking. That is why it is so essential to have complete understanding of the total process of one's consciousness - the ways of one's own thought, feeling and action. Without understanding oneself, merely to achieve a result will only lead to further confusion, misery, and frustration.

To understand the whole process of oneself requires constant alertness, awareness in the action of relationship. There must be a constant watching of every incident, without choice, without condemnation or acceptance, with a certain sense of dispassion, so that the truth of every incident is revealed. But this self -

knowledge is not a result, an end. There is no end to self-knowledge; it is a constant process of understanding which comes about only when one begins objectively and goes deeper and deeper into the whole problem of daily living, which is the `you' and the `me' in relationship.

I have several questions, and in considering them, do not let us seek an answer; because, merely to find an answer is to put an end to further discovery and understanding. But if we can follow the problem as it is revealed step by step, then perhaps we shall be able to see the truth of it; and it is the truth of the problem that will free us from the problem itself.

Question: Though you tell us it is necessary for the mind to become still if we are to experience reality, yet you do everything in your power to stimulate us to think.

Krishnamurti: Am I stimulating you to think? If it is mere stimulation, then weariness will come out of it; because, every form of stimulation soon comes to an end, leaving the mind dull, unrealistic, and weary. If these talks and discussions have become merely a means of stimulation, then I am afraid you will find, when they are over, that you will fall back into your dreary ruts, your old beliefs, your insensitive attitudes and ways of thinking. But if, instead of being a stimulation, they are a process in which you and I examine facts and see them exactly as they are - which is the beginning of the perception of what is true - , then these talks and discussions will obviously have been worth while. Surely, it is edifying to see things as they are - for, then it will bring about a fundamental transformation. Therefore, we are not seeking stimulation, but are exploring together all our human problems.

Stimulation makes you think along a particular line, it is a process of substitution, which conditions you in a new direction; whereas, only when we are trying to see things as they are, very clearly, without bias, without distortion, is it possible for the mind to be quiet. The mind cannot be quiet, cannot be calm or still, when there is any distortion, when it is capable of creating illusion. And as the mind is infinitely capable of creating illusion, to be aware of the power to create illusion, which is to be aware of desire, is surely not stimulation. On the contrary, there is freedom from stimulation only when there is awareness of how the mind works, how it manipulates, connives, distorts; and that freedom alone can bring about tranquillity of mind.

Now, the mind can enclose itself in a particular belief or illusion, and thereby think it is tranquil; but such a mind is obviously not tranquil - it is dead, un-pliable, insensitive. The mind is tranquil only when it is infinitely pliable, capable of adjusting, of seeing things as they are; and it is only when the mind is capable of seeing things as they are that there is a freedom from that which it has seen. Surely, we must go through all this process of uncovering, exploring, before the mind can be still. Without tranquillity of the mind, obviously there can be no true perception; and to discover what are the distorting factors, the distractions which the mind has cultivated, is not a stimulation. If it is a stimulation, the mind will never be tranquil, because it will go from one stimulation to another; and a mind that seeks stimulation is a dull, an insufficient mind, incapable of perceiving anything but its own sensations.

So, what is important is not to depend on any stimulation, either

of a ritual, of an idea, or of drink. All stimulations are on the same level, for stimulation of any kind makes the mind dull and weary; but to see the fact that the mind depends upon stimulation, is to be free of that fact. Perceiving things without distortion brings about the tranquillity of mind which is so essential for reality to be.

Question: I worry a great deal. Can you tell me how I can be free from worry?

Krishnamurti: Why do you want to be free from worry? You mean you want to be free from a particular worry, from a certain kind of disturbance; but you do not want to be free from all worry, do you? Most of us want to be occupied, and we only know we exist because we are occupied. We say that occupation is necessary for the mind - whether it is occupation with God, with self-fulfilment, with a car, with a family, with success, with virtue, or what you will. Surely, the mind demands to be occupied, otherwise we would be lost; and this very occupation is worry, is it not? What would happen if you did not worry, if the mind were not occupied with something? Would you not feel utterly lost? If you have no occupation, you will find one. If you do not worry about society, you will worry about God, and be occupied with that; or you will worry about the war, about the newspapers, the radio, about what people say or do not say. The mind is constantly occupied, its very existence depends on its occupation. So, for most of us, occupation, which is a form of worry, is essential. If we did not worry, if we were not occupied, we would feel utterly at a loss, we would say there is nothing to do, that life is vain, empty; so, the mind occupies itself and keeps worrying.

For most of us, occupation is an escape from our own essential

insufficiency. Being insufficient, we worry over something as a means of escape from that which is. So, the question is not how to be free from a particular worry, but to understand the whole problem of occupation - which involves right means of livelihood in one direction, and the psychological occupation of the mind in another. Most of us find that the mind cannot be without thought, without occupation, without worry. Most of us are afraid to be what we are - beautiful or ugly, intelligent or stupid, or whatever it may be - and proceed from there. The mind is afraid to be what it is, and so it seeks an escape, the higher-sounding, the better. This escape from what is may be called reality or God, but it is merely a self-enclosing isolation; and the more isolated one is, the more one worries, the more one must be occupied.

Surely, then, freedom from worry is not the problem. The problem is to find out why the mind demands occupation; and if we go into it rather carefully, we will discover that the mind is afraid of being as nothing. Surely, a cup is useful only when it is empty; and the mind is creative only when it is capable of emptying itself, being purged of its whole content. It is only when the mind is empty, silent, that it is creative. But to come to that point, one must understand the total process of the mind, how it is constantly occupied, worrying about a virtue, about death, about success. At however high a level, worry is still worry; and a worrying, agitated mind can never understand any problem. It can only go around in circles, hoping to find a way out - and that is what it does. A mind that is constantly occupied is seeking a result, an end, a goal; and to such a mind, the means is not important at all.

So, the important thing is not how to free oneself from worry, but to find out why the mind is so occupied, so desirous of holding on to and identifying itself with a particular idea, belief, or concept. Surely, it does this because of its own insufficiency. Without understanding its own insufficiency, without going into it deeply, the mind tries to run away from it through occupation; and the more you run, the more you worry. The only way out of this process is to come back and look at insufficiency.

Question: I love my son. He may be killed in the war. What am I to do?

Krishnamurti: I wonder if you do love your son? If you really loved your son, would there be war? Would you not prevent war in any form if you really loved your son? Would you not bring about right education - an education which would not be identified with either the Orient or the Occident? If you really loved your son, would you not see to it that no belief divided human beings, that no national frontier stood between man and man?

I am afraid we do not love our children. "I love my son" is merely the accepted phrase. If we loved our sons, there would be a fundamental revolution in education, would there not? Because, at the present time, we are merely cultivating technique, efficiency; and the higher the efficiency, the greater the ruthlessness. The more nationalistic and separatist we are, the faster society disintegrates. We are torn apart by our beliefs, by our ideologies, by our religions and dogmas; and inevitably there is conflict, not only between different societies, but between groups in the same society.

So, although we may say that we love our children, we are

obviously not deeply concerned about them as long as we are nationalistic, as long as we cling to our property, as long as we are bound, conditioned by our religious beliefs. These are the disintegrating factors in society, leading inevitably to war and utter misery; and if we are really desirous of saving the children, it is for us as individuals to bring about a fundamental transformation in ourselves. This means, does it not?, that we have to revalue the whole structure of society. That is a very complex and arduous business, and so we leave it to the experts, religious, economic, and political. But the expert cannot understand that which is beyond his particular specialization. The specialist is never an integrated person; and integration is the only solution to our problem. There must be a total integration of ourselves as individuals, and only then can we educate the child to be an integrated human being; and there obviously cannot be integration as long as there are racial, national, political, and religious prejudices. Until we alter all that in ourselves fundamentally, we are bound to have war - and whatever you may say about loving your son is not going to stop it. What will stop war is the profound realization that one must oneself be free of those disintegrating factors which create war. It is only then that we will put an end to war. But unfortunately, most of us are not interested in all this. We want an immediate result, an immediate answer.

War, after all, is the spectacular and bloody projection of our daily lives; and without altering the fundamental structure of our own existence, we hope that by some miracle, wars will come to an end. Or, we blame some other society, we say some other national group is responsible for wars. It is our responsibility, not that of

someone else; and those who are really serious about this thing, who are not seeking an easy explanation, will know how to act, taking into consideration this whole structure of the causation of war.

So, if we do love our children, then the structure of society will be fundamentally altered; and the more we love, the deeper will be our influence on society. Therefore, it is important to understand the whole process of one self; and no expert, no general, no teacher, can give us the key to that understanding. Self-knowledge is the outcome of our own intensity, our own clarity, our own awareness in relationship; and relationship is not only with people, but also with property and with ideas.

Question: How am I to overcome loneliness?

Krishnamurti: Can you overcome loneliness? Whatever you conquer has to be conquered again and again, does it not? What you understand comes to an end, but that which you conquer can never come to an end. The battling process only feeds and strengthens that with which you fight.

Now, what is this loneliness of which most of us are aware? We know it, and we run away from it, do we not? We take flight from it into every form of activity. We are empty, lonely, and we are afraid of it, so, we try to cover it up by some means or other - meditation, the search for God, social activity, the radio, drink, or what you will - we would do anything else rather than face it, be with it, understand it. Running away is the same, whether we do it through the idea of God, or through drink. As long as one is escaping from loneliness, there is no essential difference between the worship of God and addiction to alcohol. Socially there may be

a difference; but psychologically, the man who runs away from himself, from his own emptiness, whose escape is his search for God, is on the same level with the drunkard.

What is important, then, is not to overcome loneliness, but to understand it; and we cannot understand it if we do not face it, if we do not look at it directly, if we are continually running away from it. And our whole life is a process of running away from loneliness, is it not? In relationship, we use others to cover up loneliness; our pursuit of knowledge, our gathering of experience, everything we do, is a distraction, an escape from that emptiness. So, these distractions and escapes must obviously come to an end. If we are to understand something, we must give our full attention to it, must we not? And how can we give full attention to loneliness if we are afraid of it, if we are running away from it through some distraction? So, when we really want to understand loneliness, when our intention is to go fully, completely into it, because we see that there can be no creativeness as long as we do not understand that inward insufficiency which is the fundamental cause of fear - when we come to that point, then every form of distraction ends, does it not? Many people laugh at loneliness and say, 'Oh, that is only for the bourgeois; for God's sake, be occupied with something and forget it'. But emptiness cannot be forgotten, it cannot be put aside.

So, if one would really understand this fundamental thing which we call loneliness, all escape must cease; but escape does not cease through worry, through seeking a result, or through any action of desire. One must see that, without understanding loneliness, every form of action is a distraction, an escape, a process of self-

isolation, which only creates more conflict, more misery. To see that fact, is essential, for only then can one face loneliness.

Then, if we go still more deeply into it, the problem arises of whether that which we call loneliness is an actuality, or merely a word. Is loneliness an actuality, or merely a word which covers something that may not be what we think it is? Is not loneliness a thought, the result of thinking? That is, thinking is verbalization based on memory; and do we not, with that verbalization, with that thought, with that memory, look at the state which we call 'lonely'? So, the very giving of a name to that state may be the cause of the fear which prevents us from looking at it more closely; and if we do not give it a name, which is fabricated by the mind, then is that state lonely?

Surely, there is a difference between loneliness and being alone. Loneliness is the ultimate in the process of self-isolation. The more you are conscious of yourself, the more isolated you are; and self-consciousness is the process of isolation. But aloneness is not isolation. There is aloneness only when loneliness has come to an end. Aloneness is a state in which all influence has completely ceased, both the influence from outside, and the inner influence of memory; and only when the mind is in that state of aloneness can it know the incorruptible. But to come to that, we must understand loneliness, this process of isolation, which is the self and its activity. So, the understanding of the self is the beginning of the cessation of isolation, and therefore of loneliness.

Question: Is there continuity after death?

Krishnamurti: In this question several things are implied. There is the idea of immortality, which we think is continuity, the

question of what we mean by death, and whether there is a spiritual essence in each one of us that will continue in spite of death. So, let us examine this question, however briefly.

You ask if there is continuity after death. Now, what do we mean by 'continuity'? Continuity obviously implies cause and effect: a series of incidents or causes, which are remembered, and which continue. Please, if I may suggest, let us listen very carefully and think it out together, and perhaps we shall see something much greater than the mere desire to continue after death.

Most of us want to continue. To us, life is a series of incidents tied together by memory, We have experiences which are continually accumulating, as the memories of childhood, of pleasant things; and the unpleasant memories are also there, although hidden. This whole process of cause and effect gives a sense of continuity which is the 'me'. The 'me', the self, is a chain of remembered incidents - whether they are pleasant or unpleasant is not important. My house, my family, my experience, my cultivation of virtue, and so on - all that is the 'me'; and you want to know if that 'me' continues after death.

Now, it is obvious that some kind of thought-continuity must exist; but we are not satisfied with that, are we? We want immortality, and we say that this process of continuity will eventually lead us to immortality. But will continuity ever lead us to immortality? What is it that continues? It is memory, is it not? It is a bundle of memories moving from the past through the present to the future. And can that which continues ever be free from the net of time?

Surely, only that which comes to an end, can renew - not that

which has continuity. That which has continuity can only continue in its own state; it can be modified, altered, but it is essentially the same all along. Only for that which comes to an end is there a possibility of fundamental transformation. So, immortality is not continuity. Immortality is that state in which time, as continuity of the 'me', has ceased.

Is there a spiritual essence in each one of us that will continue? What is spiritual essence? If there is a spiritual essence, it must obviously be beyond the field of time, beyond causation; and if the mind can think about it, or if it has already conceived it, it is obviously the product of thought, and so within the field of time; and therefore it is not a spiritual essence. We like to think that there is a spiritual essence, but it is merely an idea, the product of thought, of our conditioning. When the mind clings to the idea of a spiritual essence, it indicates, does it not?, that we are seeking security, certainty; and it is the perpetuation of comfort, of security, that we call immortality. As long as the mind continues in the sense of moving from the known to the known, there is always the fear of death.

Now, surely, there is another way of living, which is to die each day to the things of yesterday, and not to carry over to tomorrow the things of today. If in living we can die to the things the mind clings to, then in that very dying we shall find that there is a life which is not of memory, which is not of time. To die in that sense is to understand this whole process of accumulation, which creates the fear of losing, which is the cause of the desire to immortalize the 'me' through family, through property, or through continuity in the hereafter. If we can be aware of how the mind is constantly

seeking certainty, a state in which there can never be freedom; if we can cease to accumulate inwardly and not be psychologically concerned about the morrow, which means coming to an end each day - if we can do this, then there is immortality, that state in which is time is not.

August 6, 1950

SEATTLE 5TH PUBLIC TALK 13TH AUGUST 1950

Most of us are very easily satisfied with explanations, theories and words, and our superficial interest will obviously never bring about a fundamental revolution. What is necessary, surely, at the present time and at all times, is to have a radical transformation in oneself; and this transformation affects not only our personal relationships, but also our relationship to society. Without this deep inner revolution, there can be no lasting happiness, no final solution to any of our problems. It is almost impossible for those who are only superficially interested to go into these matters deeply and understand the whole process of themselves; and only those who are really in earnest can bring about this revolution. This inner revolution is not the search for new explanations, new words, new slogans; it comes only with the freedom from all sense of acquisitiveness.

Now, we are not only acquisitive on the physical plane, where we have built our whole social structure on acquisitiveness, but also in our relationships. That is, in our relationship with one another there is a sense of possessiveness, which is merely an outward indication of deep frustration, loneliness, and so on. We are acquisitive also in the matter of knowledge. We think that acquiring more and more knowledge, more and more explanations, wider and wider information, will in some miraculous way solve our problems. Acquisitiveness at any level only binds the mind, shapes it according to a particular pattern; and a pattern can obviously never produce revolution. Any form of acquisitiveness -

whether in the pursuit of worldly things, in relationship, in learning, in experience, or in the desire to find reality - will always create conflict, will always bring about misunderstanding, a series of battles, inward as well as outward. And where there is conflict, there can obviously be no understanding.

It is acquisitiveness that prevents us from living clearly, simply, and directly; and until there is a fundamental revolution in each one, obviously no real social improvement is possible. That is why it is so important to understand the whole process of oneself. The ways of the self can be discovered only in relationship to things, to people, and to ideas; and in the mirror of that relationship we begin to see ourselves as we are. But to understand the process of oneself, there can be no condemnation or justification of one's own reactions. Our difficulty is, is it not?, that most of us are continually seeking subtle forms of isolation. Because we have conflict in our relationships, we gradually withdraw, inwardly as well as outwardly, into isolation; and without understanding relationship at all levels, not only with people, but also with ideas and things, it is impossible to go deeply into the problem of reality.

Reality is not something abstract or theoretical, it has nothing to do with philosophy; reality is in the understanding of relationship, in being aware at every moment of our speech, of our conduct, of the way we treat people, the way we consider others; for behaviour is righteousness, and in that there is reality. Without understanding relationship, it is impossible to go beyond conflict. To go beyond conflict without that understanding is merely a means of escape; and where there is escape, there is the power to create illusion. Most of us have that power to create illusion extraordinarily

developed, because we have not understood relationship. It is only in the understanding of relationship, which is to comprehend the total process of oneself fundamentally and deeply, that there is freedom; and only in freedom can there be the discovery of what is real.

The mind can never find reality by searching for it. All that the mind can do is to be quiet, to be tranquil, and then reality comes into being. Reality must come to us; we cannot go after reality. If you seek God, you will never find God, because your search is merely a desire to escape from the realities of life. Without understanding the realities of life, every conflict, every movement of thought, the inward workings of the mind, both subtle and obvious, the hidden as well as the open - without understanding all that, merely to seek reality is only an evasion; and the mind is infinitely capable of producing illusory concepts of reality. So, as long as the mind is not understood, as long as the whole process of the self, of the `me`, which is the centre of acquisitiveness, is not fully comprehended, there can be no cessation of conflict, and therefore no happiness, no virtue.

Virtue is not an end. Virtue brings freedom; therefore, virtue is essential. Virtue, which is freedom, lies in the understanding of conduct, of our relationship to things, to nature, to people, and to ideas. Surely, then, it is important to know our own thinking and feeling, to be aware of all our actions without any sense of condemnation or justification. To see in the mirror of our relationship exactly what is taking place, there must be choiceless awareness; and in the very perception of what is, there is freedom from what is. But to perceive clearly exactly what is taking place,

is most difficult and arduous; because, we have so many prejudices, so many subtle forms of condemnation and justification, and these prevent fundamental understanding. It is these subtle conditioning's of the mind that hinder the further understanding of relationship, of the complex problem of life; and without that understanding, however earnest one may be in search of what is called reality, such a search inevitably becomes an evasion, an escape. In escape there are all kinds of illusions, all kinds of myths; and the more we acquire and cling to these myths, the greater will be the difficulty of liberation.

So, what is important is to understand the whole process of the self, of the 'me', for without that understanding, there is no possibility of a new and fundamental action. If one would understand society and bring about a fundamental revolution in the social structure, one must obviously begin with oneself; because, we are not different from society. What we are, society is. We have made society from ourselves, from our reactions, from our responses; and without understanding our responses, there is no possibility of a radical change in society.

I have several questions, and I shall try to answer them as briefly as possible; but the solution to any problem does not lie in the answer. The answer is never important; what is important is the understanding of the problem. If we approach the problem merely with a desire to find an answer, we shall not be in a position to understand the problem itself. Most of us are eager to find an answer, a solution, eager to solve the problem; and this very eagerness prevents the full observation and clear understanding of the problem. Whatever the problem may be, as long as we seek an

answer away from the problem, the problem cannot give its whole significance. Most of us have problems in our life; and to carry a problem on from day to day exhausts the mind. Conflict can never solve any problem. What brings about the solution of a problem is to study it, to observe it, for only then can it reveal its full significance. But that is arduous; and we are always so anxious to go beyond the problem that we are incapable of living with it, of allowing it to unfold, to give its perfume. Surely, the problem comes to an end only when it is understood completely.

Question: I want to help people. What is the best way?

Krishnamurti: I wonder why you want to help people? Is it because you love people? And if you love, will you ask what is the best way to help? There are different ways of 'helping' people, are there not? The market helps people; the doctor, the lawyer, the scientist, the laborer, the priest - they are all 'helping' people, are they not? The desire to serve people has become a profession, and this desire always has a reward attached to it. Service organizes itself into efficient groups, and each group is in contention with the other. All desire to serve, to help; and all are in competition with each other, becoming more and more efficient, therefore, more and more ruthless.

So, when you say you want to 'help' people, what do you mean by that word? How can you help people? At what level do you want to help people? Is it at the economic level, or at the so-called spiritual or psychological level? Some are content to help people merely at the economic level, at the immediate social level. Their concern, therefore, is to bring about social reformation. But mere reform creates the need for further reform, and there is no end to

reformation. And there are those who want to help people psychologically or spiritually. But to help another in the psychological or spiritual sense, must you not understand yourself first? It is so easy to say, 'I can help another', to have the desire, the wish, the longing, to help; but in the very process of helping, you may bring about confusion.

So, if you would help others at any level, is it not important to see that there must be, not mere patchwork reform, but a fundamental revolution? And can fundamental revolution be based on an idea? Is revolution ever a revolution when it is born of thought? Because, ideas are always limited, they are conditioned responses, are they not? Thought is always the response of memory, therefore it is always conditioned; and any revolution based on an idea can never be a fundamental transformation. The more there are revolutions based on ideas, the more separation and disintegration there will be; because, ideas, beliefs, and dogmas, always separate people, they can never bring people together, except in mutually exclusive and conflicting groups. They are a most disastrous foundation on which to build a society, because they inevitably create enmity.

Now, seeing all that, if you really want to bring about a fundamental revolution in the structure of society, surely you must begin on the psychological level, that is, with yourself. And if you really bring about in yourself a fundamental transformation, then you will be able to help others not to create illusions, not to create more dogmas, more beliefs, more cages for people to be caught in. Then your desire to help another will not be born of any conviction, of any calculation, of any belief. You will help people

because you love them, because your heart is full. But your heart can never be full if it is the mind that fills the heart; and most of us have our hearts filled with the things of the mind. It is only when our hearts are filled with the things of the mind that we want to know how to help; but when the heart is empty of the things of the mind, and is therefore full, then there is a possibility of helping. When one really loves, one helps. But love is not a thing of the mind. Love is not sensation. You cannot think about love. If you think about love, you are only thinking about sensation, which is not love. When you say, 'I love somebody', you are not thinking about love, but about the sensation, the image, the picture, of that person.

So, thought is not love. Love is something that cannot be captured by the mind. The mind can only capture sensation, and then it is sensation that fills our hearts; and from that sensation there comes the desire to help people through making them better, through reforming them, and so on and on. As long as our hearts are filled with the things of the mind, there is no love; and when there is love, there is no question of how to help people. The very action of love, without the interference of the mind, helps people; but as long as the mind interferes, there can be no love.

Question: My life seems to be aimless, and as a result my behaviour is unintelligent. Should I not have an overall purpose?

Krishnamurti: How will you discover an overall purpose? And why do you want a purpose? Can you discover a purpose that will cover the whole significance of existence? And what is the instrument that discovers? Most of us want a purpose, for then we can use it as a guide, and according to our purpose we can build; in

its shadow we can live securely, purposefully, with a sense of direction. Without an end, a goal, a purpose, most of us are lost and our action becomes unintelligent, as the questioner says.

Now, can you find an overall purpose? How will you set about to find it? Who is the entity that will find it? Surely, it is your own mind, your own desire and longing; so, your own desire will shape the end, will it not? That is, your own desire creates the end or the purpose. To put it differently, you are confused, and your actions are therefore unintelligent. Out of this confusion, you want to choose an end, an overall purpose. But can you choose anything when you are confused? And will whatever you choose not also be confused? Surely, it is important to clarify the confusion, and not choose a purpose out of that confusion. There is the purgation of confusion only when you begin to understand every act of that confusion; and in that very process you will discover a clarity which is its own end.

Most of us are confused, struggling, uncertain, we do not know what to do. We have created society and are subject to all of its influences, its demands its wars, its utter confusion, misery and destruction. We are part of all that; and if, in that state, we make a choice, whatever we choose will obviously still be confused. And that is what is happening in the world, is it not? Being confused, we choose a leader, and therefore the leader is also confused. But if we can patiently understand our own confusion, going deeper and deeper, ever more widely and extensively, into all the layers of consciousness, then we will see that out of that understanding there comes a clarity; and that clarity brings about a spontaneous behaviour which is not chosen by will or guided by any particular

pattern.

So, what is essential is, not to have a purpose, but to understand oneself. That is, one must begin to see the deep inward source of conflict, misery, pain, uncertainty; and in the very process of that understanding, there comes a direct action which is not in the shadow of a determined end.

Question: What objective proof is there of the experiencing of reality? In the search for reality, is not self-confidence necessary?

Krishnamurti: Surely, there are two kinds of self-confidence, are there not? There is the self-confidence which comes through having a particular faculty, through experience, through repetition or practice, through gain. That is, the more you acquire at any level, the greater the self-confidence. Such confidence only breeds arrogance, defensive attitudes, and enmity, within and without, because it is essentially based on the expansion of the self. The more you possess, the more you acquire, the more you experience, the greater the strength of the self, of the `me; and that obviously breeds a certain kind of self-assurance. But surely, such self-confidence is a form of resistance, is it not? It only strengthens the process of isolation, ultimately leading to illusion, to misery.

Now, I think there is a different kind of confidence, which is not based on accumulation. It is the confidence that comes through experimentation, through being sensitive, alert, through continual discovery and understanding of every response, every idea, every movement of thought. That is quite a different kind of confidence, is it not? Because, in that confidence, there is no question of an accumulating centre. The moment you have an accumulating centre, there can be no rapid adjustment, swift sensitivity, nor the

immediate perception that understands fully and extensively every movement of thought and feeling. It is the confidence born of understanding that is essential - not the self-assurance which breeds arrogance; and that confidence comes only when there is constant watchfulness without accumulation. How can you be sensitive when you are accumulating? The person who is accumulating is shrewd and watchful to save himself and his accumulation; but surely, that is not sensitivity. The confidence of sensitivity, which is essential, comes into being only when there is no sense of accumulation, when there is no centre which is always gathering, which is always craving for more.

The other part of this question is, "What objective proof is there of the experiencing of reality?" What do you mean by objective proof? A demonstration? An argument capable of convincing another? A system of philosophy, carefully devised and sharply defined, so that others can see it? Do you want the authority of another to support your own experience? Is truth, reality, something to be proved, either to another or to yourself? As long as we want proof, which means that we want to be made certain in our own experience, whatever we experience is not truth. Most of us want assurance, we want to be assured that we are experiencing what we call truth. We want to be sure that we are not caught in the net of illusion, of myths, and so on, and that what we experience is real. We want not only objective proof, but also subjective proof.

Now, as long as the mind clings to any form of experience, it is bound to be caught in illusion, because then it is the residue or memory of the experience that becomes all-significant to the mind. What is remembered is the sensation of the experience. If the

sensation is painful, it is avoided; if pleasurable, it is retained. So, as long as the mind clings to any so-called spiritual experience, living around the sensation of it and building that into its own existence, it is bound to be caught in the net of illusion.

Reality is not cumulative, it is not to be gathered, it does not give you any assurance, any gratification. It comes when the mind is quiet, tranquil, not demanding; and it is to be understood from moment to moment. And there is no accumulation, no urge for more, as a result of that experience. The moment you want an assurance of the truth of your experience, you may be sure that the experience is an illusion. A mind that craves to be certain, that seeks certainty as an end, is conditioning itself; and therefore, whatever experience it has will only further condition it, bringing about more struggle and misery.

You may have an experience, and because it is pleasurable, you cling to it; the mind goes back to that pleasure over and over again. So, the past becomes extraordinarily significant, and your memories of it then prevent the experiencing of the new. There is a possibility of experiencing the new only when the mind is not anchored to any particular pleasure or experience.

So, there is no proof of reality, objective or subjective; but what is important is the conduct of life, for behaviour is not different from righteousness. Merely to seek proof of subjective experience in no way transforms the conduct of life. On the contrary, it prevents righteous behaviour, because the past experience then becomes all-important, and the mind is made incapable of understanding its own responses in the present. Do not let us be caught in proof and disproof, in assertions and denials, but let us

understand confusion, struggle, misery, ill will, enmity, greed, and ambition. When the mind is free from all that, from all the worldly things which it creates and clings to, then there is a real possibility of stillness; and in that stillness, in that tranquillity, reality comes into being. But to ask for proof of reality is to ask the impossible; because, if you want assurance, you do not want truth. For truth or reality to be, the state of uncertainty is essential, because only then is there no accumulation, no centre around which the mind can dwell.

What is important, then, is not to seek proof of reality, but to look to one's conduct in everyday life, to be choicelessly aware of what we do, what we think, what we say. In the freedom of that understanding, the mind is quiet, not demanding, not projecting; and in that stillness, there is the real.

Question: My thoughts wander to such an extent that I find meditation extremely difficult. Is not concentration necessary for meditation?

Krishnamurti: This is a very complex question, and to understand it fully I am afraid we will have to go rather deeply into the problem. Meditation of the right kind is essential, but very few people know the full significance of meditation. They may learn a few tricks from some oriental teacher, or from their own priest, but that is not meditation. Meditation is something which has no result, nor is meditation the search for a result. We will find out what is right meditation only if we can understand the process of thinking. The questioner wants to know how to concentrate, because his thoughts wander.

Now, why do our thoughts wander? Have you ever watched

your mind in action? It is always going off, it is always being distracted - at least, that is what we call it. Distracted from what? Distracted from a central thought, a thought which you have chosen and upon which you want to dwell. Please follow this, if you will, and you will see what is right meditation. Without right meditation, self-knowledge is not possible; and without self-knowledge, do what you will, there can be no right thinking. So, meditation is fundamentally necessary. But we must understand what meditation is, so I hope you will follow it patiently.

When we want to focus our attention on a particular thought, the mind wanders off repeatedly, and there is a constant struggle to keep it focused; and the wandering off we call distraction. Now, there are several things involved in this process. First, you choose a central thought upon which you wish to dwell, and as that choice is made out of confusion, there is resistance against other thoughts. That is, as long as you have a chosen central thought upon which you wish to dwell, every other thought is a distraction; and it is important to discover why you choose that central thought. Surely, you have chosen it from among many thoughts because it gives you pleasure, or it promises you a reward, a comfort. That is why you wish to dwell on it. But the very desire to dwell on it creates resistance against the other thoughts which come pouring in; and so you keep up the battle, the constant fight between the central thought and the other thoughts. And if ultimately you can conquer all other thoughts and make them one, you think you know how to meditate. Surely, that is really quite immature.

So, it is futile to say, 'This is the right thought, and all the rest are distractions'. What is important is to find out why the mind

wanders. Why does it wander? It wanders because it is interested in all the things that are going on. It has some vested interest in every thought that comes back, otherwise it would not come back. Every thought has some significance, some value, some hidden meaning; and so, like weeds, they keep coming.

Now, if you can understand each thought and not resist it, not push it away; if you can look at each thought as it arises and uncover its meaning, then you will see that those thoughts never come back - they are finished. Only thoughts that are not fully understood are repetitive. So, the important thing is not the controlling of thought, but the understanding of thought. Anybody can learn to control thought, but that is not understanding. In merely controlling thought there is no flexibility, it is only a form of resistance. All disciplining of thought to a particular pattern creates resistance; and how can you understand through resistance?

The questioner asks, "Is not concentration necessary for meditation?" What do we mean by concentration? By concentration we mean exclusion, do we not? To concentrate is to exclude every thought but one. Therefore, with most of us, concentration is a narrowing-down process; and a mind that is narrowed down, limited, disciplined, controlled, shaped, according to its own desires and the influences of its environment, can obviously never be free. So, concentration, as most people practise it in what they call meditation, is a form of exclusion, and therefore a process of self-isolation. This isolation is self-protection; and a mind that is protecting itself must inevitably be in a state of fear. And how can a mind which is fearful ever be open to that which is real?

If you examine and understand the significance of every thought, you will inevitably and naturally come to the question of whether the thinker is separate from thought. If the thinker is separate from thought, then the thinker can operate upon thought, can control and shape thought. But is the thinker separate from thought? Does not the thinker come into being because of his thought? Surely, the two are not separate; the thinker, the experiencer, is not separate from what is experienced.

Now, the moment you see that there is no thinker separate from thought, that there is only thought, then all choice is removed, is it not? That is, if there is only thought and not the translation of thought, then there is no entity that says, 'I will choose this thought and reject the others; there is no translator, no interpreter, no judge, no bearer of the club. Then you will see that there is no conflict between the thinker and the thought, and therefore the mind is no longer chattering, no longer caught in the word 'distraction'. Then every movement of thought becomes a significant one. And if you go still deeper, you will find that the mind becomes very quiet. It is no longer made quiet, it is no longer disciplined to be quiet.

A mind which is made quiet by discipline, is a dull mind; it lives in its formula of discipline, and such a mind is not sensitive, free. It lives only in the known, it is not an open mind; therefore, it is incapable of receiving the unknown, the imponderable. A mind that is disciplined can never be extensive; it is a limited mind, and whatever it does, is bound to be always petty. God is made petty by a petty mind. So, when the mind sees that whatever it does to control its own thought only makes it more narrow, limited, conditioned, then the thought process as we know it comes to an

end, because the thinker is no longer fighting with his thoughts. Then the mind becomes quiet, still, without any contradiction; and in that stillness, there are wider and deeper states. But if you merely pursue the deeper, it becomes imagination, speculation. Imagination and speculation must cease for reality to be.

So, this whole process of understanding oneself is the beginning of meditation. There is no technique, no special posture, no acquired method of breathing, nor any of the tricks that one learns from books or from others. Self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation. Without knowing yourself, whatever you think has no reality, no basis. But to know yourself, there must be constant watchfulness - not with a stick, not with condemnation or justification, but just awareness, a passive alertness, in which you see things as they are. In seeing things as they are, you understand yourself, which leads to perfect tranquillity of mind; and only in that tranquillity, that stillness of the heart and mind, can reality be.

August 13, 1950

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 2ND AUGUST 1952

I think most of us are aware that some kind of change is necessary, not only in our individual lives, but as a group, as a race, as a nation. We see the importance of a radical change, a change that will bring lasting hope, that will give an assurance, a certainty, not of the mind, but of something which is above and beyond the mind. Surely, most of us feel - those of us, at least, who are serious - that within ourselves there must be this vital transformation; but transformation is not of the mind, because the mind can never solve any human problem. The more we investigate the process of thought and seek to resolve our problems by the sanctions of the mind, the greater are the complications; there is more and more degradation and suffering, and less of creative existence. Yet it is obvious that a vital change is necessary, and that is what I would like to discuss during the course of these talks: how to bring about, not a superficial reformation or a casual adjustment to some immediate challenge, but a change, a revolution, a radical transformation that will give us direct experience of something which is fundamental, eternal, not of time, and which may be called truth, God, or what you will. I feel this is the only essential study, the only fundamental inquiry, especially now that we are in a state of crisis, both individual and historic. To look for transformation to some philosophy, to some teacher, to some ideal or example, or to analyze our own complexities and try to do something about them within the field of the mind, within the field of time, is so utterly futile.

Let us see, then, if we cannot, during this and the subsequent

talks, peacefully, tentatively and deeply go into the matter of how to change, how to bring about a real transformation within ourselves. One can see the importance, the necessity, the urgency of such a change; because mere reformation, superficial adjustment to an idea, to a particular end in view, is not a change at all. Most of us are concerned only with the immediate changes; we do not want to go more deeply, more fundamentally into the problem. Our desire for change is brought about through superficial thought, and in the process of our changing there is constant mischief in action. I am sure most of us are aware of this, and yet we do not know how to go beyond it; and, if I may suggest, I would like these talks to result in the discovery for each one of us, including myself, of how to touch that source which is not of the mind, which is not of time, which has nothing to do with any particular philosophy or political system, with any organized religion, code of ethics or social reform. Religion is the discovery of that which is unnameable; and if we can directly experience it and let that operate, let that be the impetus, the drive, then that will bring about this transformation which is so essential.

May I add here that there is a right way of listening. Not that you must accept or reject what I am saying, but you want to find out, do you not? Surely, that is why you are here - not to spend a pleasant afternoon amongst friends whom you have probably met after many years. You can do all that afterwards. You have taken the trouble to come, and you must be somewhat serious. The art of listening is not to be merely vague and receptive, but to find out what it is I want to convey. Together - and I mean this - together we can discover it, discover something which is not merely at the

verbal level, something which is not an idea to be opposed by another idea, something which is not mere knowledge, which you can not acquire, but which you and I together can experience directly; something which is the only transcendental value, which gives you extraordinary confidence, a confidence that no theory, no political or religious argument can evoke.

So, these talks are not mere lectures for you to listen to and for me to expound, but let us undertake a journey together to find out for our selves that which is not made up by the mind. I can invent, speculate, and so can you; I can put out some idea, and you can oppose it by another idea, a different argument; but surely, if I want to find some thing which is not of time, which is not of the mind, which is not merely the response to a particular challenge - if I really want to find out, I must go beyond the responses, the casual, superficial reactions.

To listen properly, then, is very important. We are discussing, talking over together problems which are very difficult and which face all humanity, every individual; and that requires a very subtle, hesitant, inquiring mind, a mind that is capable of going deeper and deeper, and not merely coming to a conclusion and adhering to it. So, if I may suggest, after each of these talks, go away by yourself, think about it, do not immediately get agitated and begin to talk about when and where you last met - you know the kind of superficial conversation that goes on.

What is important is to find out how to bring about a radical change in ourselves. I do not know if this is a problem to you. Probably it is not, because most of us are caught in inertia, in habit, in tradition; we have given ourselves over to a particular political

or religious conviction, and we pursue that, hoping it will bring a lasting, fundamental change, a transformation, a revolution within us. Having committed ourselves to a certain pattern of thought, we pursue it for years, and we think we are changing. Surely, fundamental change is not to be found in the pursuit of a pattern of thought, however noble, nor in compliance with tradition, nor in the acceptance of any idea, belief or example; but what is required is a change that is not of the mind. So, please listen carefully and do not immediately translate what I am suggesting into the pattern with which you are familiar, whether it is of some book which you have read, or of a particular society or religious group to which you belong. Let us put aside all those things and think of the problem anew.

Now, I see the immense importance of a fundamental change in myself. I may be ambitious, I may be greedy, I may tell lies. How are these things to be changed completely? I see that ambition is a very destructive process, both individually and collectively; though one must have sufficient, the whole spirit of acquisitiveness, the craving for more, more, more, the self-defences which ultimately end up in lying, deception, illusion - all this is creating havoc in the world. Seeing all these patterns, the reactions, the stupidity, the vanity, the prejudices in which we are caught, how is one to transform them, not just verbally but actually? Those of us who have experimented with these things have already tried several ways, have we not? We have disciplined ourselves through action of the will, we have followed teachers, leaders, worshipped authority; and yet, in spite of various kinds of effort to be free from these things, we remain shallow, empty. Our problems are still

there in a different form. I may cease to be a liar, or give up being ambitious; but what? I may be very kind, affectionate, considerate, but that spark, that flame has still never been touched; that thing which gives a quality of life I have never known. So, until I touch that, until there is the experiencing of that, all superficial reformation, the outward capacity to adjust, has very little meaning, because more adjustment on the outside does not give that faith, that hope, that conviction, that certainty, that tremendous feeling of something eternally new. And I feel if we can touch that, then the change will have an extraordinary meaning. Surely, that is the search for reality, for God, or what you will. Without having touched that, we are doing everything in our endeavour to shape, to alter, to mould the mind. That is why, when so-called religions have failed, as they inevitably do, political parties become all important; they offer a vision, a conviction, a hope, and we jump at these things because in ourselves we have lost the source, the spring of that which is unnameable.

So, it is not a question of mere social reformation, superficial change, but of how to bring about an experience which gives lasting faith - if I can use that word "faith" without introducing all the superstitious sentimentality that goes with it; an experience which brings confidence stripped of all our stupidities and selfish arrogance, a confidence born of clarity, of that thing which cannot be destroyed and for which we live and die. There is a certainty, a peculiar quality which gives, not the superficial hope in something, but a feeling which is in itself the flowering of something beyond the functioning of the mind. It is that, that we have to touch; and if we are really in earnest, it is our problem, yours and mine, to find

it. Without touching that, we shall be everlastingly in misery, in confusion; there will be endless wars, perpetual conflicts between nations, races, groups, individuals; without that, there is no compassion, no love.

Now, you and I are not brilliant, we are not cursed with immense knowledge, we are ordinary people; perhaps there are some on the out skirts who are unbalanced, but that doesn't matter. Is it possible for ordinary people, for you and me, to go into this and to experience, not anything which the mind invents and then experiences, but something which is not of the mind at all? That is what we are going to find out - which may entail a great many denials, sacrifices, the putting aside of various personal ambitions, the desire to become great; for a mind that is caught in its own patterns of thought can never experience the eternal. If we are to inquire earnestly into this, we must study the mind - not the universal mind, or the mind of another, however great, but the mind that you and I have, with which we think, with which we operate and in the reactions of which we are caught. The mind is the only instrument we have, and without knowing how it works, merely to find out what is beyond the mind only leads to illusion; and most of us are caught in that illusion, especially the so-called religious people, the people who are seeking God.

So, if I want to understand, to experience directly something which is not of the mind, the first step is to understand the process of the mind, which is thinking. Only by penetrating, by going deeply into the process of thought, can thought come to an end. After all, our thinking has not led us very far; our ideas have not brought peace to the world or happiness to ourselves. Thought is a

process of reaction, a conditioning of the past, and it is ever creating patterns which we instinctively follow. All that has to be understood, which means going into and dissipating the traditions, the prejudices, the particular patterns and peculiarities of the "me", stripping the mind, laying it bare, so that it becomes really still. Such stillness is not induced, it is not cultivated, it can not be brought about through discipline, because all those processes are still part of the mind. It is only a quiet mind, a still mind experience that which is not of the mind; and it is one of the most, difficult things for the mind to be quiet. When the mind is as nothing, only then is there God. But we have cultivated the mind for centuries, it is the one thing that we worship, and therefore we have to understand the process of the mind. We will go into this at every talk. As we begin to discover, as we become aware of the process of our own thinking, through that understanding, through that awareness, there comes a tranquillity of the mind itself in which there is no longer any effort towards a particular end; and only then is the mind capable of receiving or experiencing something which is not a projection of itself. When there is the experiencing of that, however little it may be, then from that there is a transformation, from that there is a change - not the change of a shallow mind, which ends in mischievous action.

Question: Unity seems essential for the well-being of man. How is one to achieve this unity in a group or in a nation?

Krishnamurti: How do we generally achieve unity as it is practised in the various nations? Superficial unity is brought about through propaganda, through education, through various forms of compulsion; you are ceaselessly reminded that you are an

American, a Hindu, a Russian, a German, and so on. Through various forms of conditioning, religious, social, economic, climatic, we are forced to unite; and that, we feel, is essential. We think that if we are identified with a particular group and give our life to it, we shall establish unity.

Now, is unity of the mind? Is unity limited to a particular group or nation? When, out of economic necessity, or for any other self-protective reason, we identify ourselves with any group or nation, is that unity? Or does all self-protective action bring about conflict within ourselves and therefore inwardly? When do we feel the sense of unity? When do you feel united with another? Surely, only when the self is absent. When the "me" and the "mine", my hurts, my prejudices, my tendencies - when all that is absent, then there is a possibility of unity with another. As long as the "me" is present, there is disunity, there is separation, is there not? Our education, our social distinctions, our economic, national and racial barriers all indicate the separateness of the "me; the "me first" runs through it all, and over that we try to find unity. That is our problem, is it not? We try to establish superficial unity without love; and love is something which cannot be when the self is. With one hand we strengthen the self, and we try to find unity at the same time. There is a conflict between the "me" and the ideal, and therefore society, like the individual, is everlastingly in conflict.

So, unity cannot be brought about by any superficial means. No psychological training, no inculcation of ideas, no special form of education, however carefully worked out, can bring about unity until we really dissolve the separating element, that process in which the "me" is predominant. Surely, that is what we are going

to find out: how to eliminate completely, if we can, the "me". Do not say it is impossible, that it cannot be done. Let us find out, let us inquire.

Question: Ever since I began reading you a number of years ago, I have been attempting to be complete, but I find that it eludes me. In what wrong process of thinking am I caught?

Krishnamurti: Let us go into this matter as fully as we can and find out for ourselves whether completeness is possible, even for a fleeting second, and what the experiencing of it implies.

Why do we want to be complete in ourselves? Because we are incomplete, we are insufficient, we are in worldly poor, miserable. we have innumerable conflicts; we want love, we want praise, we want peace, we want to be patted on the back, we want to be told what wonderful beings we are, we want to worship, we want somebody to help us. Being incomplete, we strive after completeness; we want to be self-sufficient, not dependent, inwardly rich, unfettered, without a shadow of sorrow, and without a shadow of sorrow, and so on. But we are fettered; we are in sorrow; and with out understanding what we are, we try to pursue something which we are not. The thing we are pursuing, which we call completeness, becomes an illusion; because, without understanding what we are, which is the fact, we pursue something which is not a fact. We think it is much easier to pursue that which is not a fact and imitate it, than to tackle and dissolve what we are. Surely, if I knew how to face this incompleteness, how to understand it, if I saw what are its colorations, its implications, those things which are not merely of the word - if I understood all that and knew how to deal with it, then I would not pursue

completeness. So when, knowing that I am incomplete, I pursue completeness, there is a wrong process set going, because that pursuit is an escape into an idea, into a fancy, into an unreality. The fact is, I am inwardly poor, I am lonely, I am in conflict, in sorrow; my mind is petty, shallow; I indulge in mischief. That is what I am. Though occasionally I may have a glimmer of something which is not all this, the actual fact is, I am these things - it may be ugly, but it is am. Why can't I deal with it? How am I to understand it and go beyond it? That is the problem, not how to be complete. If you say, "Well, I once caught a glimpse of something which is more than this, therefore I am going to pursue it", then you are living on the dead. As a boy I may have had an experience of something beautiful; but if I live in that, I am incapable of understanding the fact of what I am.

So, to go beyond what I am, I have to understand it, I have to break it down, and not try to become complete; because, when that which I am is not, there is completeness, I don't have to look for it. I don't have to look for light when I can see; it is only when I am caught in darkness, in misery, in travail, that I think of something beyond it. What is important, then, is to find out if I can understand the thing which I am. Now, how do I set about it? I hope I am making this very clear, because the pursuit of completeness is a wrong process altogether. If I pursue completeness, it will always elude me, for then it is an illusion, an invention of the mind. The fact is what I am, however ugly or beautiful. I can deal with the fact, but not with the illusion. So, how can I look at the fact in order to understand it and go beyond it? That is my problem. Have I the capacity to look at it? Can I actually see that I am poor,

insufficient, and not invent ideas about the fact? The fact is one thing, and the idea about the fact is another. When I look at the fact, I am full of ideas about it, and the ideas frighten me, they prejudice me, they help me to run away from incompleteness through worship, drink, amusement, and other forms of escape. So, we have to understand the idea about the fact.

Let us say I am dishonest, ambitious, a liar, what you will. I am that. Now, can that be transformed without the idea? Please follow this; because the moment I introduce the idea of what it should or should not be, I am not bringing about a fundamental transformation, I am only dealing with it superficially. But I want to deal with the fact fundamentally, to transform it with a different force altogether. If I deal with it superficially, I may cease to be ambitious, or jealous, or envious - but then what? I am still empty, I am still striving, I am still incomplete. I see, then, that when the mind acts upon the fact, it cannot fundamentally alter it; it can modify it, it can cover it up, it can move it to another place, but it cannot transform the fact and go beyond it.

So, is it possible to experience a fundamental change which is not a result of the mind? And how am I to bring about such a transformation in the thing which I have called ugly, or whatever it is, so that there is a different action altogether upon it which is not a calculated, self-assertive, self-deceptive action of will? I hope I am making myself clear. It is rather difficult to explain this.

Let us suppose I am ambitious, and I see all the implications of ambition as well as its obvious manifestations in society, in relationship every where. I see that an ambitious person, like an ambitious nation, is destructive, shallow, bringing misery and

conflict to others and to himself. Now, how am I to be free of ambition without controlling, subjugating, without trying not to be ambitious? That is the problem, is it not? If I struggle against ambition, I am still ambitious in a different direction; I am ambitious not to be ambitious because I think that by being free of ambition I shall achieve some other thing: peace, tranquillity, God, or what you will. So, how am I to be free from ambition without the exertion of will? For, the moment I apply will, it has a motive, it has a tail attached to it, an acquisitive tentacle; and yet I see the immense necessity, the urgency of really changing that thing which I have called ambition. So, I have to inquire into the problem of change, what change implies. Change brought about by the mind is still very shallow, therefore there is always conflict in it. Then what am I to do? As it is a problem to me, because I really want to go into this and be free of ambition, I have to study, not ambition, but the question of change - whether change is in time, or from a point which have nothing to do with time. So, I have to discover or experience a state which is not of time. And can I experience that - a state which is not of memory, which is not of accumulated knowledge? Can I experience something eternal, which is beyond time? And if I can experience it, then the problem of change, of trying to resolve ambition, has completely gone.

So, what is important is not how to be complete, but how to bring about a transformation which is not of time; and that, as I said, we will talk over in all these meetings.

August 2, 1952

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 3RD AUGUST 1952

Perhaps we can continue with what we were considering yesterday afternoon: the problem of change, of fundamental or radical transformation, and how it is to be brought about. I think it is very important to go into this question fully, not only this morning, but in the subsequent talks that are going to take place. I do not know if you have further considered the matter; but the more one regards the problem, the more one takes it into consideration, the vaster and more complicated one discovers it to be. We see the importance and the absolute necessity of changing - changing ourselves in our relationships, in our activities, in the process of our thinking, which includes the mere accumulation of knowledge. Yet when one considers the implications of change, one sees how, though we attempt to change ourselves, there is no radical transformation. I am using the word "transformation" in its simple meaning, not in any grandiose sense, the super-physical, and all the rest of it.

We see the necessity of change, not only in world politics, but in our own religious attitude, in our social relationships, in our individual, everyday contacts with the familiar, with each other; but the more we attempt to change on the small scale, the more superficial our thinking becomes and the greater the mischief in action. The closer we look at the problem, the more we are aware of this. Seeing the necessity of change, we project ideals, and according to that pattern we hope to transform ourselves. I am narrow, petty, superstitious, shallow, and I project the ideal of something vast, significant, deep; and I am continually struggling,

adjusting, moulding myself according to that pattern. Now, is that change? Let us look at it a little closely. When I project an ideal and try to live up to that ideal, constantly adapting myself to a particular pattern of thought, does that process bring about the fundamental change which you and I recognize as essential? But first of all, do we in fact recognize that it is essential to bring about a fundamental change in our orientation, in our outlook, in our values, in our contacts, in the manner of our behaviour in the way of our thinking? Do we see the importance of that? Or do we merely accept it as an ideal and try to do something about it?

Surely, it is obvious to any person who is at all thoughtful that there must be a revolution in our thinking and in our action; because every where there is chaos, misery. In our selves and outwardly there is confusion, there is an incessant striving without any release, any hope; and perhaps, being aware of it, we think that by creating an ideal, a projection outside of us of something which we are not, or by following an example, a leader, a saviour, or a particular religious teaching, we can bring about a fundamental change. Of course, in following a pattern, certain superficial modifications take place, but obviously that does not bring about a radical transformation. And yet most of our existence is spent in that way; trying to live up to something, trying to bring about a change in our attitude, to change according to the pattern which we have projected as an ideal, as a belief.

Now, let us find out if the pursuit of an ideal really does bring about a change in us, or only a modified continuity of what has been. I do not know if this is a problem to you. If you are satisfied with merely trying to live up to an ideal, then there is no problem -

though that has its own problem of constant conflict between what you are and what you should be. This struggle, this ceaseless effort to adjust to a pattern, is still within the field of the mind, is it not? Surely, there is a radical transformation only when we can jump, as it were, from the process of time into something which is not of time. We will go into that as we discuss.

For most of us, change implies the continuation of ourselves in a modified form. If we are dissatisfied with a particular pattern of ideas, of rituals, of conditioning, we throw it aside and pick up the same pattern in a different milieu, a different colour, with different rituals, different words. Instead of Latin it is Sanskrit, or some other language, but it is still the old pattern repeated over and over and over again; and within this pattern we think we are moving, changing. Because we are dissatisfied with what we are, we go from one teacher to another. Seeing confusion about us and in ourselves, seeing perpetual wars, everincreasing destruction, devastation and misery, we want some haven, some peace; and if we can find a refuge that gives us a sense of security, a sense of permanency, with that we are satisfied.

So, when the mind projects an idea and clings to it, struggles towards it, surely that is not change, that is not transformation, that is not revolution, because it is still within the field of the mind, the field of time. To clear away all that, we must be conscious of what we are doing, we must be aware of it. And it must be cleared away, must it not? Because, with all that burden, with all that impetus of the mind, obviously we cannot find the other; and without experiencing the other, do what we will, there will be no change. But what generally happens? We say that individually we can do

nothing, we are helpless, therefore let us do something politically to bring about peace in the world; let us have faith in the vision of one world, of a classless society, and so on and so on. The intellect worships that vision, and to carry out that vision we sacrifice ourselves and others. Politically, that is what is happening. We say that, in order to end wars, we must have one society, and to create that society we are willing to destroy everything - which is using wrong means to a right end. All this is still within the field of the mind.

Also, are not all our religions man made, that is, mind-made? Our rituals, our symbols, our disciplines, though they may temporarily alleviate, bring about an uplift, a feeling of well being, are they not all within the field of time? When we regard the political and religious ideals by means of which we hope to bring a change, to educate and discipline ourselves to be less selfish, to be less ambitious, to be more considerate, more virtuous, to renounce, not to acquire so much and so on - when we look at this whole pattern, do we not see that it is a process of the mind? The mind, which is also the will, is the source of effort, of intentions, of conscious and unconscious motives, it is the centre of the "me" and the "mine; and, whatever it may do, however far it may endeavour to go, can that centre ever bring about a fundamental change within itself?

I want to change, but not superficially, because I see that in the process of superficial change there is mischievous action taking place. So, what am I to do? Isn't that your problem also, if you are really serious about all this? One may be a communist, one may be a socialist, one may be a reformer or a religious person, but that is

the core of our problem, is it not? Though we may have a hundred explanations of man, of his responses and activities, or of the universe, until we change fundamentally, no explanation has any value. I see that, not just casually, I see the importance of a radical change in myself. And how is that to be brought about? There is revolution only when the mind has ceased to function within the field of time, for only then is there a new element which is not of time. It is that new element which brings about a deep, lasting revolution. You can call that element God, truth, or what you will - the name you give to it is of no importance. But until I touch it, until I have a sense of that which will cleanse me completely, until I have faith in that which is not self induced, not of the mind, obviously every change is a mere modification, every reformation has to be further reformed, and so on - infinite mischief.

So, what is one to do? Have you ever asked yourself this question? Not that I am asking you or you are asking me; but if we are at all intelligent, if we are at all aware of our own problems and those of the world, isn't this the first question to put to ourselves? Not what kind of beliefs, religions, sects, new teachers we should have - they are all so utterly empty and futile. But surely, this is the fundamental question that one ought to put to oneself: how to bring about a change which is not of time, which is not a matter of evolution, which is not a matter of slow growth. I can see that, if I exercise will, control, if I discipline myself, there are certain modifications; I am better or worse, I am changed a little bit. Instead of being bad tempered, or angry, or vicious, or jealous, I am quiet; I have repressed all that, I have held it down. Every day I practise a certain virtue, repeat certain words, go to a shrine and

repeat certain chants, and so on and so on. They all have a pacifying effect they produce certain changes; but these changes are still of the mind, they are still within the field of time, are they not? My memory says, "I am this, and I must become that". Surely, such activity is still self-centred; though I deny greed, in seeking non-greed I am still within the self-enclosing process of the "me". And I what I will; though there may be change, as long as my thinking is held within the process of the "me", there is no freedom from struggle, pain.

I do not know if you have inquired into this. The problem of change is very important, is it not? And can this change be brought about through a process of thinking, through disciplines, through rituals, through various forms of sacrifice, immolation, denial, suppression? - which, if you observe, are all tactics, designs of the mind. However much the self, the "me", struggles to be free, can it ever be free? Whatever effort it makes, can it ever absolve itself from its own activities? If it cannot, then what is it to do? I hope you see the problem as I see it. You may translate it differently in words, but that is the core of our problem.

Now, since we do not see any outlet, any way of release from the process of the "me", we begin to worship reason, the intellect. We reject everything else and say that the mind is the only important thing, the more intellectual, the more cunning, the more erudite, the better. That is why knowledge has become so important to us. Even though we may be worshippers of God, essentially we have denied God, because our gods are the images of our own minds; our rituals, our churches - the whole business is still within the field of the mind. We say, "Since there is only the

mind, let us make man according to the mind, according to reason". Our society, our relationships, everything we do conforms to the pattern of the mind; and whoever does not conform is either liquidated or otherwise denied.

Seeing all this, are we not concerned to find out how we can jump over that intangible barrier between the process of time and the timeless, between the projections of the mind and that which is not of the mind? If that is really an earnest question which we have put to ourselves, if it has become an urgent problem, then surely we will lay aside the obvious activities of the mind: the ideals, the rituals, the churches, the accumulation of knowledge - we will completely wash them out of our system. It is through negation that we will find the other thing, not through direct approach; and I can negate only when I begin to understand the ways of my own mind and see that I seek refuge, that I am acquisitive, that there is not a single moment when the mind is really quiet. The incessant chattering, the images, the things that I have acquired and hold on to, the words, the names, the memories, the escapes - of all that I have to be aware, have I not? Because, with that burden, which is of time, how can I experience something which is timeless? So, I must purge myself completely of all that, which means I must be alone - not alone in an ivory tower, but there must be that aloneness in which I see all the processes, the eddies of the mind. Then, as I observe, as I become more and more aware and begin to put aside without effort the things of the mind, I find that the mind becomes quiet; it is no longer curious, searching, groping, struggling, creating and pursuing images. All those things have dropped away, and the mind becomes very quiet, it is as nothing.

This is the thing that cannot be taught. By listening a hundred times to this statement, you are not going to get it; if you do, then you are mesmerized by words. It is a thing that must be experienced, that must be directly tasted; but it's no good hovering at the edge of it.

So, when the mind is still, not made still by self-discipline, by control, by greed to experience something which is not of the mind, when the mind is really still, then you will find that there comes a state which brings a revolution in our outlook, in our attitude. This revolution is not brought about by the mind, but by something else. For this revolution to take place, the mind must be quiet, it must be literally as nothing, stripped, empty; and I assure you, it is not an easy job. That emptiness is not a state of day-dreaming; you can not get it by merely sitting still for ten hours or twenty-four hours of the day and trying to hold on to some thing. It can come only when the mind has understood its own processes, the conscious as well as the unconscious - which means one must be everlastingly aware. And the difficulty for most of us is inertia. That is another problem which we will not go into now. But the moment we begin to inquire and see the importance of change, we must go into all this. That means we must be willing to strip ourselves of everything to find the other; and when once we have even a slight glimmering of the other, which is not of the mind, then that will operate. That is the only revolution, that is the only thing that can give us hope, that can put an end to wars, to this destructive relation ship.

Question: How is one who is superficial to become serious?

Krishnamurti: Let us find out together. First of all, we must be

aware that we are superficial, must we not? And are we? What does it mean to be superficial? Essentially, to be dependent, does it not? To depend on stimulation, to depend on challenge, to depend on another, to depend psychologically on certain values, certain experiences, certain memories - does not all that make for superficiality? When I depend on going to church every morning, or every week, in order to be uplifted, in order to be helped, does that not make me superficial? If I have to perform certain rituals to maintain my sense of integrity, or to regain a feeling which I may once have had, does that not make me superficial? And does it not make me superficial when I give myself over to a country, to a plan, or to a particular political group? Surely, this whole process of dependence is an evasion of myself; this identification with the greater is the denial of what I am. But I can not deny what I am; I must understand what I am, and not try to identify myself with the universe, with God, with a particular political party, or what you will. All this leads to shallow thinking, and from shallow thinking there is activity which is everlastingly mischievous, whether on a worldwide scale, or on the individual scale.

So, first of all, do we recognize that we are doing these things? We don't; we justify them. We say, "What shall I do if I don't do these things? I'll be worse off; my mind will go to pieces. Now, at least, I am struggling towards something better". And the more we struggle, the more superficial we are. So, I have to see that first, have I not? And that is one of the most difficult things; to see what I am, to acknowledge that I am stupid, that I am shallow, that I am narrow, that I am jealous. If I see what I am, if I recognize it, then with that I can start. Surely, a shallow mind is a mind that escapes

from what it is; and not to escape requires arduous investigation, the denial of inertia. The moment I know I am shallow, there is already a process of deepening - if I don't do any thing about the shallowness. If the mind says, "I am petty, and I am going to go into it, I am going to understand the whole of this pettiness, this narrowing influence", then there is a possibility of transformation; but a petty mind, acknowledging that it is petty and trying to be non-petty by reading, by meeting people, by travelling, by being incessantly active like a monkey, is still a petty mind.

Again, you see, there is a real revolution only if we approach this problem rightly. The right approach to the problem gives an extraordinary confidence which I assure you moves mountains - the mountains of one's own prejudices, conditioning's. So, being aware of a shallow mind, do not try to become deep. A shallow mind can never know great depths. It can have plenty of knowledge, information, it can repeat words - you know, the whole paraphernalia of a superficial mind that is active. But if you know that you are superficial, shallow, if you are aware of the shallowness and observe all its activities without judging, without condemning, then you will soon see that the shallow thing has disappeared entirely without your action upon it. But that requires patience, watchfulness, not an eager desire for a result, for a reward, for achievement. It is only a shallow mind that wants an achievement, a result. The more you are aware of this whole process, the more you will discover the activities of the mind; but you must observe them without trying to put an end to them, because the moment you seek an end, you are again caught in the duality of the "me" and the "not-me" - which is another problem.

Question: I read the Buddha because it helps me to think clearly about my own problems, and I read you and some others in the same way. You seem to suggest that such help is superficial and does not bring about a radical transformation. Is this a casual suggestion on your part, or do you mean to indicate that there is something very much deeper which cannot be discovered through reading?

Krishnamurti: Do you read in order to be helped? Do you read in order to confirm your own experience? Do you read in order to amuse yourself, to relax, to give your mind, this constantly active mind, a rest? The questioner says he reads because it helps him to solve his problems. Are you really helped by reading? - it does not matter who it is. When I go out seeking help, am I helped? I may find temporary relief, a momentary crack through which I can see the way; but surely, to find help, I must go within myself, must I not? Books can give you information about how to move towards the door which will solve your problems; but you must walk, must you not? You see, that is one of our difficulties: we want to be helped. We have innumerable problems, devastating, destructive problems in which we are caught, and we want help from somebody: the psychologist, the doctor, the Buddha, whoever it is. The very desire to be helped creates the image to which we become a slave; so, the Buddha, or Krishnamurti, or X becomes the authority. We say, "He helped me once, and my goodness, I am going back to him again" - which indicates the shallow mind, the mind that is seeking help. Such a mind created its own problems and then wants somebody else to solve them, or it goes to somebody to help it to uncover the process of its own thinking. So,

unconsciously, the one who seeks help creates the authority: the authority of the book, the authority of the State, the authority of the dictator, the authority of the teacher, of the priest, you know, the whole business of it. And can I be helped, can you be helped? I know we would like to be. Fundamentally, can you and I be helped? Surely, it is only by understanding ourselves patiently, quietly, unobtrusively, that we begin to discover, experience something which is not of our own creation; and it is that which brings about help, which begins to clear the field of our vision. But you cannot ask for that help; it must come to you darkly, uninvited. But when we are suffering, when we are in real psychological pain, we want somebody to give us a hand; and so the church, the particular friend, the teacher, or the State, becomes all important. For that help, we are willing to become slaves.

So, we have to go into this problem of how we are caught in our own sorrows, we have to understand and clear it up for ourselves; for reality, God, or what you will, is not to be experienced through another. It must be experienced directly, it must come to you without any intermediary; but a mind that is seeking help, that is petitioning, that is asking, begging - such a mind can never find the other, because it has not understood its own problems, it has not studied the process of its own activities. It is only when the mind is quiet that there is light. That light is not to be worshipped by the mind; the mind must be utterly silent, not asking, not hoping for experience. It must be completely still. Only then is there a possibility of that light which will dispel our darkness.

August 3, 1952

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 9TH AUGUST 1952

The last two times we met, we were considering the problem of change; and I would like, this after noon, to go into the question of power, and whether power, as we know it, can bring about a fundamental psychological transformation within one self. The difficulty in going into this problem lies, I think, in understanding the usage of words. That is one of our major difficulties, is it not? Words like God, love, discipline, power, communist, American, Russian, have a very specific psychological significance in our lives, and when they are touched upon, we react nervously, emotionally, there is a psychological response. So, if we are to go further into this problem of change, I think we also have to consider the fact that certain words have a psychological influence on each one of us. We have built about ourselves so many verbal barriers, and it is very difficult to transcend those barriers and see the significance that lies beyond the word. After all, words are a means of communication; but if particular words cause a neurological or psychological reaction in us, then it becomes very difficult to communicate. And surely, this is another of our difficulties: that in trying to understand the problem of change, we have to strip ourselves of all ideals; because, conformity to a particular pattern, how ever reasonable, however logical and well thought out, is not a change at all, is it? Change implies a complete transformation, not the continuity of a modified thought. So, there are many factors to be considered in this whole problem of how to bring about a fundamental change, not only psychologically, within ourselves, but also outwardly.

I see the necessity of certain changes in myself; and I can either deal with the problem superficially or go into it very profoundly and find out what are its implications. When I see that I have to change, that it is a necessity, I generally exercise the will, do I not? Any process of change implies resistance, the application of effort, which is will. With that we are familiar. That is, I perceive in myself a state which is socially not good, or a state which brings conflict within me, and I want to go beyond it; I want to break down that particular quality or condition, so I suppress it, or I discipline myself to resist it, which necessitates a certain power of the will. We are accustomed to that process, are we not? So we think power in different forms - social, political, economic, inward, spiritual and so on - is a necessity.

Now, is not this whole process of will a self-centred activity in which there is no release from the condition in which I am caught, in which the mind is held, but only a covering up and a continuity of the same thing in a modified form? And our education, our reforms, our religious thinking, our psychological struggles are all based on this process, are they not? I am this, and I want to become that; and in becoming that, I must employ a certain force of will, there must be resistance, control. And is not this process of control, of discipline, a self-centred activity which engenders a sense of power? The more you discipline, control yourself the more there is of a certain concentrated activity; but is not that activity still within the field of the self, of the "me" and the "mine"? And is reality, God, or what you will, the outcome of self-centred activity do not all your religious books, your teachers, the various sects or which you belong - do t not all imply, fundamentally, can be brought

about through compulsion, through conformity, through the desire for success, that is, to achieve a certain result? But is not that whole process an activity of the "me" in his desire to be something more? And can we, realizing it, bring that process to an end?

I do not know if you see the problem as I see it. All this activity, however reasonable, however noble or well calculated, is still within the field of the mind; it is the activity of the self, the result of desire, of the "me" and the "mine", is it not? And can the self, that consciousness which is always within the limits of the mind and therefore always in conflict - can that self ever go beyond itself? Will that self not always create conflict between individuals, and therefore between groups, bet when nations?

Now, it seems to me very important to understand this; but is it a problem to each one of us? We see that a radical change is necessary in society, in ourselves, in our individual and group relationships; and how is it to be brought about? If change is through conformity to a pattern projected by the mind, through a reasonable, well-studied-out plan, then it is still within the field of the mind; therefore, whatever the mind calculates becomes the end, the vision, for which we are willing to sacrifice ourselves and others. If you maintain that, then it follows that we as human beings are merely the creation of the mind, which implies conformity, compulsion, brutality, dictatorships, concentration camps - the whole business. When we worship the mind, all that is implied, is it not? If I realize this, if I see the futility of discipline, of control, if I see that the various forms of suppression only strengthen the "me" and the "mine", then what am I to do? Have you ever put yourself that question I see that to exercise any power

over myself is evil, it is merely a continuation of the "me" in a different form and I also see that the "me" must entirely cease if there is to be peace in the world and in myself. The "me" as a person, as an entity, as psychological process of accumulation, the "me" that is always struggling to become something, the "me" that is assertive, dogmatic, aggressive, the "me" that is kind, loving - that is the centre from which arise all conflicts, all compulsion, all conformity, all desire for success, and it is only in bringing it to an end that there is a possibility of peace within myself and outwardly. When I realize this, what am I to do? How am I to put an end to the "me"?

Now, if this is a serious problem to each one of us, what is our response to it? Naturally, we cannot all give our replies; but we can see that any movement of the self in order to become better, nobler, any movement of suppression, any desire for success, must come to an end. That is, the mind, which is the centre of the "me", has to become very quiet, has it not? The mind is the centre of sensation, it is the result of memory, the accumulation of time; and my movement on the part of the mind to become something is still within the limits of the "me", of sensation. And can the mind, which is sensation, which is memory, which is tradition, which is the calculating machine of the "me", which is everlastingly seeking security, hiding behind words - can that mind, out of its own desire, by any exercise of its own will, come to an end? Can it cease by its own volition?

So, I must study my own mind, I must be aware of all its reactions - just be aware of my mind, without any desire to transform it. Is that not the first necessary step? - if I can use that

word "step" without introducing the idea of time. To be aware of the process of my mind without condemnation, to observe the fact without judgment, to be merely aware of what is - is it possible to do that? Some may say "yes", some may say "no" - but what others say about this matter is of very little importance, is it not? You have to experiment with this, experience it; and is it possible to experience without building up images, symbols? That is, we generally experience only the things that we recognize, do we not? We are conscious of experiencing only when we recognize the experience; and if we are not capable of recognizing it, there is no experience. So, the factor of recognition is essential to what we call experience. Now, is God, truth, or what you will, a matter of recognition? If I can recognize something, it implies that I have already experienced it before, does it not? That which I have experienced before becomes a memory; and when there is a desire for the continuation of that experience, I project that memory and recognize it, experience it. That is, through memory, through recognition, through experience, I build the centre of the "me".

So, for most of us, it is extremely arduous to go into this problem of change and really bring about a transformation within ourselves. Can I change if I am constantly experiencing through the process of recognition, whether on the verbal level or the psychological level? That is, when I meet you for the first time, I do not know you; but the second time I meet you, I have certain memories of you, there is like or dislike, pain or pleasure. So, through the dictates of pain and pleasure, I say I have met you, there is a process of recognition. That recognition is established verbally or psychologically; and, if I am to go beyond and discover

a state which is not mere recognition, recollection, memory, must not the centre of the "me", which is the process of recognition, come to an end? There is this entity as the "me" which is everlastingly craving experience, seeking more of what it has known, whether outwardly or psychologically; and as long as the "me" continues to exist, whatever I experience only strengthens the "me", does it not? Therefore I create more and more problems, endless conflict. And is it possible for the mind to be so still that the process of recognition ceases? After all, that is creation is it not?

Please, in listening to these talks it seems to me that what is important is, not to accept all this, but to let the significance of the words penetrate and see whether they have any validity, any truth. It is that quality of truth which liberates, not the verbal denial or assertion; and so it is very important to listen rightly, that is, not to be caught in words, in the logic of certain statements, or in your own experiences. You are here to find out what another says, and to find out you must listen; and to listen rightly is one of the most difficult things to do, is it not? Because, when I use words like "experience", "truth" and so on, you immediately, have certain responses; certain images, symbols come up; and if the mind gets caught in those symbols, you cannot go beyond.

So, our problem is how to free the mind of this self-centred activity, not only at the level of social relationships, but also at the psychological level. It is this activity of the self that is causing the mischief, the misery, both in our individual lives and in our life as a group, as a nation; and we can put an end to it only if we understand the whole process of our own thinking. Can thought

bring about a vital change? Up to now we have relied on thought, have we not? The political revolution, whether of the right or the extreme left, is the result of thought. And can thought fundamentally change man, change you and me? If you say it can, then you must see all the implications: that man is the product of time, that there is nothing beyond time, and so on and on. So, if I am to create a fundamental change in myself, can I rely on thought as an instrument to bring about that transformation? Or, can there be a fundamental change only when there is the ending of thought? My problem, then, is to experiment, to find out; and I can find out only through self-knowledge, through knowing myself, watching, being aware in moments when I'm off guard. It is only when I begin to understand the process of my own thinking that I can find out whether or not there is a possibility of a fundamental change; until then, mere assertion that I can or cannot change is of little significance. Though we see the importance of a radical change in the world and in ourselves, there is very little chance of such a change as long as we do not understand the thinker and his thought. The economist and the politician are never revolutionary. It is only the truly religious person that is revolutionary, the man who is seeking reality, God, or what you will. Those who merely believe, who follow a pattern, who belong to a particular society, sect or group - they are not seekers, therefore they are not real revolutionaries. We can bring about a transformation within ourselves only when we understand the process of our own thinking.

Question: What do you mean by ambition? Would you consider any improvement of oneself ambitious? At what point does

ambition begin?

Krishnamurti: Do we not know when we are ambitious? When I want something more, when I want to assert myself, when I want to be come something, is that not ambition? Can we say where it begins and where it ends? Is not all self-improvement a form of ambition? I may not be ambitious in this world, I may not want to be a leader with great political power, or a big business man with a lot of property, position; but I may be very ambitious spiritually. That is, I want to become a saint, I want to be free from all pride. Is not the very assertion of wanting to be something, the beginning of ambition? The desire not to be ambitious - is that not self-improvement, and therefore self-centred activity? If I am proud and, seeing the implications of pride, I cultivate humility, is not that cultivated humility a self-centred activity? And is that not ambition? And if you are not to cultivate humility, then what are you going to do with pride? How is one to deal with it? The very desire to get rid of one thing in order to be something else - is that not a self-centred activity, which is ambition? Please see how extremely difficult it is, when you know what you are, not to struggle to be something else. This process of struggle, this trying to become great, or humble, or generous, is called evolution, is it not? I am this, and I am going through a struggle to be come that. From thesis I proceed to antithesis, and out of that create synthesis. This process is called growth, evolution, is it not? Now, in that is implied self-centred activity, the improving of the self, the "me". But can the "me" ever be improved? It may be improved within its own field; but if I want to go beyond and find out if there is something which is not of the "me", will self-improvement help to

bring about that discovery? So, being ambitious, what am I to do? Should I suppress ambition? And is not the very suppression of ambition a form of ambition which negatively strengthens the "me" and in which there is a certain sense of power, dominance?

I see that I am ambitious; and what am I to do? Is it possible to be free from it? - which does not mean that I must become non-ambitious. Is it possible to be free from ambition? I can think it out logically, see the conflicts, the ruthlessness, the brutality of ambition in my relationships, and so on. And will that help me? Will explanations of the perniciousness of ambition help me to be free from ambition? Or, is there only one way, which is to see all the implications of ambition without condemnation, just to be aware of the fact that I am ambitious, not only at the conscious level, but at the deeper levels of my own thinking? Surely, I must be completely aware of it, without any resistance, because the more I struggle against it, the more vitality I give it. Ambition has become a habit with me, and the more I resist a habit, the stronger it becomes. Whereas, if I am aware of it, merely see the fact of it, does that not bring about a radical change? I am no longer concerned with suppressing ambition, or with putting it aside, nor am I satisfied with any explanation - I am directly concerned with the fact of ambition. So, when I look at it, what do I see? Is ambition mere habit? Am I caught in the habit of a society which is based on ambition, on success, on being somebody? Am I stimulated by challenge, by the sense of achievement, and without that stimulation do I feel lost, and so I depend on stimulation? Is it not possible to be aware of all this, to see the implications of it and not react - just see the fact? And will that perception not bring

about a radical change? If I acknowledge that I am ambitious and see the implications of it, not only at the verbal level, but also inwardly which means that I am aware of the influence of habit, sensation, tradition and so on, then what has happened? My mind is quiet with regard to that fact, is it not? My mind does not react to it any more: it is a fact. And the quiet acceptance of what is - is a release from that fact, is it not?

Please do not accept this. Experiment with it and you will see. First be aware that you are ambitious, or whatever it is, and then see all your reactions to it, whether those reactions are habitual, traditional, verbal. Merely to oppose the verbal responses by another series of words, will not free you; or if it is tradition, in the mere cultivation of a new tradition or habit you will not find release. The very desire to suppress ambition is a trick of the mind to be something else - which is part of ambition. So, when the mind sees that any movement it makes with regard to a particular quality is part of the process of its own sustenance and security, what can it do? It cannot do any thing; therefore, it is immediately quiet with regard to that quality. It is no longer related to it. But this is an arduous task, is it not?

A revolutionary inward change is essential, and if we are to understand the problem of change, we must go into all this and study the problem of the "me" from different angles.

August 9, 1952

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 10TH AUGUST 1952

In talking about the necessity of fundamental and radical change, should we not consider the problem of method, of the "how"? For most of us, the means, the method, the system becomes very important. We see that a change is essential, and so our minds immediately turn to the problem of how to change, how to bring about the radical transformation which is so obviously necessary. Let us for a moment consider whether the "how", the technique, is important. What happens when we are concerned with the technique, the "how"? The cultivation of the "how", the practice of a particular method with the intention of success, does that not induce inertia? Is that not one of the primary causes of inertia in ourselves? The moment I have found the "how", the system, I begin to practise it, which implies a conformity brought about by the desire to succeed, to achieve a certain result. So, for most of us, the "how" becomes very important: how am I to change, what system am I to follow, how am I to meditate, what discipline should I practise? Don't we ask this question all the time? Are we not constantly seeking the "how"?

Now, is that important - the "how", the method? And is it not far more important to be aware that the mind is demanding the "how", and to see why it is seeking a method? If you want a method, a technique, you will find it, for every religious teacher offers a certain form of discipline, control, or a system of meditation. What happens in this process of self control, in the process of trying to follow a particular discipline? I do not know if you have practised any disciplines. If you have, are you not aware

that the mind is conforming to a pattern of thought? And in doing so, does not the mind produce its own limitations? Surely, though it is able to live and function within a certain field of thought and action, such a mind is bound by conformity, in which there is no freedom to experience anything anew. So, by practising a discipline with an end in view, by gradually conforming in the hope of success, the mind induces inertia, does it not? Obviously, that is one of our greatest problems: the laziness, the extraordinary inertia of the mind; and the more we want to break down this inertia, the more the mind inquires how". That is why the "how" becomes so extra ordinarily important for most of us.

If we do not seek the "how", the method, the technique, what are we to do? Suppose I see the falseness of this pursuit of the "how; I see that to find and practise a method is mere repetition, which essentially dulls the mind. If I see that, see the falseness of it, then what happens? Then the mind is really watchful, is it not? To see the implications of practising any particular method, to be aware of the significance of it, not only at the superficial level, but fundamentally, deeply - does that not quicken the mind, is there not greater alertness? And is that not one of our problems when we are considering the question of fundamental change? Because, it seems to me that the desire for a method, the search for a technique which will bring about a radical change in ourselves, induces a slowing down, a deadening of the mind. A method, a technique may produce certain experiences; but are not those experiences merely the result of a very careful training, are they not the projections of a mind which has constantly followed a particular pattern of thought and action? And is reality, God, or what you

will, to be experienced through any pattern? Surely, it can come only when the mind is free of desire, the invitation to further experience.

So, when we are discussing the question of change, should we not inquire into this complex problem of technique, effort? If you watch your mind, you will see how quickly it falls into a particular habit of thought; because it has once experienced a pleasant sensation, a feeling of joy, there is a desire for its repetition, and so the mind cultivates it, practises a discipline, hoping to recapture that pleasure. And is not this repetition, with its desire, one of the primary causes of inertia? Through technique, through discipline, through a method, can there be a fundamental change? Is not this fundamental change brought about, not through any manipulation of thought, but only when the mind understands its own activities, its self-centred movements, and so comes to an end? For that, one needs constant watchfulness, not a discipline, a technique.

Perhaps some of you practise various forms of discipline, and so you may be listening rather guardedly, you may be resisting. You will say, "What shall I do without a discipline? My mind will be all over the place". But if you want to understand something which I am trying to convey, will you resist what I am saying? Or, will you try to find out the truth of the matter for yourself? Not that you should accept what I am saying; but do you not want to find out what is true in this affair? And to find out, your mind must not be in a state of resistance, in a state of fear. Because you have practised a discipline for a number of years doesn't mean that it's right; there may be the fear that, if you remove the fence which you have so carefully built around yourself, the mind will overflow

and get lost. And to find out what is true, one must obviously listen, not according to one's desires, prompting's and wishes, but with an inquiring mind, a mind that is in a state of discovery. I think that brings about its own discipline, which is not the discipline imposed by the mind in order to achieve a certain result.

Take, for example, the problem of integration. We are in a state of contradiction at different levels. Each level is in conflict within itself and with the other levels of our being; there is conflict at both the conscious and the unconscious levels. Please follow this, do not try to feel integrated, or inquire how you are to arrive at the state of integration. If you will listen and not try to achieve a result, then perhaps the thing will come without your asking.

We are aware of contradiction at different levels within ourselves, and there are various methods of bringing about the so-called unification of these contradictions: analysis, hypnosis, constant introspection and so on, all of which entail a struggle to establish the integration of our whole being. I recognize that a sense of unity, a sense of inner completeness is necessary; and I also see that this integration cannot be brought about by avoiding contradiction, by enclosing the mind in a particular pattern of thought and action. A state of integration is obviously necessary, because only in that state is there freedom from conflict, which enables the mind to discover, to experience, to feel things out anew. If, seeing the importance of integration, of that state of inner unification, that state of completeness, I do not inquire how I am to get at it, am I not then aware of all the contradictions? And does not that awareness allow the unconscious, the deep layers of myself in which there are contradictions, to come out? There is no

resistance. I simply want to find out, and so I watch my dreams, my waking consciousness, every hint of conflict, every incident that awakens a contradiction. My concern is not integration, but to be aware of these contradictions in different layers, at different levels. So, what happens? Since I am not seeking a particular state, but am just being aware of the different contradictions in myself, observing them from moment to moment, does not this watchfulness bring about an integration which is not that of desire, not that of a mind which has sought integration? What have I done? I have understood conflict, not run away from it; I have let it come out from the very bottom of my being; and then, perhaps, one has a flash of this integration which is not induced, but which comes of itself. When there is a flash of integration, the mind proceeds to live in the memory of that experience and thereby sets going the machinery of imitation, conformity. That memory is not integration: it is merely a memory. So, one has again to be aware of how the mind, having experienced a sense of integration, instead of being integrated, now lives in memory. And so the question arises how to maintain, through memory, a living quality, which then becomes our problem.

So, when we consider the problem of change, we have to go into this question of memory, the cultivation of a particular habit or pattern of action. The mind can never be free when it is seeking or cultivating the "how". To listen to my own contradictions, to see that my mind is pursuing memories, cultivating habits in order to be secure, and is thereby held in the self-centred activity of the "me" - to be really aware of all that, without going with it or battling against it, is much more important, requires far greater

energy, greater alertness, than to cultivate a particular pattern of discipline. Conformity obviously leads to inertia; and as most of us worship success, in others and in ourselves, we naturally want to conform. Is it not one of our traditions to live in a state of conformity, in a state of discipline? Please do not think I am against discipline: that is not the problem. We are considering the question of change, revolution within ourselves; and can that revolution, that fundamental transformation be brought about through discipline? Obviously it cannot - at least for me, it cannot. Discipline can only make me more conforming, and conformity does not bring about a change. I have to understand why the mind seeks conformity; and can the mind ever be free from this pressure of tradition, not only the external, but the constant, self-created tradition which is memory? As we have seen, what ever the mind does, however erudite, however extensive, however cunning, however speculative it may be, it cannot produce a fundamental change; and a fundamental change is necessary, is it not? No reason, no logic, no discipline can bring about this lasting, radical transformation. It is only when the mind is quiet that there is a possibility of something else coming and transforming us. But we cannot seek it - it must come; and it can come only when the mind is capable of receiving it, which is when the mind is no longer thinking in terms of time. For all thinking is a process of time, is it not? We cannot put an end to thinking, but we can understand the movement of thought; and as long as there is a "me", a thinker apart from the thought, obviously we are thinking in terms of time. When the mind seeks to go beyond time through discipline, it only creates barriers, strengthens time.

So, when you listen to all this, is it not important to find out how you are listening? Is it not important to see your own reactions, to study your own mind and begin to know your self? After all, what I am saying is what each one of us is thinking, more or less; but we cannot go beyond the verbal level if we do not see the truth of this, and with patience and watchfulness become aware of the movement of our own thought. If we do that, then, perhaps, some other element, some other quality which is not of the mind, will come in; but it can come in only when there is no desire for it, when the mind is not caught in the process of recognition.

Question: Of all the spiritual teachers, you are the only one I know of who does not offer a system of meditation for the attainment of inner peace. We all agree that inner peace is necessary, but how can we attain it without practising a technique, whether of eastern yoga or western psychology?

Krishnamurti: Isn't it too bad that there are teachers, spiritual teachers and followers? The moment you have a teacher and you become the follower, have you not destroyed that flame which must constantly be kept alive if you are to find out, to discover? When you look to a teacher to help you, does not the teacher become more important than the truth you are seeking? So, let us put aside the teacher-and-follower attitude, let us get it out of our systems completely, and regard the problem itself as it is affecting each one of us. No teacher can help you to find truth, obviously; one has to find it within oneself, one has to go through the pain, the suffering, the inquiry, one has to discover and understand things for oneself. But in becoming the follower of a particular teacher, have you not cultivated inertia, laziness, is there not a darkening of

the mind? And, of course, the various teachers with their various groups are in contradiction, competing with each other, doing propaganda - you know all the nonsense round it.

So, the whole question of followers and teachers is ridiculous and childish. What is important in the question is this: is there a method, whether eastern or western, to attain peace? If peace is attained through practising a certain method, that which you have attained and which you call peace, is no longer a living quality, it is a dead thing. You know by formulation what peace should be, and you have laid down a path which you follow towards it. Surely, that peace is a projection of your own desire, is it not? Therefore, it is no longer peace. It is what you want, a thing opposite to that which you are. I am in a state of conflict, of misery, of contradiction, I am unhappy, violent; and I want a refuge, a state in which I shall not be disturbed. So I go to various teachers, guides, I read books practise disciplines which promise what I want; I suppress, control, conform in order to gain peace. And is that peace? Surely, peace is not a thing to be sought after: it comes. It is a byproduct, not an end in itself. It comes when I am beginning to understand the whole process of myself, my contradictions, desires, ambitions, pride. But if I make of peace an end in itself, then I live in a state of stagnation. And is that peace?

So, as long as I am seeking peace through a system, a method, a technique, I shall have peace, but it will be the peace of conformity, the peace of death. And that is what most of us want. I have had a glimmer of something, an experience which can not be put into words, and I want to live in that state, I want it to continue, I want an absolute reality. There may be an absolute reality, or

there may be experiences of greater and greater significance; but if I cling to one or the other, am I not cultivating slow death? And death is not peace. So, I cannot possibly imagine what peace is in this state of confusion, in this state of conflict. What I can imagine is the opposite; and that which is opposite to what I am is not peace. So, a technique merely helps me to obtain something which is the opposite of what I am; and without understanding what I am, going into it completely, not only at the conscious but also at the unconscious levels - without understanding the whole process of myself, merely to seek peace has very little significance.

You see, most of us are lazy; we are so inert, we want teachers, monasteries to help us; we do not want to find out for ourselves through our own enquiry, through our own constant awareness, through our own experience, however vague, however subtle, elusive. So we join churches, groups, we become followers of this or that - which means there is a struggle on one side, and the cultivation of inertia on the other. But if one really wishes to find out, experience directly - and we can discuss what that experiencing is at another time - , then surely it is imperative that one put aside all these things and understand oneself. Self knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and that alone can bring peace.

Question: Can the mind ever be still, and should it be still?

Krishnamurti: Let us find out. Why should the mind be still? And can I make the mind still? Is the "me" who is trying to still the mind an entity apart from the mind? Who is the "me" that is trying to control the mind? And who is the "me" that asks if the mind should be still? Is not the thinker, the questioner, part of the mind?

Why is there this division in the mind as the thinker and the thought, the "me" and the "not me"? Why is there this division? Please, that is the problem, is it not? I do not know whether the mind can be still, or whether it should be still, but I want to find out; and I shall find out only when I have inquired into who the entity is that is asking this question. Is he different from the mind? For most of us, he is, is he not? There is the discipliner, the thinker, the controller, the experiencer, the observer apart from the observed, apart from the experience, apart from the thought. Having brought about this division, we then ask how the thinker is to control his thoughts; and from that arises the question of technique.

Now, is the questioner, the thinker an entity apart from thought? Please let us go into this, not for the sake of argument, not so that you can oppose my ideas by your ideas, but let us find out together what is the truth of this matter. First of all, we do not know whether the mind should be still, or even whether it is capable of being still; but before it can experience stillness, or find out if it is possible to be still, must not the mind bridge this gulf between the thinker and the thought? Who is this entity that is always trying to control, the censor, the judge that says this is right, that is wrong? Is he different from the thing which he is observing in himself? For most of us, he is different; he is an entity quite apart who is watching, guiding, shaping, controlling, suppressing thought. Now, why is this entity different, apart? But first of all, are you not aware that there is a different entity, the higher self controlling the lower? - you know, the whole business of it. There is in each one of us a thing apart which is guiding, shaping, watching every

thought. We know that, do we not? Now, how has that separate entity come into being? Is it not the result of the mind, the result of thought? Obviously it is; it is not different from thought. If I had not thought about it, it could not exist' so it is a product of thought, is it not? And can that which is a product of thought be a spiritual entity, apart from thought? Can it be a timeless entity, something eternal, beyond the thought process? If it is a timeless entity, I cannot think about it because I can only think in terms of time. But I do think about it, for it is I who have set it apart; I am related to it, therefore it is a projection of my own memory, a product of thought. It is not something apart from me, yet I have set it apart. Why? I see that my thoughts are transient, that everything around me is impermanent, that there is death, decay; everything is in movement, in a state of flux. So I say there must be some thing in me which is permanent, and I want that permanency; therefore I create the entity, the thinker, the judge who is apart from me. That is, thought separates and establishes part of itself as a permanent entity who is watching, guiding, shaping; and then the problem arises of how this entity, the thinker, is to bridge the gap and integrate himself with his thoughts. Till I really understand and solve this problem, it is not possible to have a still mind, or to find out if the mind can ever be still.

So, please just listen to what I am saying, and try to find out if it is possible for the observer and the observed to be one, for the thinker and his thought to be integrated. As long as they are separate, the mind cannot be still. As long as I am apart from my thought, as long as I am away from the experience and observing it, as long as I am conscious that I am still, there cannot be peace,

there cannot be stillness. Until I understand and resolve this fundamental problem, to search for peace, or to ask whether the mind should or should not be still, has very little meaning.

So, I am broken up into various fragmentary states; and how is all that to become one? Can I do any thing about it? That is, the thinker, the actor, the maker of patterns of action - can he do anything about it? And if he does, is there not then another fragment to be brought into focus and absorbed? As long as there is the maker of patterns, the thinker, can he bring about integration? Surely, it is impossible, is it not? So, I have to find out how this separate entity as the thinker comes into being, I have to see how it accumulates memory, wealth, knowledge, property, flattery, insult - I have to be aware of the whole thing. It is when I am more and more aware of its reactions, its implications, that I begin to find out whether it is possible for this extraordinary integration to take place, this stillness which is not of the mind, which is not the product of discipline, of control, of conformity to a particular pattern of thought or action. What is that state? When the mind is no longer separating itself as the thinker and the thought, can it be called "still"? Is there not then a different kind of movement which is not of time, a different kind of becoming which is not of the "me" and the "mine"? We know stillness only as a reaction within the activity of the "me"; but is there not a stillness which is not of the "me"? But that state cannot possibly be conceived as long as there is a division between the thinker and the thought, as long as the thinker is trying to experience stillness. It comes only when the thinker is the thought.

August 10, 1952

OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 16TH AUGUST 1952

May I request those who are so anxious to take photographs of me to refrain from doing so. I do not autographs nor do I want to pose for photographs, and please don't embarrass yourself by asking me about it.

If we can this evening talk over together this problem of fundamental change, I think it will be very profitable. As there are so many of us and we cannot discuss it individually, perhaps you will kindly listen to me and try to find out what I mean. I feel that this radical change demands a certain attitude of mind, a certain state of consciousness; and I want to talk it over, so that you and I together understand both the problem and its resolution. I feel we have so far dealt with the problem of change merely on the level of active consciousness. We see that a change, a psychological change is necessary, and we set about to find ways and means to achieve that change. Such a pursuit is still on the level of active consciousness, on the superficial level of the mind, is it not? And some times we feel that if we could only get at the unconscious, resolve or bring to the surface all its hidden motives, pursuits and urges, then, perhaps, a vital change would be brought about. I feel there is quite a different way of approach to this problem, and I would like to talk it over hesitantly and rather tentatively with you.

To consider this problem fully we must go into the question of what is consciousness. I wonder if you have thought about it for yourself, or have merely quoted what authorities have said about consciousness? I do not know how you have understood, from your own experience, from your own study of yourself, what this

consciousness implies - not only the consciousness of everyday activity and pursuits, but the consciousness that is hidden, deeper, richer, and much more difficult to get at. If we are to discuss this question of a fundamental change in ourselves, and therefore in the world and in this change to awaken a certain vision, an enthusiasm, a zeal, a faith, a hope, a certainty which will give us the necessary impetus for action - if we are to understand that, isn't it necessary to go into this question of consciousness?

We can see what we mean by consciousness at the superficial level of the mind. Obviously, it is the thinking process, thought. Thought is the result of memory, verbalization, it is the naming, recording and storing up of certain experiences, so as to be able to communicate; and at this level there are also various inhibitions, controls, sanctions, disciplines. With all this we are quite familiar. And when we go a little deeper, there are all the accumulations of the race, the hidden motives, the collective and personal ambitions, prejudices, which are the result of perception, contact and desire. This total consciousness, the hidden as well as the open, is centred round the idea of the "me", the self.

When we discuss how to bring about a change, we generally mean a change at the superficial level, do we not? Through determinations, conclusions, beliefs, controls, inhibitions, we struggle to reach a superficial end which we want, which we crave for, and we hope to arrive at that with the help of the unconscious, of the deeper layers of the mind; therefore we think it is necessary to uncover the depths of oneself. But there is everlasting conflict between the superficial levels and the so-called deeper levels - all psychologists, all those who have pursued self-knowledge are fully

aware of that.

Now, will this inner conflict bring about a change? And is that not the most fundamental and important question in our daily life; how to bring about a radical change in our selves? Will mere alteration at the superficial level bring it about? Will understanding the different layers of consciousness, of the "me", uncovering the past, the various personal experiences from childhood up to now, examining in myself the collective experiences of my father, my mother, my ancestors, my race, the conditioning of the particular society in which I live - will the analysis of all that bring about a change which is not merely an adjustment?

I feel, and surely you also must feel, that a fundamental change in one's life is essential - a change which is not a mere reaction, which is not the outcome of the stress and strain of environmental demands. And how is one to bring about such a change? My consciousness is the sum total of human experience, plus my particular contact with the present; and can that bring about a change? Will the study of my own consciousness, of my activities, will the awareness of my thoughts and feelings and stilling the mind in order to observe without condemnation - will that process bring about a change? Can there be change through belief, through identification with a projected image called the ideal? Does not all this imply a certain conflict between what I am and what I should be? And will conflict bring about fundamental change? I am in constant battle within myself and with society, am I not? There is a ceaseless conflict going on between what I am and what I want to be; and will this conflict, this struggle bring about a change? I see a change is essential; and can I bring it about by examining the

whole process of my consciousness, by struggling, by disciplining, by practising various forms of repression? I feel such a process cannot bring about a radical change. Of that one must be completely sure. And if that process cannot bring about a fundamental transformation, a deep inward revolution, then what will?

I hope I have made myself clear so far.

Do we see that the struggle to change what one is will not bring about a revolution, an inward transformation? If I see that, then what is the next step, what am I to do? Before I can find out the truth of this matter, must I not be very clear that such a process - the restrictions, moralities, compulsions and thoughts which are continually imprinted upon me by the society in which I have been brought up and conditioned - can never bring about a fundamental change? I must be very clear about that, must I not? And I doubt if we are.

So, I think it is important to see very clearly for oneself that the way we have been attempting to change ourselves is utterly false; for, if that process is seen to be false, then we shall be in a state of mind to discover what is the true way of changing. But if we do not see the content of the false in our minds, in our habits of thought and so on, then how can we ever find the other? So, should we not find out for ourselves, first of all, whether the pursuits with which we are familiar can ever bring about a radical change? Discipline, suppression, control, analysis, going through various forms of hypnosis to release the unconscious, adherence to a belief, conformity, the constant developing of a particular quality, the struggle to follow an ideal - is not this whole process utterly false?

And if it is false, then should we not look at it, understand it, go into it and be completely free of it? Surely, it must be completely put away from us, and only then is there a possibility of discovering the new, which will bring about a transformation.

To convey verbally how to bring about a radical change is comparatively simple; but to actually experience that new element, that transforming quality, is entirely different. That is why I feel you should listen, not merely to hear what I am saying, but to find out for yourself whether the disciplines you have practised, the ambitions, the jealousies, the envies you have felt, the various ideals and beliefs you have followed, the analysis you have gone through, the introspection and struggle in which you have been caught - whether these things have any validity. And if they have not, then what is the state of the mind that has seen through and finished with them all?

Let us put the problem differently. However much I struggle to be different, to change, is not that struggle still part of the "me" that is desirous of a result, that is seeking a continuity of happiness, the perpetuation of a particular state? I am greedy, or envious, or acquisitive, and I see the implications of it; so I discipline myself against it, I suppress it, try to inhibit certain reactions. This desire, this struggle to change greed into something else, is it not still an activity of the "me" that is attempting to become a better "me"? And the "me", the "I", this centre of the accumulating process, can it ever be "better"? And we know those moments, those rare occasions when the "me" is absent, completely absent, in which there is a timeless state, a sense of happiness that is not measured by the mind.

So, our problem is, how to bring about a change without effort? We are used to effort, are we not? We have been brought up in the habit of effort. Not liking this, we make effort to change it into that. Seeing have been brought up in the habit of effort. Not liking this, we make effort to change it into that. Seeing myself to be ugly, selfish, or what you will, I make tremendous effort to change it. That is all we know. Now, realizing all this, being aware of the workings of the mind, is it possible not to make effort - and see what happens? Our effort is always towards success and conformity, is it not? We work towards a desired end, and to achieve it, we must conform. That is all we know in various degrees, negatively or positively. And is it possible to free the mind from this habit, that is, to make no effort, but merely be in a state in which the mind sees the fact and does not act upon the fact in order to transform it?

If we can look at ourselves without any desire to change, then there is a possibility of a radical change. But that is extremely difficult, is it not? It is not easy to observe one self without the desire to do something about it. When we have a pleasant experience, we want to continue in that experience. If I had a pleasant experience yesterday, I want to continue it today; my mind lives on that experience of yesterday, and so it is everlastingly making an effort to recapture the past, or to create the future from the memory of yesterday. Is it not possible for the mind to be aware of all this? And if you are not aware, you cannot be quiet, you cannot but make effort. You have to know the various activities of the mind, you have to be conscious of them, aware of what the mind is doing; and being aware, seeing how every kind of

effort is still within the field of struggle of trying to become something, and therefore of conformity - being aware of all that, is it not possible to observe without effort, to look without any desire to change what you are into something else?

It is extremely difficult to talk about this, to convey in words the thing that actually happens when you do not desire any particular change. After all, that is what we mean by integration, is it not? When you see the whole process of the mind, when you are aware of the various struggles, divisions, cleavages, and in the centre there is no movement to transform or to bring these cleavages together then the observer is essentially quiet. He does not wish to transform anything, he is merely aware that these things are happening - which requires enormous patience, does it not? But most of us are so eager to change, to do something about ourselves; we are impatient for an end, for a result. When the mind is aware of its own activities, not only the conscious, but also the unconscious, then you do not have to examine the unconscious to bring the hidden things to the surface - they are there. But we do not know how to observe. And don't ask, "How am I to observe, what is the technique?" The moment you have a technique it is finished, you do not observe. The quietness of the centre comes only when you are aware of all this, and you see that you cannot do anything about it: it is so. As long as the mind is active in its desire to transform itself, it can only be a model of its own projection; therefore there is no transformation. If you really see the truth of this, then there comes a state of mind which is not concerned with change at all - and therefore a change does take place.

As I said, this is a very difficult subject to talk about. It is more

a question, not of verbal or so-called intellectual comprehension, but of feeling out for oneself how the activities of the mind do impede the radical change.

I will try to answer some of these questions.

Question: I think all mysticism is foolish, and your talks seem to have a mystical undertone. Is this your intention, or is my reaction to your talks a peculiar one based on my own prejudices exclusively?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by "mysticism"? Something hidden, mysterious? Something that comes out of India? Something you feel when your mind is irrational? Something vague, unclear, of which the prophets and teachers have spoken? Or, is it the experiencing of something real, something which is the summation of reason and yet is beyond reason, which is not verbal, an experience which is not a mere projection of the mind? Is it not important to find out the truth of the matter, without condemnation or acceptance?

We live in experience, do we not? We know life only as experience. And what do we mean by that word "experience"? Something which we can recognize, do we not? Something which we can name, which we can communicate to others. I have an experience only when I am capable of recognizing it. Otherwise, I have no experience. Once having had a certain experience, I store it in memory, name it, give it a particular term; and when a similar experience comes, I recognize it, I give it the same term which I have used before. So, is not all experience that we are aware of based on recognition? And is truth, God, that something which is unnameable, a matter of recognition? That is, can reality be

recognized? To recognize it, I must have had an experience of it before. Having had a previous experience of it, I say, "There it is again; therefore, what I experience is never new.

Is it not important to inquire into this question of recognition and experience? If I am capable of recognizing an experience, does it not indicate that I have already experienced it? Therefore the experience which I now have is not new, it is already the old. As that which is re experienced, recognized, is never new, but always the old, can it be reality, God? Must not this process of recognition come to an end before the new can be? And can that which is the new be verbalized, put into words? If it cannot, then is mysticism the experiencing of that which is beyond the verbal level, beyond the recognition of the mind? Surely, to be aware of that state, , whatever it is, must we not go beyond all images, all knowledge? To find reality, God, or what you will, must we not go beyond the symbols of Christianity, of Hinduism, of Buddhism? Must we not free the mind from all habits, traditions, from all personal and collective ambitions? You may call this "mysticism" and say that it sounds foolish; but it is only when the mind is as nothing that it is capable of receiving the new. If we rely entirely on the mind for our guidance, if our action is based exclusively on reason, on logic, on conclusions, on materialistic reactions, then we will obviously create a brutal, ruthless world. Seeing all this, is it not possible for the mind to go beyond and discover that which is new, the timeless?

Question: I find it extremely difficult to concentrate. Would you please go into this matter?

Krishnamurti: Let us go into this matter together and see if we

cannot understand what it is to concentrate without making an effort to be concentrated. Actually, what happens when you are attempting to concentrate? There is a conflict, is there not? You are trying to fix your mind on a particular thought, and your mind goes off; so there is a division, a cleavage in the mind between what it wants to concentrate upon, and what it is interested in. There is this constant battle going on. We try to discipline the mind, we practise focussing our thought on a particular idea, phrase, image, or symbol, and the mind is always wandering off. With that we are familiar, are we not?

Now, how is the mind to be concentrated? If it is interested, is there an effort to concentrate? And why is there this division between various thoughts pursuits, desires if that can be understood, then there will be natural concentration, will there not? Why is there this division of attention between the thing which I am trying to be interested, and a thought which is apart from that? And what happens when we are aware of this division? We try to bridge the gap so that the mind can be concentrated on only one thing.

So, is not our problem that of the thinker and the thought? I want to think about one particular thought, and I put my mind on it, but another part of me wanders off. I pull it back and try to concentrate, and again it wanders off; so I keep this conflict going. I never try to find out why there is a thinker apart from the thought, why the thinker is always trying to control the thought, bring it back. Why is there this division? That is the problem, is it not? If there is no thinker apart from the thought, then every thought is concentration, is it not? Please observe your own thinking and you

will see. There is the thinker trying to control his thought, trying to do something about his thought, trying to change it, dominate it. Now, why is there this division? And can the thinker ever dominate all his thoughts? He can do it only when he is completely absorbed in one particular thought, wholly identified with one belief, one symbol. Such a state obviously leads to insanity, does it not?

Now, can we understand why the thinker chooses between various thoughts and tries to dwell upon one particular thought? If we can understand that, which is to understand the process of choice, then we shall come naturally to a concentration in which there is no conflict. So, we have to understand the problem of choice, why the thinker chooses one thought and rejects another. When the thinker chooses a particular thought, various other thoughts are always impinging, and he is always pushing them aside. So does choice lead to concentration? Is the mind concentrated when it is constantly choosing, excluding, rejecting? Is concentration a process of narrowing down the mind so that it can be completely identified with a particular thought? Yet that is what we generally mean by concentration, is it not? We mean a state in which the mind is so completely absorbed in a particular idea, a chosen thought, that no other thoughts disturb it, no other reactions come in; and yet there is a conflict of choice going on all the time.

So, in order to understand concentration, must we not first understand the problem of choice? As long as we choose one particular thought and try to dwell on it, is not conflict with other thoughts inevitable? Must we not examine, be aware of every thought, rather than choose one and reject others? You will say, "I

have no time to do that". But have you time to struggle against the army of impinging thoughts? And is that not a waste of time?

As every thought arises, look at it; do not choose, do not say, "This is good, that is bad; I am going to hold to the good and reject the bad". Without condemnation, be aware of each thought as it arises, and then you will see there comes a concentration which is not exclusive, which is not the result of choice, which is not the narrowing down of the mind. Such concentration is extensive, and only then is it possible for the mind to be quiet, for the mind to be still. Stillness is not the outcome of concentration, it is not the result of choice. Stillness comes about spontaneously when we understand the whole process of choice with its various activities, struggles; and in that stillness there is the unrecognizable, an experience which is not of the past.

August 16, 1952

OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH AUGUST 1952

We have become accustomed, I think, to the idea that struggle is inevitable, and that through struggle we shall come to understanding, we shall have peace, we shall realize something beyond the problems which evoke conflict. It seems to me important to understand this question of struggle, the conflict within and about us, and to find out whether it is necessary to creative understanding and to the release of human happiness. We accept struggle as an integral part of our daily existence, of our social contacts, of our inward, psychological being, and we think that without struggle, conflict, we shall stagnate. There is the fear of stagnation, of being nothing, of destroying ourselves if we do not make an effort, if we do not struggle towards an object, a goal, an end. We think that without struggle, without inward stress and strain, the ultimate happiness is not attainable. So we accept struggle as part of life, and through struggle we think we can bring about a radical change in ourselves. This morning let us find out, if we can, whether struggle is necessary, whether conflict contributes to understanding, enlightenment and human happiness.

We see that struggle is necessary in certain directions, at certain levels: struggle with the earth, struggle in resolving objective problems. At certain levels of existence, struggle seems to be necessary; but we carry on that struggle into the psychological realm, where it becomes the acquisitive survival of the "me", and it is there that we have to find out whether struggle contributes to one's own happiness, to human welfare, and to the creation of a peaceful society. This conflict in relationship is a complex

problem, is it not? For centuries we have accepted it as inenviable, and it is therefore very difficult to examine the whole question anew, to go into it deeply and discover its full significance. If we can, let us try this morning to see how far it is valid, and whether struggle must end if we are to understand the further reaches of the human heart.

Why do we struggle psychologically, inwardly? We struggle in order to conform to a pattern of action; we struggle to express certain feelings, or because we have a problem which through struggle we hope to resolve; we struggle in order to achieve a continuity, a survival of the "me" as an entity. Now, this struggle to conform, to survive, expresses itself in belief, in the ideal, does it not? We project the ideal and strive to conform, to adjust ourselves to it, hoping through that struggle, through that adjustment to improve, to be happier, kinder, and so on. That is, we create a pattern of action through the desire to achieve a certain result, and thereby we establish the habit of constant inward or psychological struggle between the various layers of our consciousness. We struggle with problems, both personal and collective; having problems, we examine them, analyze, go into them as fully as possible, hoping in this way to resolve them. We struggle with the trivialities of our mind in order to banish them, to put them aside and go beyond. Our life is a series of never ending struggles; we are always inquiring, always struggling to find out. We start to find out, but gradually establish the habit of a particular pattern of action; or, if we are more deeply concerned, we think that through struggle we shall be creative, that we must go through this process of conflict in order to achieve a certain peace of mind. All this is

our life, the familiar pattern of our daily existence, and we need not go into it in more detail.

Now, I want to find out if struggle is necessary, if struggle can produce the radical inward change which is so essential. When we have a psychological problem, a problem of relationship, why do we struggle to solve it? Can such a problem be solved through struggle, through conflict? We struggle with a problem only when we want a particular result, a particular answer to that problem; but if our intention is to understand and go beyond the problem, surely this conflict with the problem will not help us, will it? We can understand the problem only when we are capable of looking at it without condemnation, justification, or any desire to find an answer outside of it. The moment we try to conform to a particular pattern which the mind has projected in the hope of solving the problem. there is a state of struggle; and the more we struggle, the more complex the problem becomes. So we see that, to understand a problem profoundly, there must, first of all, be no effort to find a particular answer to it.

When I have a problem, am I not always seeking a particular answer to that problem? I am not concerned with understanding the problem, I want an answer to it; so a conflict is established. Whereas, if I would really understand the problem, I must be aware of the whole content of it, which is possible only when I am not identifying myself with a particular answer, when I am not judging, when I am not condemning. Being fully aware, the mind is quiet; and only then is the problem resolved, not when there is a struggle to find an answer. At one level we want an answer, and at another level we do not. We seek a particular solution to a problem, and yet

we know, deeply, that the search for a particular solution involves conflict with in oneself and therefore only increases the problem in another direction. So, what is required is insight into the problem, which means understanding the whole of one's consciousness, the total process of one self.

We see, then, that struggle to resolve a problem does not bring about freedom from that problem. On the contrary, it only makes the problem more complex. You can observe this for yourself.

Now, we think that survival is possible only through struggle, through contention, through conflict; and yet we see that where there is conflict between individuals, between groups, between nations, there is no possibility of survival at all; war and mass destruction are inevitable. As long as we are struggling for psychological security, there must be outward conflict, which results in war. We struggle to be psychologically secure, to survive acquisitively, to be the more; and as long as we are acquisitively struggling to be more, either in this world or in the psychological realm, there must be conflict, there must be incessant battle with in and about us.

We struggle to be secure, to be certain, because the mind is afraid to be uncertain, to be in a state of constant inquiry, constant understanding, constant discovery. There can be discovery, understanding only when there is a state of deep uncertainty. But the mind dislikes to be uncertain, so it proceeds from memory to memory in order to be secure; it builds for itself various virtues qualities, attributes, habits, patterns of action in which it can function. Unconsciously as well as consciously, most of us are seeking this psychological survival, which denies survival in the

physical world. As long as the "me", the self the "I" is cultivated, given nourishment, strength, there must be everlasting conflict.

So, that is our state, is it not? And if we want to change radically, then the walls which the mind has built around itself - the walls of virtue, belief, ideas, the desire for immortality and so on - must all be broken down so that the mind is completely free to discover what is real.

What is necessary, first of all, is to perceive for ourselves, without persuasion or argumentation, how we move from memory to memory, from knowledge to more knowledge; and this movement we consider a revolution. Tradition, environment, education, conditioning, can all be modified - and that is what every outward revolution tries to do, whether it be capitalist, communist, or fascist. They all try to change the environment, the conditioning, the tradition. It can be done, of course; but it does not release man from suffering, does it? And it is that we are considering: how to free the mind from sorrow, and whether sorrow can ever be solved through struggle. Does not cause of sorrow, which is the "me" with its self-centred activities? When I struggle to be virtuous, is that virtue? Though we have been brought up to believe that a virtuous state can be achieved through struggle, through conflict, through discipline, through influence, through education, does not that whole process strengthen the "me", which is the very cause of misery? When I try to discipline myself to be more generous, am I not strengthening the "me", which is the cause of greed? When I struggle to be humble, without pride, is that not a self-centred activity?

This is a very complex problem, and it cannot be dealt with

casually, at only one level. Seeing this complex problem, and being aware that the root of suffering is the "me", the "I", the self, the ego - what name you give it is of no importance - , how can that foundation, how can that basis be broken, destroyed? How can this self, the "me", be put aside without struggle? That is the real problem, and it is there that the revolution, the change, the transformation must take place. Is this transformation brought about through conflict? Do I resolve the "me" by trying to impose upon it various regulations, compulsions? Or, does its resolution come about when the mind is aware of this whole complex problem and becomes non-active with regard to it? After all, it is the mind that is the centre of the "me", is it not? Perhaps most of us have not thought about this problem. As long as the self exists, there must be conflict. misery; as long as the self exists, there can be no creative being. But most of us accept the self and cultivate it in various ways. Now, if we realize the nature of the self, if we are extensively aware of its complex problems, is it not possible for the mind to be non-active with regard to them so that it does not contribute to the "me", give it nourishment? I am concerned with the dissolution of the "me", of the "I", the negation of the self. How is it to be achieved without becoming an end? I see that suffering, frustration, conflict are inevitable as long as my mind is consciously or unconsciously occupied with the "me" and its activities. Now, how is all that to be resolved? Will the identification of myself with a nation, with an idea, with a belief, with what we call God, resolve it? Such identification is an activity of the "me", is it not? It is only an extension of the "me", an escape from the "me" of trivialities to what I call the immense, the

universal - which is still part of my petty mind. So, identification does not resolve the "me", does not break down the walls of the "me; nor does discipline, the practice of a particular pattern of action; nor does prayer, supplication, nor the constant demand to resolve it. All this only strengthens the "me" gives it continuity - the "me" being a bundle of memories, experiences, pleasures, struggles, pains, suffering. Nothing will resolve the "me" as long as the mind is active in its resolution, for the mind is incapable of breaking down the barriers, the walls that it has created. But when I am aware of this whole complex structure of the "me", which is the past moving through the present to the future, when I am aware of the inward as well as the outward, the hidden as well as the open - when I am fully aware of all that, then the mind, which has created the barriers in its desire to be secure, to be permanent, to have continuity, becomes extraordinarily quiet, it is no longer active; and only then is there a possibility of the dissolution of the "me".

Now, in listening to a statement of that kind, how you listen matters, does it not? Because, after all, what are we trying to do in these talks? We are not trying to superimpose one set of ideas on another, or substitute one belief for another, or follow one teacher, renouncing another. What we are trying to do is to understand the problem, talk it over; and in talking it over, you are open to suggestions, you see the implications, and thereby you discover directly for yourself the falseness of this struggle. You do not make a conscious effort to change. The transformation comes when there is direct understanding, and therefore there is a certain spontaneity without any sense of compulsion. But that is possible only when you are capable of listening very quietly, inwardly, without any

barriers. If you change because of argumentation, because logically it is so, because you are influenced, then you are only conditioned in a different direction, which brings again its sorrow. Whereas, if you understand this problem of sorrow as a whole, as a totality, and not as something to be escaped from superficially, then the mind becomes very quiet; and in that quietness there takes place a transformation which is not induced, which is not the result of any form of compulsion, of desire. It is that transformation which is essential; and that transformation is not possible through influence, through knowledge. Knowledge does not resolve our suffering - knowledge being explanations. Only when knowledge is suppressed completely, when we are no longer looking to knowledge as a means of guidance, only then is there a possibility for the mind to experience the unnameable, which is the only factor that brings about a radical transformation, a revolution.

Question: Great minds have never been able to agree on what is the ultimate reality. What do you say? Does it exist at all?

Krishnamurti: What do you say? Is that not much more important: what you think? You want to know if there is an ultimate reality, and you say that great minds have said there is or there is not. Of what value is that? You want to find out, don't you? You want to know if there is an absolute reality, something which is not changeable, which is permanent, which is beyond time. Now, how are you to find out? With what instrument are you going to find out? You have only the mind, have you not? - the mind being the result of time, the residue of memory, of experience. With that mind, you are going to find out if there is an ultimate reality. You have read about these matters, and what you have read has

strengthened your own prejudices opinions or objections; and with that mind you are going to find out. Can you? And is this not really a foolish question to ask? If I said there is or there is not an ultimate reality, what significance would it have? Actually, what significance would it have in your life? It would merely strengthen your particular conception, your particular experience, your particular knowledge. But the strengthening of your idea, the corroboration of your belief, is not the ultimate reality, is it? So, what is important, surely, is for you to find out; and to find out, your mind must be in a state of creative experience, must it not? Your mind must be capable of discovering - which means it must be completely free from all knowledge as to whether there is an ultimate reality, or only a series of ever more extensive and significant experiences. But your mind is crammed with knowledge, with information, with experience, with memories; and with that mind you try to find out. Surely, it is only when the mind is creatively empty that it is capable of finding out whether there is an ultimate reality or not. But the mind is never creatively empty. It is always acquiring, always gathering, living on the past or in the future, or trying to be focussed in the immediate present; it is never in that state of creativeness in which a new thing can take place. As the mind is a result of time, it cannot possibly understand that which is timeless, eternal. So, our job is to inquire, not if there is an ultimate reality, but whether the mind can ever be free from time, which is memory, from this process of accumulation, the gathering of experiences, living on the past or in the future. That is, can the mind be still? Stillness is not the outcome of discipline, of control. There is stillness only when the mind is silently aware of this

whole complex problem, and it is such a mind that can understand if there is an ultimate reality or not.

Question: With what should the mind be occupied?

Krishnamurti: Here is a very good example of how conflict is brought into being: the conflict between what should be and what is. First we establish what should be, the ideal, and then try to live according to that pattern. We say the mind should be occupied with noble things, with unselfishness, with generosity, with kindness, with love; that is the pattern, the belief, the should be, the must, and we try to live accordingly. So there is a conflict set going between the projection of what should be, and the actuality, the what is, and through that conflict we hope to be transformed. As long as we are struggling with the should be, we feel virtuous, we feel good. But which is important: the should be, or what is? With what are our minds occupied - actually, not ideologically? With trivialities, are they not? With how one looks, with ambition, with greed, with envy, with gossip, with cruelty. The mind lives in a world of trivialities; and a trivial mind creating a noble pattern is still trivial, is it not? So, the question is not with what should the mind be occupied, but can the mind free itself from trivialities? If we are at all inquiring, we know our own particular trivialities: incessant talk, the everlasting chattering of the mind, worry over this and that, curiosity as to what people are doing or not doing, trying to achieve a result, groping after one's own aggrandizement, and so on. With that we are occupied, and we know it very well. And can that be transformed? That is the problem, is it not? To ask with what the mind should be occupied is mere immaturity.

Now, being aware that my mind is trivial and occupied with

trivialities, can it free itself from this condition? Is not the mind, by its very nature, trivial? What is the mind but the result of memory? Memory of what? Of how to survive, not only physically, but also psychologically through the development of certain qualities, virtues, the storing up of experiences, the establishing of itself in its own activities. Is that not trivial? The mind, being the result of memory, of time, is trivial in itself; and what can it do to free itself from its own triviality? Can it do anything? Please see the importance of this. Can the mind, which is self-centred activity, free itself from that activity? Obviously, it cannot; whatever it does, it is still trivial. It can speculate about God, it can devise political systems, it can invent beliefs; but it is still within the field of time, its change is still from memory to memory, it is still bound by its own limitation. And can the mind break down that limitation? Or, does that limitation break down when the mind is quiet, when it is not active, when it recognizes its own trivialities, however great it may have imagined them to be? When the mind, having seen its trivialities, is fully aware of them, and so becomes really quiet - only then is there a possibility of these trivialities dropping away. But as long as you are inquiring with what the mind should be occupied, it will be occupied with trivialities, whether it build a church, whether it go to prayer or to a shrine. The mind itself is petty, small, and by merely saying it is petty you haven't dissolved its pettiness. You have to understand it, the mind has to recognize its own activities; and in the process of that recognition, in the awareness of the trivialities which it has consciously and unconsciously built, the mind becomes quiet. In that quietness there is a creative state, and this is the factor which

brings about a transformation.

Question: I find I am a snob. I like the sensation, but I feel it is a wrong attitude. How am I to be free from this snobbishness?

Krishnamurti: We all like to be superior, or to feel that we are superior, do we not? We want to have friends who are prominent, who are in the centre of things, we want to know the great. We all want to be identified with the great, or be seen with the great, or be ourselves the great, either through heredity, or through our own particular endeavour. From the clerk to the highest of the land, we all want to be some bodies; so the snobbishness, the sense of importance begins. And though the questioner says the feeling of being somebody is pleasurable, he wants to know how to be free from that snobbishness. Surely, it is very simple to be free from that snobbishness, is it not? Be nobody. No, sirs, don't laugh and pass it off. It is very difficult to be nobody; because, our education, our social environment, our religious instruction, all encourage us to be somebody. In worldly, don't you want to be some body? Don't you want to be a good writer, or to know somebody who writes extraordinarily well and is popular, famous? Don't you want to be the first painter, the greatest musician, the most beautiful person or the most virtuous saint? To know, to acquire, to possess - isn't that what we are all striving after? If we are honest with ourselves, it is. All our struggle, our everlasting conflict is to achieve that: to be somebody. It gives great impetus, great energy, does it not? Ambition is a great spur, and we are caught in that habit of thought. Can you easily deny all that and be as nothing? And yet we must be as nothing - but not through discipline, not through compulsion. We are as nothing when we know what it is to

love; but how can a man love when he is concerned with his own importance?

So, it is easy to say, "I must be as nothing; but to bring it about requires enormous vitality, energy. To break down the habits, the customs, the traditions, the educational influences, the sense of competition - to break down all those encrustations requires a great deal of watchfulness, alertness, not only at the superficial level, but profoundly, deeply. But to be conscious that you are as nothing, is to be something. To be as nothing is a state which comes without invitation; and one knows that state only when there is love. But love is not a thing to be sought after; it comes when there is inward revolution, when the self is not important, when the self is not the centre of one's existence.

August 17, 1952

OJAI 7TH PUBLIC TALK 23RD AUGUST 1952

I think it is possible, in talking, to expose oneself and one's own inward thoughts, and if we can do that this evening, perhaps it will be worth while; for then this will not be a lecture, a talk to which you are listening, but an exposing of the problems and difficulties that one confronts in going into the question of transformation, this inward revolution which is so essential. We see around us the disintegration of the world, and we are aware of our own extraordinary processes of deterioration as we grow older: lack of energy, the settling into grooves of well-established habit, the pursuit of various illusions and so on, all of which creates a barrier to the understanding of our own fundamental and radical change.

In considering this problem of change, which we have been doing for the last three weeks, it seems to me that the question of incentive is very important. For most of us, change implies an incentive. I need an incentive to change. Most of us require an incentive, an urge, a motive, a purpose, a vision, or identification with a particular belief, Utopia, or ideology, do we not? And does incentive bring about a radical change? Is not incentive merely a projection of one's own desires, idealized or personified, or put away in the future in the hope that by pursuing that self-projection we can somehow bring about a change? Is not this problem of change very profound, and can it be solved by the superficial incentives which societies offer, which religious organizations dangle before us? Can a fundamental transformation be brought about by the revolutionary ideologies which give logical reasons for change and offer the incentive of a better world, a heaven on

earth, a society in which there are no class distinctions? We identify ourselves with these incentives and give our lives for the things which they promise; and does that bring about a radical change? That is the problem, is it not?

I do not know how much you have thought about all this, or how deeply you have gone into the question of changing oneself; but unless we understand from what point of view, from what centre the transformation must take place, it seems to me that mere superficial changes, however beneficial socially and economically, will not resolve our extraordinarily complex problems. The incentives, the beliefs, the promises, the Utopias - to me, all these are very superficial. There can be a radical change only at the centre, only when there is complete self-abnegation, complete self-forgetfulness, the complete putting aside of the "me", the self. Until that is done, I do not see how a fundamental transformation can take place. And is this radical change at the centre brought about through an incentive of any kind? Obviously not. And yet all our thinking is based on incentive, is it not? We are continually struggling to gain a reward, to do good, to live a noble life, to advance, to achieve. So, is it not important to find out what this self is that wants to grow, to improve?

What is the self, the "me"? If you were asked, what would be your response to that question? Some would say, perhaps, that is the expression of God, the higher self enclosed in material form, the immense manifested in the particular. And probably others would maintain that there is no spiritual entity, that man is nothing but a series of responses to environmental influences, the result of racial, climatic and social conditioning. Whatever the self may be,

should we not go into it, understand it, and find out how it can be transformed at the centre?

What is the self? Is it not desire? Please, I would like to suggest these things for you to observe, not to contradict or accept; because, I feel the more one is capable of listening, not so much with the conscious mind, but unconsciously, effortlessly, the more there is a possibility of our meeting and proceeding together further and more deeply into the problem. If the conscious mind merely examines an idea, a teaching, a problem, then it does not go beyond its own level, which is very superficial; but if one can listen, not with the conscious mind, as it were, but with a mind that is relaxed, observing, and is therefore able to see what is beyond the words, the symbols, the images, then there is a possibility, I think, of a quickening of direct experience and understanding, which is not a process of conscious analysis. I think we can do that at these talks if we do not meet idea by idea. What I am saying is not a set of ideas to be learnt, to be repeated, to be read over, or communicated to others; but if we can meet each other, not at the conscious, reasoning level, which we can do later, but at that level where the conscious mind is neither opposing nor struggling to understand, then there is a possibility, I think, of seeing something which is not merely verbal, not merely intellectual.

So, what is the self that needs fundamental transformation? Surely, it is there that a change must take place, not on the superficial level; and in order to bring about a radical change there, must we not find out what this self is, the "me"? And can we ever find out what the "me" is? Is there a permanent "me"? Or, is there a permanent desire for some thing, which identifies itself as the

"me"?

Please don't take notes, do please listen. When you take notes you are not really listening; you are more concerned with putting down what you hear so that you can read it over tomorrow, or convey it to your friends, or print it somewhere. What we are trying to do is something quite different, is it not? We are trying to find out what this thing is which we call the self, the centre of the "me", from which all activity seems to spring; for if there is no transformation there, mere change on the periphery, on the outside, on the surface, has very little meaning.

So, I want to find out what this centre is, and whether it is possible to really break it up, transform it, tear it away. What is the self with most of us? It is a centre of desire manifesting itself through various forms of continuity, is it not? It is the desire to have more, to perpetuate experience, to be enriched through acquisition, through memories, through sensations, through symbols, through names, through words. If you look very closely, there is no such thing as a permanent "me" except as memory, the memory of what I have been, of what I am and what I should be; it is the desire for more, the desire for greater knowledge, greater experience, the desire for a continued identity, identity with the body, with the house, with the land, with ideas, with persons. This process goes on, not only at the conscious level, but also in the deeper, unconscious layers of the mind, and so the self, the centre of the "me" is sustained and nourished through time. But none of that is permanent, in the sense of a continuity, except through memory. In itself it is not a permanent state, but we try to make it permanent by clinging to a particular experience, a particular

relationship or belief - not consciously, perhaps, but unconsciously we are driven to it through various desires, urges, compulsions, experiences.

So, all this is the "me", is it not? It is the self, the "I", which is ever wanting the more, which is never satisfied, everlastingly groping for further experience, further sensation, cultivating virtue in order to strengthen itself at the centre; therefore it is never virtue, but only the expansion of itself in the guise of virtue. So, that is the "me", the "I": it is the name, the form, and the feeling behind the symbol, beyond the word, which, in its struggle to acquire, to hold, to expand or to be less, creates an acquisitive society in which there is contention, competition, ruthlessness, war, and all the rest of it.

Unless there is a transformation at the centre, not substitution, but a radical uprooting of the "me", no fundamental change is possible. Realizing this, how is one to bring about a deep inner change? That is the problem, is it not? - for a serious person, not for the superficial who are seeking some comforting illusion, gurus, teachers, and all the rest of the nonsense. So, how can that centre transform itself? Sirs, people who see that a change must take place, and do not know how it should come about, are easily caught by incentives, are they not? They are distracted by ideological Utopias, by the Masters, by worship, by churches, by organizations, by saviours and so on and on and on; but when I put aside all distractions because they will not transform the centre, and I am concerned only with the transformation of the center - when I really see the urgency, the necessity of that, then all these superficial reformations have very little significance.

Now, when all incentives, pursuits and desires have been put aside, is one then capable of transforming the centre? You and I are considering this problem as two individuals, I am not addressing a group. You see the problem, do you not? There must obviously be a change, not at the superficial or abstract level, but at the very centre; there must be a new flow, a new state of being which is not of time, of memory; there must be a change which is not the result of any theory or belief, whether of the left or of the right, a change which is not the conditioning of a believer or a non-believer. I see this complex problem; and how is it possible for a spontaneous change to take place at the center - a change which is not the result of compulsion, of discipline which are mere substitutions? I do not know if you have put the question to yourself in this manner; and if you have, what do you find, how are you to bring about that change, that transformation? Is the understanding of these distractions, incentives, pursuits, de sires, merely verbal, intellectual, superficial, or is it real - real in the sense that incentives no longer have any value, and there fore they have dropped away? Or, knowing their immature prompting's, are you still playing with them?

So, I have first to find out what is the state of my mind that sees the problem and tries to seek an answer, have I not? Am I making myself clear? There is the problem, which we all know, and of which we are fully aware at different moments of our existence; there are occasions when we see the significance, the depth of it. And as we discuss it together, what is the state of one's mind that is looking at the problem? Isn't that important? The state of the mind as it approaches the problem is very important, because that state

of mind is going to find the answer. So, I first see the problem, and then I have to see what the state of my mind is that looks at the problem. Please, these are not first and second steps - the problem is a whole, a total process. It is only in putting it verbally that it has to be broken up in this way. If we approach the problem in stages, first seeing the problem, then inquiring what the state of the mind is, and so on and on, we shall get lost, we shall wander further and further away from the central issue. So, it is very important for me to be fully aware of the whole state of my mind as I approach the problem.

First of all, I do not know if I want to have a fundamental change, if I want to break all the traditions, values, hopes, beliefs that have been built up. Most of us do not, obviously. Very few want to go so deeply and fundamentally into the problem. They are quite satisfied with substitutes, with a change of belief, with better incentives. But, going beyond that, what is the state of my mind? And is the state of the mind different from the problem? Is not the problem the state of the mind? The problem is not apart from the mind. It is my mind that creates the problem, my mind being the result of time, of memory, the seat of the "me", which is everlastingly craving for the more, for immortality, for continuity, for permanency here and in the hereafter. So, can the mind detach itself from the problem and look at the problem? It can abstractly, logically, with reason - but actually, can it separate itself from the thing it has created and of which it is a part? This is not a conundrum, this is not a trick. It is a fact, is it not? My mind, seeing its own insufficiency, its own poverty, proceeds to acquire properties, degrees, titles, the everlasting God; so, it strengthen

itself in the "me". The mind being the centre of the "me", says, "I must change", and it proceeds to create incentives for itself, pursuing the good and rejecting the bad.

Now, can such a mind see the problem and act upon the problem? And when it does act, is it not still within the field of incentives, of desires, of time, of memory? So is it not important for me to find out how my mind looks at the problem? Is the mind separate from the problem, as the observer apart from the observed, or is the mind itself the totality of the problem? With most of us, that is the point, is it not? I am observing the problem of how to dissolve radically and deeply that centre which is the "me", so the mind says, "I am going to dissolve it". That is, the mind, the "I" separates itself as the observer and the observed, and then the observer acts upon the observed, the problem. But the observer is the creator of the problem, the observer is not separate from the problem. He himself is the problem. So, what is he to do? If we can really feel this out, just stay with the problem and not try to find an answer a quick solution, or reach for a quotation from some teacher or book, or rely on our past experience; if we can simply be aware of this total problem without judgment, then I think we will find the answer - not an answer at the verbal level, but a solution which is not invented by the mind. So, my problem is this, and I hope it is yours also: I see that a fundamental revolution must take place at the centre, not on the surface. Change on the surface has no meaning. Becoming better, nobler, acquiring more virtue, having much or little property - these are all superficial activities of a very superficial mind. I am not talking about those changes; I am concerned only with a change at the centre. I see that the "me"

must be completely dissolved. So I inquire what the "me" is, I become aware of the "me", not as a philosophical abstraction, but from day to day. From moment to moment I see what the "me" is - the "me" that is always watching, observing, gathering, acquiring, rejecting, judging, hating, breaking up, or coming together in order to be more secure, The change has to take place there; that centre has to be rooted out completely. And how is that to happen? Can the mind, which is the creator of the problem, abstract itself from the problem and then act upon it in the name of God, in the name of the higher self, for a Utopia, or for any other reason? And when it does that, has it dissolved the centre? Obviously it has not. Therefore, my problem is, can the mind bring about a fundamental revolution through dialectics, or through knowledge of historical processes? This is an important question, is it not? Because, if a radical change can take place at the centre, then my whole life has a different significance; then there is beauty, then there is happiness, then there is creation, then there is quite a different state of being; there is love, which is everlasting forgiveness.

So, can that state be brought about by the mind? If you say, "No", you are not aware of the problem. That is a very quick, a very superficial answer. And if you say, "I must look to God, to some high spiritual state which will transform all this", again you are relying on words, on symbols, on a projection of the mind. So, what is one to do? Is this not a problem to you? Looking at this complex problem of the "me", with all its darkness, its shadows and lights, its tensions and stresses, can I, the observer, affect this thing that is observed? Please listen to the problem, don't look for an answer or try to solve it; just listen to it, let it soak into you, as

the soft rains that enrich the earth. If you are really with the problem, if it is your daily concern from moment to moment to see how that change can be brought about, and if you are negatively putting aside those things which you have thought to be positive, then I think you will find the element that comes into being so darkly, without your knowing. This is not a promise. Don't smile as though you had understood.

So, what we have to do, surely, is to be aware of the totality of this problem, not merely consciously, but especially unconsciously; we have to be aware of it inwardly, deeply. The superficial mind can give reasons, explanations, it can logically work out certain problems; but when we are concerned with a profound problem, the superficial approach has little value. And we are concerned with a very profound problem, which is how to bring about a change, a revolution at the centre. Without that fundamental transformation, mere changes on the surface have no meaning, and reforms need constant reform. If we can look at this problem as a whole, taste it, smell it, unconsciously absorb it, then we shall be familiar with all the activities and tricks of the "me", we shall see how the observer is separating himself from the observed, rejecting this and accepting that. The more we know of this total process, the less the superficial mind will act. Thought is not the dissolver of the problem. On the contrary, thought must come to an end. It is the observer who judges, justifies, accepts and rejects, all of which is the process of thinking. Thought has created our problem - the thought that seeks the more in property, in things, in relationship, in ideas, in knowledge; and with that thought we are trying to solve the problem. Thought is memory,

and the calming of memory is the stilling of the mind; and the more the mind is still, the deeper it will understand this problem and resolve the centre.

Question: Does not this process of constant self-awareness lead to self-centredness?

Krishnamurti: It does, does it not? The more you are concerned about yourself, watching, improving, thinking about yourself, the more self-centred you are, are you not? That is an obvious act. If I am concerned with changing myself, then I must observe, I must build a technique which will help me to break up that centre. There is self-centredness as long as I am consciously or unconsciously concerned with a result, with success, as long as I am gaining and putting aside - which is what most of us are doing. The incentive is the goal I am pursuing; because I want to gain that end, I watch myself. I am unhappy, I am miserable, frustrated, and I feel there is a state in which I can be happy, fulfilled, complete; so I become aware in order to gain that state. I use awareness to get what I want; so I am self-centred. Through awareness, through self-analysis, through reading, studying, I hope to dissolve the "me", and then I shall be happy, enlightened, liberated, I shall be one of the elite - and that is what I want. So, the more I am concerned with gaining an end, the greater is the self-centredness of thought. But thought is ever self enclosing anyhow, is it not?

So, what? To break down the self-centredness, I must understand why the mind seeks an end, a goal, a particular result. Why does my mind go after a reward? Why? Can it function in any other way? Is not the movement of the mind from memory to memory, from result to result? I have acquired this, I don't like it,

and I am going to get some thing else. I don't like this thought, but that thought will be better, nobler, more comforting, more satisfying. As long as I am thinking, I can think in no other terms; for the mind moves from knowledge to know ledge, from memory to memory. Is not thinking self-centred in its very nature? I know there are exceptions, but we are not discussing the exceptions. In our everyday life, are we not consciously or unconsciously pursuing an end, gaining and avoiding, seeking to continue, putting aside anything that is disturbing, that is insecure, uncertain? In seeking its own certainty, the mind creates self-centredness; and is not that self-centredness the "me", which then watches over and analyzes itself? So, as long as we seek a result, self-centredness must exist, whether in an individual, in a group, in a nation or a race. But if we can understand why the mind seeks a result, a satisfying end, why it wants to be certain - if we understand that, then there is a possibility of breaking down the walls that enclose thought as the "me". But that requires an astonishing awareness of the total process, not only of the conscious, but also of the unconscious levels, an awareness from moment to moment in which there is no gathering, no accumulation, no saying, "Yes, I have understood this, and I am going to use it for tomorrow", a spontaneity which is not of the mind. Only then is there a possibility of going beyond the self-enclosing activities of thought.

August 23, 1952

OJAI 8TH PUBLIC TALK 24TH AUGUST 1952

I would like to continue this morning with what we were discussing yesterday afternoon, the necessity of change and the problem involved in changing. I think most of us see at least superficially and sometimes, perhaps, deeply, the important change in the outward world, where there is so much misery: war, starvation, class distinctions, snobbishness, the appalling difference bet when the rich and the poor, eighty or ninety percent of Asia going to bed without proper food, while here you are well fed. There must obviously be a complete transformation, a vital change, and many people have tried to bring it about in different ways: through bloody revolution, through economic adjustments, through various superficial reforms and so on. But it seems to me that the fundamental revolution cannot take place unless there is complete self-abnegation, a total dissolution of the "me", of the self; and yesterday I somewhat went into the problem and the processes involved in the dissolution of this "me" that is everlastingly struggling to assert it self, positively or negatively.

This morning I would like to discuss desire, and whether desire can ever be changed; for I think that desire is one of the major problems that confront each one of us in considering the question of fundamental transformation. Surely, until we understand the whole process of desire, the longing, the striving, the conscious or unconscious pursuit of a particular object, however noble - until we go into and understand that process, mere superficial reform or violent revolution will have very little significance. And again, as I said yesterday please do not regard this as a talk to which you are

listening, do not argue with me in your own mind, opposing one idea by another idea. What we are trying to do is to see the complex problem involved in this process of desire. I am talking to you as an individual, not to a large and heterogeneous group of people who are not particularly interested in all this. We are discussing the problem as one individual to another without opposition, to see how far we can go into it, how deeply we can bring about a radical transformation in ourselves. In talking it over with you, I am merely exposing the problem, and how I feel it may be approached; and I think it is much more important to listen, as it were, unconsciously, rather than with a conscious effort to understand.

For most of us, desire is quite a problem: the desire for property, for position, for power, for comfort, for immortality, for continuity, the desire to be loved, to have something permanent, satisfying, lasting, some thing which is beyond time. Now, what is desire? What is this thing that is urging, compelling us? - which doesn't mean that we should be satisfied with what we have or with what we are which is merely the opposite of what we want. We are trying to see what desire is and if we can go into it tentatively, hesitantly, I think we will bring about a transformation which is not a mere substitution of one object of desire for another object of desire. But this is generally what we mean by "change", is it not? Being dissatisfied with one particular object of desire, we find a substitute for it. We are everlastingly moving from one object of desire to another which we consider to be higher, nobler, more refined; but, however refined, desire is still desire, and in this movement of desire there is endless struggle the conflict of the

opposites.

So, is it not important to find out what is desire and whether it can be transformed? What is desire? Is it not the symbol and its sensation? Desire is sensation with the object of its attainment. Is there desire without a symbol and its sensation? Obviously not. The symbol may be a picture, a person, a word, a name, an image, an idea which gives me a sensation, which makes me feel that I like or dislike it; if the sensation is pleasurable, I want to attain, to possess, to hold on to its symbol and continue in that pleasure. From time to time, according to my inclinations and intensities, I change the picture, the image, the object. With one form of pleasure I am fed up, tired, bored, so I seek a new sensation, a new idea, a new symbol. I reject the old sensation and take on a new one, with new words, new significances, new experiences. I resist the old and yield to the new which I consider to be higher, nobler, more satisfying. So, in desire there is a resistance and a yielding, which involves temptation; and of course, in yielding to a particular symbol of desire, there is always the fear of frustration.

If I observe the whole process of desire in myself I see there is always an object towards which my mind is directed for further sensation, and that in this process there is involved resistance, temptation and discipline. There is perception, sensation, contact and desire, and the mind becomes the mechanical instrument of this process, in which symbols, words, objects are the centre round which all desire, all pursuits, all ambitions are built; and that centre is the "me". And can I dissolve that centre of desire - not one-particular desire, one particular appetite or craving, but the whole structure of desire, of longing, hoping, in which there is always the

fear of frustration? The more I am frustrated, the more strength I give to the "me". As long as there is hoping, longing there is always the background of fear, which again strengthens that centre. And revolution is possible only at that centre, not on the surface, which is merely a process of distraction, a superficial change leading to mischievous action.

So, when I am aware of this whole structure of desire, I see how my mind has become a dead centre, a mechanical process of memory. Having tired of one desire, I automatically want to fulfil myself in another. My mind is always experiencing in terms of sensation, it is the instrument of sensation. Being bored with a particular sensation, I seek a new sensation, which may be what I call the realization of God; but it is still sensation. I have had enough of this world and its travail, and I want peace, the peace that is everlasting; so I meditate, control, I shape my mind in order to experience that peace. The experiencing of that peace is still sensation. So my mind is the mechanical instrument of sensation, of memory, a dead centre from which I act, think. The objects I pursue are the projections of the mind as symbols from which it derives sensations. The word "God", the word "love", the word "communism", the word "democracy", the word "nationalism" - these are all symbols which give sensations to the mind, and therefore the mind clings to them. As you and I know, every sensation comes to an end, and so we proceed from one sensation to another; and every sensation strengthens the habit of seeking further sensation. So, the mind becomes merely an instrument of sensation and memory, and in that process we are caught. As long as the mind is seeking further experience, it can only think in terms

of sensation; and any experience that may be spontaneous, creative, vital, strikingly new, it immediately reduces to sensation, and pursues that sensation, which then becomes a memory. Therefore the experience is dead and the mind becomes merely a stagnant pool of the past.

If we have gone into it at all deeply we are familiar with this process; and we seem to be incapable of going beyond. And we want to go beyond, because we are tired of this endless routine, this mechanical pursuit of sensation; so the mind projects the idea of truth, of God; it dreams of a vital change and of playing a principal part in that change, and so on and on and on. Hence there is never a creative state. In myself I see this process of desire going on, which is mechanical, repetitive, which holds the mind in a process of routine and makes of it a dead centre of the past in which there is no creative spontaneity. And also there are sudden moments of creation, of that which is not of the mind, which is not of memory, which is not of sensation, of desire. So, what am I to do?

As I said yesterday, I think it is important to listen to what I am saying and merely be aware of what I am trying to imply. I am not trying to convince you or to impress upon you a particular pattern of thought, which only leads to superficial thinking and so to mischievous action. To see how far what I am saying is true, as you listen be aware of the process of your own thinking without judgment; and the moment you are aware of something that is true, it will act if you give it a chance. But if you listen to something that is true without letting it act upon you, it becomes a poison, it brings about a state of deterioration. Consciously or unconsciously, most of us avoid finding out what is true; we do not want to listen to

something which is not habitual, which is not the traditional pursuit of thought. So, if I may suggest, please listen, not with a view to being convinced, but listen to find out how your own mind operates. The moment I see how I am thinking, how I am acting, I do not want another to convince me of what I am. Self-knowledge brings wisdom; and wisdom is not conviction opinion, information, knowledge. It is something which is not measurable by the mind. All that I am trying to convey is the process of our own thinking, and how to be aware of it; and in the process of being aware of itself, the mind captures the significance that lies beyond the words, beyond the symbols and their sensations.

So, our problem is to understand desire - not how far it should go, or where it should come to an end, but to understand the whole process of desire, the cravings, the longings, the burning appetites. Most of us think that possessing very little indicates freedom from desire - and how we worship those who have but few things! A loin cloth, a robe, symbolizes our desire to be free from desire; but that again is a very superficial reaction. Why begin at the superficial level of giving up outward possessions when your mind is crippled with innumerable desires, beliefs, struggles? Surely it is there that the revolution must take place, not in how much you possess, or what clothes you wear, or how many meals you eat. But we are impressed by these things because our minds are very superficial.

So, your problem and my problem is to see whether the mind can ever be free from desire, from sensation. Surely, creation has nothing to do with sensation; reality, God, or what you will, is not a state which can be experienced as sensation. When you have an

experience, what happens? It has given you a certain sensation, a feeling of elation or depression. Naturally, you try to avoid, put aside the state of depression; but if it is a joy, a feeling of elation, you pursue it. Your experience has produced a pleasurable sensation, and you want more of it; and the more strengthens the dead centre of the mind, which is ever craving further experience. Hence the mind cannot experience anything new, it is incapable of experiencing anything new, because its approach is always through memory, through recognition; and that which is recognized through memory is not truth, creation, reality. Such a mind cannot experience reality, it can only experience sensation; and creation is not sensation, it is something that is everlastingly new, from moment to moment.

Now, I realize the state of my own mind; I see that it is the instrument of sensation and desire, or rather, that it is sensation and desire, and that it is mechanically caught up in routine. Such a mind is incapable of ever receiving or feeling out the new; for the new must obviously be something beyond sensation, which is always the old. So, this mechanical process with its sensations has to come to an end, has it not? The wanting more, the pursuit of symbols, words, images with their sensations - all that has to come to an end. Only then is it possible for the mind to be in that state of creativeness in which the new can always come into being. If you will listen without being mesmerized by words, by habits, by ideas, and see how important it is to have the new constantly impinging on the mind, then, perhaps, you will understand the process of desire, the routine, the boredom, the constant craving for experience. Then I think you will begin to see that desire has very

little significance in life for a man who is really seeking.

Obviously, there are certain physical needs: food, clothing, shelter, and all the rest of it. But they never become psychological appetites, things on which the mind builds itself as a centre of desire. Beyond the physical needs, any form of desire - for greatness, for truth, for virtue - becomes a psychological process by which the mind builds the idea of the "me" and strengthens itself at the centre.

So, when you see this process, when you are really aware of it with out opposition, without a sense of temptation, without resistance, with out justifying or judging it, then you will discover that the mind is capable of receiving the new, and that the new is never a sensation; therefore it can never be recognized, re-experienced. It is a state of being in which creativeness comes without invitation, without memory; and that is reality.

Question: I happen to be a successful business man of considerable means. I dropped by casually last Sunday to hear your talk, and I saw at once that what you are saying is perfectly true. It has created in me a serious conflict, for my whole background and occupation are diametrically opposed to the kind of life which I now realize is essential. I don't see how I can return to my business. What am I to do?

Krishnamurti: I wonder why some of you laughed? Was it a nervous reaction to cover up your our conflict of a similar kind? This man has asked a serious question, and you brush it off with a laugh. He is concerned, he wants to know what to do. What should he do? If he is serious and not carried away by words, by the mere sensation of a pleasant morning, obviously he has to act drastically,

has he not? He may have to give up his business, because what he has realized is much more important than the business, than making money, than position, prestige, family, property. Can he go back to an occupation which is not what he wants, which he realizes is not his life? But we generally cover up this struggle, this discontent, by words, by explanations, justifications, and slip back to the former state. We realize that the life we have been leading as a business man, or what you will, is unworthy, corrupting, destructive - we realize that, we feel it in our bones and blood. But instead of acting, thinking it out, pursuing what we think, we are afraid of the consequences; and so there is an everlasting conflict going on between what we have realized and what we should do according to the dictates of society. So we invite psychosomatic diseases, we invite the deterioration of the mind, the conflict underground. You have felt the stirring of something real, of something which you know to be true, but you are caught in a machine of making money, or ritualism, or what you will. If you fully realize that, and not just verbally accept it, then there will be drastic action, a breaking away from the old habits. But you see, very few ever come to that realization. We are getting old, our habits are settled, we want comfort, we want people to appreciate us, to love us, to be kind in the pattern of action to which we are accustomed. So, instead of taking the drastic action, we cover up our conflict and get lost in words, in explanations. The more you are attached to possessions, to responsibilities, the vaster are the implications and the more difficult it is to act. But if you realize that it has to be done, there is the end of the matter, you will do it. When you perceive what is true, that very perception is action.

Question: After stripping away all the stimulations, sensations, hopes and beliefs, one is left with a sense of utter dullness. Since you say that the thinker can do nothing about this dullness, one feels frustrated. How is one to go beyond the dullness with out doing something about it?

Krishnamurti: I think most of us feel this way, do we not? We consciously strip ourselves of beliefs, of hopes, of sensations, because we want greater hopes more stimulating sensations, more satisfying beliefs. We do not see the significance of hope, of belief, of sensation as a total process; we merely see that certain beliefs, sensations, hopes are futile, empty, without meaning, so we push them aside, we strip ourselves of them, or resign from certain societies. In stripping itself in order to gain more, naturally the mind be comes dull. It is still acting within the pattern of hope, of belief and sensation, so it feels frustrated; and then the problem arises, "How am I to be free of frustration? "With out understanding the total process of belief, which is the desire to be secure, to be certain, to take shelter in an idea, in a sensation - without understanding all that, going into it, being aware of all its implications, its nuances, we strip away one belief and pursue another. Whereas, if one is aware of how the mind creates a belief and clings to it, how it is ever lastingly seeking sensation through experience - if one sees the full significance of that, then there is no problem of frustration. Then the mind is not dull - it is alert, it is constantly watching to find out, to discover where it lurks in its own security. It is fully aware of itself, ceaselessly observing its own processes; and how can such a mind be dull? How can such a mind ever feel frustrated? You feel frustrated because you want to

fulfil yourself in certain sensations, in certain beliefs, certain hopes. Where there is the desire to fulfil, there is fear, which is frustration.

In its desire for sensation, happiness, security, certainty, the mind is creating at the same time the fear that they will not be. In pursuing its own projections it gets caught in the fear of not fulfilling, of not being secure. It is this whole process that we have to understand; and understanding comes when we are aware of this process, when we observe it without judgment. The mind observes itself in action, there is no such entity as you observing the mind. The mind is aware of itself, of all its thoughts, of its hidden and open pursuits. Such a mind can never be dull, because there is never a moment of achievement, of success, of conformity. It is only when the mind conforms in its desire to succeed that it becomes dull, weary. A mind that is not seeking to extend itself through sensation, through further experience, has no blockage, no hindrance in which it feels frustrated. If you and I can understand this process, if the mind can see itself in operation from moment to moment in our daily life, then I think the problem of dullness, of frustration will disappear completely.

Question: I have had an experience of God, and I know for myself that God exists. Though it is a belief, it is not a mere escape, but is based on an actual experience. I listened to you for the first time last week, and I feel you are wrong when you say that all belief is a hindrance. Is not belief based on direct experience, a help to the realization of reality or God?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by a belief? A conviction? Please, I am not trying to define it according to the dictionary. You

have beliefs. What are they based on? On experience, are they not? And your experience is the result of your tradition, of your background, of your education and the influence of your society. The influence of your environment conditions your belief. You have been brought up as a Christian, and you believe according to that tradition, according to that background. Another is brought up in a society where God is taboo, is regarded as absurd, illogical, unreal; and he also believes according to his background. So, you experience according to your background, as he will experience according to his. You experience that which you have unconsciously and deeply cultivated. You have been educated according to a certain pattern of thought which has been inculcated, built into you from childhood, and naturally you experience God according to that pattern; and your experience then becomes a reality to you, and you say it is no longer a matter of mere belief, but is based on knowledge, on conviction, on truth. Will such a belief help you to experience further what you call God? Of course it will. But that which you experience according to your conditioning - is it God, is it truth? And will not that experience strengthen your belief, which is your conditioning? You may say that this is not an escape; but are you not reacting according to your conditioning, as another will react according to his conditioning?

So, what is important is, not whether you believe or disbelieve in God, but to free the mind from its conditioning - and then discover. If, without freeing itself from its own conditioning, the mind asserts that there is or that there is not God, what significance has it? So, the mind must free itself from its conditioning, that is,

from its self-projections, its desires, its longing for certainty, for security, for its own continuity, whether in the State or in God. Only then is it possible to say whether there is an absolute reality, or a series of everexpanding and more significant experiences. Surely, that is the important point, not whether your belief strengthens your conditioning, or whether your experience is of God. The moment the mind recognizes God, it is not God; the word is not the thing. Memory is not reality. That which is unnameable cannot be recognized, it is not a sensation; it is something completely different which comes into being from moment to moment; therefore, there is no continuity. As long as my mind seeks continuity, it is conditioned by its own desires; therefore it experiences that which gives it continuity, which it may call God, but which is not God. So, what is vital in this question is how the mind can free itself from its own background, conditioning; and is it ever possible to be free? That is the problem, not continued belief or disbelief, or whether belief will help you. We want God to help us in our pettiness, in our ambitions, in our pursuits. Such a God is not a help but a hindrance.

So, our problem is, can the mind free itself from its conditioning, the background in which it has been brought up, educated controlled, shaped? To be free, one has first to be aware that one is bound. The mind has to be aware of its own conditioning, of the conscious as well as of the hidden, underground conditioning - which is not a process of analysis. That is, if one part of the mind analyzes itself, goes deeply into the problem through analysis, it is not possible to free the mind from its conditioning. The mind can free it self only when it is aware of

the total process of its conditioning, and of why it accepts this conditioning; and you can be aware of it, it is not very difficult. If the mind is constantly aware of its conditioning in its relationship with nature, with people, with ideas, with things, then the whole of existence is a mirror in which you can discover without analyzing. Analysis may temporarily open the door to a few difficulties; but to free the mind from its back ground, from conditioning, from tradition, so that it is made new - that is possible only when we are aware from moment to moment with out struggle, when we see without effort what is happening within the corridors, the recesses of the mind. Only when the mind is new, free, is it capable of receiving that which is unnameable, the timeless.

August 24, 1952

OJAI 9TH PUBLIC TALK 30TH AUGUST 1952

Those who have attended these talks fairly regularly will know that we have been considering the very complex problem of change. This evening I would like to discuss, if possible, the power that brings about change, and what it is; and whether there can be a direct experiencing of that power, that energy, or what you will. I think we realize that some kind of energy, force, or power is necessary for change. Politically we see it very clearly. There are the extreme forms of tyranny, and also the more persuasive methods of bringing about a reform through the power of organization. Most of us rely on some form of compulsion, on political, religious or social coercion, because we are caught in inertia, we are lazy, slothful. For most of us, change implies danger, and so we are unwilling to go through this psychological revolution which is so essential if we are to create a world in which human beings can act cleanly, decently.

We have been considering the various approaches to this problem of change; and it seems to me that we inevitably come to the central question as to what it is that brings about this change. What is that power, that energy, that force? Compulsion, self-discipline, any kind of coercion, creates resistance; and resistance does produce energy, power, which brings about a certain form of change. You must have noticed in your own life that the more you resist something, the more energy you have; the more you discipline, the more concentrated, focused you are, the greater the power. But does that bring about a fundamental change? Is that the power that is necessary for this inward, psychological revolution?

Does the cultivation of the opposite bring about this essential transformation? If I hate, will the cultivation of love bring about a radical change? Is not the opposite of hate still within the field of hate? Is goodness the opposite of evil? Must I go through evil to find goodness? Is goodness the outcome of any form of compulsion, any form of discipline, coercion, suppression? Does not the cultivation of goodness, of compassion, of kindness, merely emphasize the "me", the self? That is, suppose I hate, and, realizing its implications, I sedulously cultivate goodness, kindness; does not that process strengthen the "me", the self? The cultivation of goodness obviously brings about a certain change; there is power, there is energy. But surely, that change is still within the field of the "me", of the self, of the mind, is it not? And as I have pointed out, the more you cultivate goodness and become conscious that you are good, the more evil there is; for evil is the outcome of the self.

Let us say you realize all this, and you also see the necessity of a fundamental transformation. How are you to bring about that revolution? What is the power, the creative energy that brings about that revolution, and how is it to be released? You have tried disciplines, you have tried the pursuit of ideals and various speculative theories: that you are God, and that if you can realize that Godhood or experience the Atman, the highest, or what you will, then that very realization will bring about a fundamental change. Will it? First you postulate that there is a reality of which you are a part, and build up round it various theories, speculations, beliefs, doctrines, assumptions, according to which you live; and by thinking and acting according to that pattern you hope to bring

about a fundamental change. Will you?

Suppose you assume, as most so called religious people do, that there is in you, fundamentally, deeply, the essence of reality; and that if, through cultivating virtue, through various forms of discipline, control, suppression, denial, sacrifice, you can get into touch with that reality, then the required transformation will be brought about. Is not this assumption still part of thought? Is it not the outcome of a conditioned mind, a mind that has been brought up to think in a particular way, according to certain patterns? Having created the image, the idea, the theory, the belief, the hope, you then look to your creation to bring about this radical change.

So, one must first see the extraordinarily subtle activities of the "me", of the mind, one must become aware of the ideas, beliefs, speculations, and put them all aside; for they are really deceptions, are they not? Others may have experienced reality; but if you have not experienced it, what is the good of speculating about it or imagining that you are in essence something real, immortal, godly? That is still within the field of thought, and any thing that springs from thought is conditioned, is of time, of memory; therefore it is not real. If one actually realizes that - not speculatively, not imaginatively or foolishly, but actually sees the truth that any activity of the mind in its speculative search, in its philosophical groping, any assumption, any imagination or hope is only self-deception - , then what is the power, the creative energy that brings about this fundamental transformation? I do not know if you have come so far in your meditations, in your thoughts, in your daily awareness as to have rejected completely all assumptions, all imaginations, all speculative hopes, fears and demands. Surely, any

person who is really seeking must come to that, must he not? And if you have come so far, what happens? What then is the force, the energy, the creative something that brings about a radical change?

You see, as long as I pursue an idea, however noble, however imaginatively godly, theoretically supreme, there is always the duality of the seeker and the thing which he seeks, is there not? There is the entity who hates, and the entity who is pursuing peace, love; the one who is good, and the other who is evil. That is our struggle, our conflict; and I think that is the central problem - how to bridge the duality, how to go beyond. That is, suppose I hate, I have no affection in my heart. My heart is full of the things of the mind; it is cunning, devious, calculating, and I realize it. Also I feel that there can be a transformation in the world only when there is more love, a state of compassion, and therefore I pursue love. So there is in me the duality of love and hate, with its struggle: the private thought and the public life, that which I am, and that which I am trying to be. There is a constant inward battle, conflict - and if we can understand that, then perhaps we shall find out how to awaken the energy, that creative something which will bring about a transformation. To understand that the thinker and the thought are one - to experience it, not repeat it verbally, which has no meaning - , that, it seems to me, is the central problem. The self, the "me" is made up of this struggle of duality, is it not? There is the "me" and the "not-me", the bundle of memories, of conditioning's, of hopes, and what it wants to be. The struggle between what is and what should be, the ever lasting conflict between what I am and what I want to be, not only consciously, but deep down, unconsciously, in the obscure recesses of my mind and

heart - is not that very struggle the process of the "me"? But if I can really experience that the thinker is the thought, the observer is the observed, then there is a release of that creative energy which brings about a fundamental transformation.

So, if you are at all aware of your self, you will know that there is this constant struggle going on, which only emphasizes, gives nourishment, strength to the "me", to the "I-ness", to the ego, to the self - whether it be the higher or the lower self, it is all the same, because it is all within the field of thought. And is not the thinker created by thought? Is the thinker separate from thought? As long as the thinker is trying to control thought, shape it, give it a certain direction, which is the process of discipline, that very struggle gives strength to the thinker and so gives vitality to the "me", and it is in this centre of the "me" that the revolution, the change must take place. And how is that to come about? I see clearly that no form of compulsion, no discipline, no incentive, no hope, no vision can bring it about, because in all these there is a duality, the what is and what should be, the observer and the observed; and as long as the observer exists, there must always be the struggle to achieve the thing which he has observed, which he has thought out. This struggle gives strength to the thinker, which is the "me", the self. I see that very clearly, so what am I to do?

Perhaps, in coming to this point, we have used the conscious mind; we have followed the argument, we have opposed or accepted it, we have seen it clearly or dimly. That is, the conscious mind is active in pursuit of what the speaker is saying. But to go further and experience more deeply requires a mind that is quiet and alert to find out, does it not? It is no longer pursuing ideas;

because, if you pursue an idea, there is the thinker following what is being said, and so you immediately create duality. If you want to go further into this matter of fundamental change, is it not necessary for the active mind to be quiet? Surely, it is only when the mind is quiet when it can understand the enormous difficulty, the complex implications of the thinker and the thought as two separate processes - the experiencer and the experienced, the observer and the observed. Revolution, this psychological, creative revolution in which the "me" is not, comes only when the thinker and the thought are one, when there is no duality as the thinker controlling thought; and I suggest it is this experience alone that releases the creative energy which in turn brings about a fundamental revolution, the break- ing up of the psychological "me". But this is an extremely difficult thing to realize, because the mind is so conditioned to struggle, to be separate, to be secure, to be permanent, that it is afraid to think of the problem anew. We have probably never experienced this state in which the thinker is absent, in which the observer is not, because we are so conditioned by the idea, so accustomed to the feeling that the thinker is all ways separate from his thought; and you are not going to experience it by merely listening to me. But if you have earnestly followed these talks and have really experimented with yourself during the past week; you are bound to come to the point when you are fully aware that there is this extraordinary division between the thinker and the thought. Most of us are still unaware of this division. We are caught up in the conflict between the thinker and the thought, in the everlasting battle of the "me", the self, to acquire, to reject, to suppress, to become something. With that we are very familiar; but

we are not aware of the division. If, becoming aware of the division, the thinker seeks to destroy it, to bridge it over, he increases the division, because then the thinker is again seeking to be something which he is not, thereby giving him self greater strength, greater security.

So, how is it possible for you and me, as individuals, to come to this experience, to this realization? We know the way of power - power through domination, power through discipline, power through compulsion. Through political power we hope to change fundamentally; but such power only breeds further darkness, disintegration, evil, the strengthening of the "me". We are familiar with the various forms of acquisition, both individually and as groups; but we have never tried the way of love, and we don't even know what it means. Love is not possible as long as there is the thinker, the centre of the "me". Realizing all this, what is one to do? Surely, the only thing which can bring about a fundamental change, a creative, psychological release, is every day watchfulness, being aware from moment to moment of our motives, the conscious as well as the unconscious. When we realize that disciplines, beliefs, ideals only strengthen the "me", and are therefore utterly futile - when we are aware of that from day to day, see the truth of it, do we not come to the central point when the thinker is constantly separating himself from his thought, from his observations, from his experiences? As long as the thinker exists apart from his thought, which he is trying to dominate, there can be no fundamental transformation. As long as the "me" is the observer, the one who gathers experience, strengthens himself through experience, there can be no radical change, no creative

release. That creative release comes only when the thinker is the thought - but the gap cannot be bridged by any effort. When the mind realizes that any speculation, any verbalization, any form of thought only gives strength to the "me", when it sees that as long as the thinker exists apart from thought there must be limitation, the conflict of duality - when the mind realizes that, then it is watchful, everlastingly aware of how it is separating itself from experience, asserting itself, seeking power. In that awareness, if the mind pursues it ever more deeply and extensively without seeking an end, a goal there comes a state in which the thinker and the thought are one. In that state there is no effort, there is no becoming, there is no desire to change; in that state the "me" is not, for there is a transformation which is not of the mind.

Question: One must obviously know the bad in order to know the good. Does this not imply the process of evolution?

Krishnamurti: Must we know drunkenness to know sobriety? Must you go through hate in order to know what it is to be compassionate? Must you go through wars, destroying your self and others, to know what peace is? Surely, this is an utterly false way of thinking, is it not? First you assume that there is evolution, growth, a moving from bad to good, and then you fit your thinking into that pattern. Obviously, there is physical growth, the little plant becoming the big tree; there is technological progress, the wheel evolving, through centuries, into the jet plane. But is there psychological progress, evolution? That is what we are discussing: whether there is a growth, an evolution of the "me", beginning with evil and ending up in good. Through a process of evolution, through time, can the "me", which is the centre of evil, ever

become noble, good? Obviously not. That which is evil, the psychological "me", will always remain evil. But we do not want to face that. We think that through the process of time, through growth and change, the "I" will ultimately become reality. That is our hope, that is our longing: that the "I" will be made perfect through time. What is this "I", this "me"? It is a name, a form, a bundle of memories, hopes, frustrations, longings, pains, sorrows, passing joys. We want this "me" to continue and become perfect, and so we say that beyond the "me" there is a "supreme", a higher self, a spiritual entity which is timeless; but since we have thought of it, that "spiritual" entity is still within the field of time, is it not? If we can think about it, it is obviously within the field of time, is it not? If we can think about it, it is obviously within the field of our reasoning.

Please, if I can think about the spiritual state, if I know what it looks like, what it tastes like, what its sensations are, it is already within the field of my knowledge; and my knowledge is based on memory, on conditioning. Surely, that which I call think about is not spiritual, timeless. Thought is the result of the past, of memory, of time; and thought has created this so-called spiritual entity because I am conditioned to accept that theory, I have been brought up from childhood to think in that way. Perhaps others are conditioned not to believe in a spiritual entity - which is actually happening in the world. They will deny that there is a spiritual entity, because they have been conditioned to think in those terms.

The mind, seeing its own impermanency, its own transiency, craves a permanent state; and the very craving creates the symbol, the sensation, the idea, the belief to which we cling. So, there is the

"me" who is transient, and the "super-me", the higher self, which we consider to be permanent; and the mind is pursuing the permanent, thereby creating duality, the conflict of the opposites. In dividing thought into the superficial "me" which is impermanent, and the "me" which is concealed, far away, timeless, spiritual, with all the various degrees between the two, I have given birth to the conflict of duality; and to achieve the timeless, I say I must have time, there must be a psychological growth, a becoming. In this process there is always the "me", the observer, and the thing which he observes and is going to gain; and in giving himself to this struggle, he strengthens his longings, his desires. And to achieve what he is after, he must have time, the future; therefore he has reincarnation - if not now, tomorrow. But if we can cut across all that, then we will see that as long as there is the thinker apart from the thought, the observer separate from the observed, there must be conflict; and through conflict there can be no understanding, no peace.

Now, is it possible for the thinker and the thought, for the observer and the observed, to be one? You will never find out if you merely glance at this problem and superficially ask me to explain what I mean by this or that. Surely, this is your problem, it is not my problem only; you are not here to find out how I look at this problem, or the problems of the world. This constant battle within, which is so destructive, so deteriorating - it is your problem, is it not? And it is also your problem how to bring about a radical change in yourself and not be satisfied with superficial revolutions in politics, in economics, in different bureaucracies. You are not trying to understand me, or the way I look at life. You

are trying to understand yourself, and these are your problems which you have to face; and by considering them together, which is what we are doing in these talks, we can perhaps help each other to look at them more clearly, see them more distinctly. But to see clearly merely at the verbal level is not enough. That does not bring about a creative psychological change. We must go beyond the words, beyond all symbols and their sensations - the symbol of love, the symbol of God, the Hindu and the Christian symbols; for, though they create certain responses, they are all at the verbal level, at the level of images. We must put aside all these things and come to the central issue: how to dissolve the "me" which is time-binding, in which there is no love, no compassion. It is possible to go beyond only when the mind does not separate itself as the thinker and the thought. When the thinker and the thought are one, only then is there silence, the silence in which there is no image-making or waiting for further experience. In that silence there is no experiencer who is experiencing, and only then is there a psychological revolution which is creative.

Question: What are the essentials of right education?

Krishnamurti: Surely, this is a very complex problem, is it not? And do you think it can be answered in a few minutes? But perhaps we can see what is important in this question.

For what are we educating our selves and our children? For war? For greater knowledge, so that we can destroy each other? For techniques, so that we can earn a livelihood? For information, culture, prestige? Actually, why are we educating our children? We really don't know, do we? How can we know when we our selves are so utterly confused? Practically everything we do leads to war,

to the destruction of our neighbours and ourselves. We are educating the child to compete, strengthening the "me", conditioning him so that he can survive in this battle; and we throw in various forms of information, knowledge. That is what we call education. Or, we condition the child to think along certain lines and act according to established patterns; we want him to be a Catholic, a Christian Scientist, a communist, a Hindu. and so on and on. So, first of all, is it not important that the educator himself be educated? Surely, education is not the mere teaching of facts - anyone can pick those up in an encyclopedia if he knows how to read. What is essential is to awaken intelligence so that the mind is able to question, to find out, and to meet life without getting caught in any form of conditioning, religious, social, or political; and for that, both the teacher and the parent have to be intelligent, have they not?

As this is a very complex problem which must be approached from different angles, we cannot merely lay down what are the essentials of right education; but we can see that what we are now doing throughout the world is false, destructive, uncreative. Creativeness is not the mere production of pictures, of inventions, it is not the writing of poems, of essays, books. That may or may not be creative. But what is important is the inward creativeness in which there is no fear, no desire for self-extension, no aggressiveness, no psychological dependence, a state in which there is a freedom, a sense of aloneness which is not loneliness. This is the truly creative state, and it is only when we have awakened it in ourselves that we can help the student in his gifts, in his studies, in his relationships, without emphasizing the "me". But

to break down the self-enclosing activities of the mind and come to that creativeness requires an enormous watchfulness, a constant alertness within oneself.

So, our problem is not easy; but we must begin with ourselves, must we not? Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and wisdom is not the mere repetition of someone else's experience or phrases. Wisdom has no authority; it comes into being as the mind begins to understand the depths and extensions of its own nature, which cannot be speculated upon. To discover that which is creative, we must come to it anew; the mind must be empty, free from all knowledge, from all memory. Only then is there a possibility of a new relationship and a new world.

August 30, 1952

OJAI 10TH PUBLIC TALK 31ST AUGUST 1952

As this is the last talk of the present series, perhaps it might be as well if I briefly went over what we have been discussing for the past several weeks; but in doing so, I am not making a resume, which would imply recollection of what has been said and repeating it, and that is not my intention.

What we have been discussing is the problem of change. I think most of us realize the necessity of change, not only outwardly, in the economic and social world, but primarily at the psychological level of our existence. When we consider change, we generally think in terms of superficial level. We mean the change that must take place in the relationship of nations, of groups, of communities, of races. We talk of economic and social revolution, and how to bring it about - and there the majority of us stop. We are satisfied with intellectual concepts, verbal formulations, or with the vision of a new world to which we can give our faith and for which we can sacrifice ourselves. So, we see the necessity of change; but I feel a radical change can take place, not at the periphery, on the outside, the circumference, but only at the centre, that is, at the psychological level. In discussing this problem, we have considered it from different points of view; and perhaps this morning we can approach it from the point of view of authority, and how authority prevents a fundamental change. There is the authority of knowledge, the authority of one's own experience, the authority of memory, the authority of what others say, the authority of the interpreter; and wherever the mind clings to authority, is hedged about by it, obviously there can be no radical change.

I think authority is one of the greatest hindrances that prevent this inward transformation which is so essential if there is to be an outward change in which the problem of war and starvation can be resolved. Until there is a psychological revolution, a fundamental transformation in each one of us, mere outward reformation will not bring about the desired end; and this inward change is prevented when you and I as individuals cling to authority. Most of us are afraid of change. We want things to remain as they are, particularly at the physical level if we are well off. We have a house, a little bit of property, and we are afraid of change there. We are also afraid of change in belief, because we are uncertain of the future. However intelligent, clever, so-called intellectual the mind may be, it clings to some form of belief. Belief becomes the authority, the ideal, the vision. In our relationships, in experiences, there is the desire to be secure, to continue in a particular psychological state, and we are afraid to have a fundamental change along these lines. Being afraid, the mind creates authority: political authority, the authority of religion, of belief, of dogma, the authority of one's own experience, and so on.

Is it not important to find out how the mind is constantly creating its own barriers of authority, which prevent a radical transformation? Has not each one of us a subtle form of authority? There is the authority of the book, which is knowledge; and must not knowledge be completely set aside if the mind is to be free to see the new? And can the mind ever be free from this acquisition of knowledge? By knowledge we mean information concerning what has been said by the clever, the intellectual, the people who are capable of expressing ideas very clearly, subtly; and does not

the mind, in its fear, make of this an authority to which it clings? And do we not make our own experience into authority, a pattern of action according to which we function? Do we not make believe into an authority? Because we our selves are uncertain, fearful of change, of what might happen, there is always the belief, the ideal, the ultimate reality the authority of a book, of another's experience, and of our own hope. Most of us are seeking some thing to which the mind can cling, round which the mind can build its own security, its own continuity, are we not? And can the mind ever be free from this pursuit, from the erection of these walls which hold it? Can the mind, being smothered by authority ever change? Is this not one of our problems, yours and mine? Can the mind ever be free from authority, even at the superficial level?

You may not make an authority of me because, after all, I am not saying anything which you cannot find out for yourself if you are eager, if you are alert, inquiring; but the desire for authority is always there. Being confused, you depend on interpreters to tell you what I am trying to say or not to say; you find interpreters of the truth. In yourself you are so uncertain, lost, confused, and you want someone to lead, to help you. The moment you rely on another, however great or absurd he may be, there is no freedom, hence there is no possibility of a radical change. In its own uncertainty, in its own confusion and desire to find security, the mind gradually sets up the authority of the church, of the political party, of the leader, the teacher, the book; and realizing this, the church, the State, the politicians, the cunning people, seize the authority and tell us what to think. Most of us are satisfied with authority because it gives us a continuity, a certainty, a sense of

being protected. But a man who would understand the implications of this deep psychological revolution must be free of authority, must he not? He cannot look to any authority, whether of his own creation, or imposed upon him by another. And is this possible? Is it possible for me not to rely on the authority of my own experience? Even when I have rejected all the outward expressions of authority - books, teachers, priests, churches, beliefs - , I still have the feeling that at least I can rely on my own judgment, on my own experiences, on my own analysis. But can I rely on my experience, on my judgment, on my analysis? My experience is the result of my conditioning, just as yours is the result of your conditioning, is it not? I may have been brought up as a Mohammedan, or a Buddhist, or a Hindu, and my experience will depend on my cultural, economic, social and religious background, just as yours will. And can I rely on that? Can I rely for guidance, for hope, for the vision which will give me faith, on my own judgment, which again is the result of accumulated memories, experiences the conditioning of the past meeting the present? Can I analyze my own problems? And if I do, is the analyzer different from the thing that he has analyzed?

Now, when I have put all these questions to myself and I am aware of this problem, I see there can be only one state in which reality, newness, can come into being, which brings about a revolution. That state is when the mind is completely empty of the past; when there is no analyzer, no experiencer, no judgment, no authority of any kind. After all, is this not one of our deep problems? As long as the mind is crippled by the past, burdened with knowledge, with memories, with judgments, the new cannot

be; as long as the mind is the centre of the self, the "me", which is the result of time, there is no possibility of the timeless. I do not know what the timeless, that ultimate reality is; but I see that I cannot possibly be aware of anything other than my own creations as long as the mind is merely in a state of experiencing, analyzing, judging, following.

So, if I am really anxious to find out whether there is anything new, the mind must see the nature of its own creations, its own illusions. And I think this is one of our greatest difficulties, because our whole education is to worship the intellect, the mind. So many books have been written about the mind, and every thing that we have read is guiding, shaping, conditioning us. This is not a matter of agreement or disagreement with me; but are you not aware of these things in your own life? And a mind which is crippled by the past, by one's own experiences, by one's own motives, urges, demands, ambitions, beliefs, by the everlasting striving to be something - how can such a mind ever be capable of seeing new? If you are at all aware of your own inner problems, and see that the political, religious and economic crises of the whole world are interrelated with the psychological conflicts, you are bound to put these questions to yourself. Any change that takes place without freeing the mind of the past, is still within the field of time, therefore within the field of corruption; and surely such a change is no change at all, it is merely a continuation of the old in a different form.

Being aware of all this, I ask myself, as you must also, whether the mind can possibly be free, completely empty of the past, and so capable of seeing something which is not of its own projection, of

its own manufacture. To find out if it is possible, you have to experiment - which means that you must distrust completely any form of authority, self imposed, or imposed by outward circumstances. And authority works very subtly. You are being influenced by me, you are bound to be. But if you are only being influenced, then there will be no radical change - it's merely a sensation which will react and throw off this influence, taking on another. Whereas, if you are deeply concerned with the problem of fundamental change, then you will see directly for yourself that this change must come about if there is to be peace in the world, if there is to be no starvation when many are well fed. If there is to be the universal well-being of man, there must be a change, not at the superficial level, but at the centre. The centre is the "me", the "I", which is ever lastingly accumulating negatively; and one of its ways of acquisition is through authority. Through authority it has continuance. So, if you and I realize this, then the problem arises, can the mind empty itself of its whole content, can it be free of all the things that have been put upon it, imposed and self imposed? It is only when the mind is empty that there is a possibility of creation; but I do not mean this superficial emptiness which most of us have. Most of us are superficially empty, and it shows itself through the desire for distraction. We want to be amused, so we turn to books, to the radio, we run to lectures, to authorities; the mind is everlastingly filling itself. I am not talking of that emptiness, which is thoughtlessness. On the contrary, I am talking of the emptiness which comes through extraordinary thoughtfulness, when the mind sees its own power of creating illusion and goes beyond.

Creative emptiness is not possible as long as there is the thinker who is waiting, watching, observing in order to gather experience, in order to strengthen himself. And can the mind ever be empty of all symbols, of all words with their sensations so that there is no experiencer who is accumulating? Is it possible for the mind to put aside completely all the reasoning's, the experiences, the impositions, authorities, so that it is in a state of emptiness? You will not be able to answer this question, naturally; it is an impossible question for you to answer, because you do not know, you have never tried. But, if I may suggest, listen to it, let the question be put to you, let the seed be sown; and it will bear fruit if you really listen to it, if you do not resist it, if you do not say, "How can the mind be empty? If it is empty, it cannot function, it cannot do its daily job". And what is its daily job? Routine, boredom, tiresome continuity. We all know that. So, it seems to me important to find out for yourself; and to find out, you must listen, inquire. When I am talking, I am helping you to inquire, I am not putting something across or over to you. I also am inquiring. That is the purpose of these talks.

After all these weeks of talking, of going into this problem of change, we must ultimately come to this question, whether the mind can ever be empty so that it can receive the new. It is only the new that can transform, turn of the old, any change is a modified continuity of the old; there is nothing new in that, there is nothing creative. The creative can come into being only when the mind itself is new; and the mind can renew itself only when it is capable of seeing all its own activities, not only at the superficial level, but deep down. When the mind sees its own activities, is aware of its

own desires, demands, urges, pursuits the creation of its own authorities, fears; when it sees in itself the resistance created by discipline, by control, and the hope which projects beliefs, ideals - when the mind sees through, is aware of this whole process, can it put aside all these things and be new, creatively empty? You will find out whether it can or cannot only if you experiment without having an opinion about it, without wanting to experience that creative state. If you want to experience it, you will; but what you experience is not creative emptiness, it is only a projection of desire. If you desire to experience the new, you are merely indulging in illusion. But if you begin to observe, to be aware of your own activities from day to day, from moment to moment, watching the whole process of your self as in a mirror, then, as you go deeper and deeper, you will come to the ultimate question of this emptiness in which alone there can be the new. Truth, God, or what you will, is not something to be experienced; for the experiencer is the result of time, the result of memory, of the past; and as long as there is the experiencer, there cannot be reality. There is reality only when the mind is completely free from the analyzer, from the experiencer and the experienced.

Now can you not just listen to this as the soil receives the seed and see if the mind is capable of being free, empty? It can be empty only by understanding all its own projections, its own activities, not off and on, but from day to day, from moment to moment, then you will find the answer, then you will see that the change comes without your asking, that the state of creative emptiness is not a thing to be cultivated - it is there, it comes darkly, without any invitation; and only in that state is there a

possibility of renewal, newness, revolution.

Question: I read recently of a Hindu girl who could easily solve problems in higher mathematics which were difficult for even the greatest mathematicians. How can you explain this except by reincarnation?

Krishnamurti: Isn't it very odd how we are satisfied by explanations? You have a particular theory of continuity, which is reincarnation. You have that belief, that conviction. I don't know why, but you have it - or rather, we do know why: because you want to continue. Having that belief, that explanation, you want to fit everything round it; and the authority of your belief cripples your discovery of the new. This girl's extraordinary faculty may or may not be the result of reincarnation; but surely, what is important is to find out your own state, not that of the girl, why your mind is caught and crippled by words, explanations. Good gracious me, there can be a dozen explanations for this; but why do you as an individual choose the particular explanation that satisfies you? That is important to find out, is it not? Because, if you go into it, you will discover how your mind is crippled by belief, by sensation, by the desire for your own continuity. Surely, that which continues cannot be the new. Only in dying is there the new. But we don't want to die, we want to continue. Our whole social structure, all our religious beliefs, are based on this continuity of the "me", of the "I", which means we are afraid of death, of coming to an end. Being afraid, we have innumerable explanations to cover up that fear; and the more we what is this fear? Please follow this: what is this fear of not being, of not continuing? What is the "you" that wants to continue? Is it not your property, the things that you have

gathered in your house, the furniture, the radio, the washing machine, the qualities, the virtues you have struggled to gain, the name, the reputation, the memories and experiences? And if you really go into it, look at it earnestly, what are all these things? What are they but empty words, symbols that give you sensations; and these sensations we cling to. It is that we want to continue; and so there is never the new, there is never a death, but a postponement. It is only in dying that you see the new; it is only in putting an end to the old that there is a possibility of something creative. And is it possible to die from day to day? Is it possible not to hoard resentments, ideas, goals, to put an end to this process of achievement which gives birth to everlasting strife? Fear is a thing which we have never looked at; death we have never faced. We watch other people die, but we don't know what death means because we are afraid of it; so we run away through explanations, through words, through ideas, beliefs. And can the mind face fear? Can the mind look at it? What is this fear? Is it a word, or an actuality? Please listen, find out. The thing which we are afraid of, is it the word "fear", or something which is actual? There is the fact of death; but we have ideas, opinions about death. The ideas about the fact create the fear. It is the word about the fact that creates the fear - not the fact itself. And can the mind be free of the word and look at the fact? Which means, really, looking at the fact without the activity of the mind. The mind is active only in words, in symbols, in opinions; so the mind creates the barrier and looks through the barrier at the fact, and therefore there is fear. Can the mind look at the fact without having an idea about it, without an opinion, a judgment? If it can, then there is a complete revolution,

is there not? Then there is a possibility of going beyond death.

Question: What is suffering?

Krishnamurti: Let us inquire and find out. There is the physical pain which gradually becomes a mental suffering, and which the mind uses to create situations, problems, either to strengthen or to diminish itself. Then there is the suffering caused by not being loved sufficiently, by wanting love; there is suffering through death, when you love some body and that somebody is gone; there is suffering through frustration, the suffering which comes when you are ambitious and cannot achieve your ambition; there is suffering through the loss of your property, through ill health. What does all this indicate? What is this thing that we call suffering? Is it not that through these activities of the mind the self-enclosing process of the "me" becomes more and more accentuated, strengthened? When you become aware that you are enclosed, held, is that not suffering? Does not suffering exist when you are conscious of yourself, of your battles, of your striving's, of your frustrated ambitions? The more you are caught in the conflicts of the self, the more there is of suffering. So, suffering is a reaction of the self; and to understand the implications of suffering is to go into the whole process of the "me", of the "I" - which is what we have been doing in these talks.

Suffering is an indication of the activities of the mind. Suffering is not to be denied; but most of us try to cover it up, we run away from it through explanations, through satisfying words. We do not go into the problem of suffering, which is to expose the "me" in its nakedness; and when it is suddenly exposed, we do not dwell with it, we do not watch it, we try to escape. In escape there is creates

further conflict, further struggle; so we are caught in this ever lasting process of suffering. Whereas, if, when suffering comes, we are capable of looking at that nakedness, that loneliness, that emptiness which is the self, only then is there a possibility of going beyond it.

Question: What is meditation?

Krishnamurti: Perhaps you and I can find out together what meditation is, so let us go into it. You are not waiting for an answer from me, so that you can be satisfied by words, by explanations. You and I are going to find out what meditation actually is.

What is meditation? Sitting cross-legged, or lying down, relaxed? Obviously, there must be relaxation of the body; but, though your body is relaxed, your mind is very active, chattering away endlessly. Being aware of this, you say, "I must control it, I must stop it, there must be a certain sense of quietness". So, you begin to control, to discipline your mind. Please follow all this, and you will see. You spend years in controlling, disciplining your chattering mind; your energy is spent in making the mind conform to a desired pattern, but you never succeed; and if you do succeed, your mind becomes so weary, lethargic, empty, dull. Obviously, that is not meditation. On the contrary, the mind must be supremely alert, not caught in a routine of habit, discipline.

So, I see that my mind, though it is chattering endlessly, cannot be disciplined, made to fit into a particular pattern of thought. Then how is it to be calmed? How is the chattering mind to be quiet? Just see the implications of the problem. If the observer, the analyzer, imposes a discipline on the chattering mind, then there is a conflict between the observer, the analyzer and the thing he has

observed, analyzed. The thinker is struggling to make his thought conform to the pattern which he desires, which is to calm the mind; so he disciplines it, he controls, dominates, suppresses it, in which is involved the conflict of duality. There is a division between the observer and the observed, and in that division there is conflict; and meditation is obviously not an endless process of conflict.

So, how is the mind, which is ceaselessly chattering, to be quiet? When I ask that question, what is the state of your mind? Please watch yourself. What is the state of your mind when I put that question? You are accustomed to discipline, control, but now you see its absurdity, its illusory nature; therefore, the state of your mind is that you do not know how to quiet the mind. You are finished with explanations, with knowledge, which is conditioning; the actual fact is that your mind is chattering, and you do not know how to quiet it. So, what is the state of your mind? You are really inquiring, are you not? You are watching, you have no answer. All that you know is that your mind is chattering, and you want to find out how the mind can be quiet - but not according to a method. Surely, the moment you put to your self the question, "How is the mind to be quiet, cease from chattering"? you have already entered the realm in which the mind is quiet, have you not? You know that your mind is active, ceaselessly battering, one layer against another layer, the observer fighting the observed, the experiencer wanting more; you are aware of the incessant vagaries of thought, and you actually do not know how to reduce it, how it is to be quiet. You eject all methods, because they have no meaning. To follow a method, to copy a pattern only cripples the mind through habit. Habit is not meditation. The routine of a discipline does not free

the mind so that it can discover the new. So, you reject all that completely; but you still have the question, how is the mind to be quiet? the moment you put that question to yourself really, vitally, actually, what then is the state of your mind? Is it not quiet? It is no longer chattering, analyzing, judging; it is watching, observing, because you don't know. The very state of not knowing is the beginning of quietness. You discover that as long as there is the struggle between the desired pattern and that which you are, there must be a battle; and this battle is a waste of energy, which creates inertia. So, the mind sees the falseness of all that and rejects it. As it observes, the mind becomes quiet; yet there is still the problem of the thinker apart from thought, so there is again a battle.

Meditation is all this process, not just a limited process with a particular end. It is this vast searching, groping, not being caught in any particular idea, belief, or experience, being aware that any projection of the mind is illusion, hypnosis. And if you go into it more and more deeply, not with a motive, not with any desire for a particular result, but simply watching the whole process of yourself, then you will see that, with out any form of compulsion, suppression or discipline, the mind becomes creatively empty, still. That stillness will not give you any riches in this world - do not translate it so quickly into dollars. If you approach it with a begging bowl, it will offer you nothing. That stillness is free from all sense of continuity, in it there is no experiencer who is experiencing. When the experiencer is there, it is no longer stillness, it is merely a continuation of sensation. Meditation is all this process, which brings about a state in which the mind is still, no longer projecting, desiring, defending, judging, experiencing. In

that state the new can be. The new is not to be verbalized; it has no words to explain it, therefore it is not communicable. It is something that comes into being when the mind itself is new; and this whole, complex process of self-knowledge is meditation.

August 31, 1952

BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 8TH FEBRUARY 1953

As we are going to have a series of ten talks, I think it is very important to establish the relationship between the speaker and yourselves; otherwise, Sirs, we shall have misconceptions, and inevitably misunderstandings will follow from those misconceptions. You see, I am speaking not to convince anyone of you of any particular theory, or of a particular mode of conduct, or to drive in certain ideas, because the intention is not in any way propagandistic. Propaganda implies the conditioning of certain minds to certain attitudes. That is not my intention at all. If you have ideas of which you want to be convinced, if you want to have certain ideas to cherish, to follow, if you want a definite course of thought leading to certain results, or if you wish to bring about a certain revolution in ideas, I am afraid, you will be very much mistaken. Because, I feel that what is fundamentally important is the revolution in the unconscious - not the conscious revolution; and of this, I shall explain presently when we go on with the talk.

But before we do that, as I said, you and I must know each other, not only at the verbal level but more deeply, if we can. Because, if we can know your intention as well as mine, then there is a possibility of our meeting together to talk over our problems. But if you have certain set-up ideas, and I contrary ideas, then obviously there is no meeting point between us. So, I think it is very important that we should from the very beginning establish the right relationship between us. I am not your guru, or a leader; so you cannot look up to me. I do not think that our problem, the

present crisis in which we are, can dissolve in any way by following any leader, political or religious, or any guru. As I said, it requires a fundamental revolution in the unconscious, not merely a change of ideas on the superficial level.

So, is it not very important to find out what I am going to say or what I have said? Because, I am not going to convince you of anything. This is not propagandistic. I mean what I say; I am not here to convince you of any particular idea. Conviction implies the process of rejection and acceptance, confirmation or denial; and that is not my intention at all. What we are trying to do is to find out the true answer, the right answer to all our problems. You can only find the right answer when you are not projecting any particular idea, when you are not merely accepting a certain thesis and rejecting your own particular form of thinking. We are concerned with the whole problem of thinking and not what to think. That is, without thinking rightly, obviously, all our actions will lead us to further confusion. So what we are concerned with is not the rejection or the acceptance of ideas, but how to think rightly together - that is, our relationship together - to find out how to think about the problems that confront us, rightly. I am using the word `rightly' not in contradiction; there is only one way of thinking, not the right or the wrong. We shall find out if it is at all possible to pursue a thought and discover the truth of that thought, of that particular problem.

Is it not important to differentiate between hearing and listening? Most of us casually hear, as we hear the noise that is going on; and gradually, we get accustomed to hear particular noises, and then we pass them by. We read papers and we hear the

familiar voices about us. But there is a difference, is there not?, between hearing and listening? In listening, there is neither acceptance nor rejection; you really listen to find out. You listen to another person, to find out what he wants to convey, not merely at the verbal level, but at deeper levels of understanding. But listening is denied if we merely object or interpose our particular ideas, instead of really listening to find out actually what the other man is saying. After all, we know our minds, so that we have not to listen to that; but perhaps if we can listen without any interpretation, without translation, if we can really listen, then perhaps there may be a possibility of that radical revolution at the unconscious level, which is the only revolution that is worthwhile.

We have got innumerable problems; and the more we consciously think about them and try to resolve them, the greater the complications, the more the problems. Because we are dealing with problems which are not the products of the superficial mind but which are the result of deep unconscious struggles, conflicts, ambitions, strifes, without a fundamental and radical change at that deep level, the mere tinkering reformation on the superficial level - economic, social, political or otherwise - will have very little significance. You can see that revolutions have not fundamentally altered the process of our living. The change at the conscious level is merely a modified continuity because there the mind is superficially calculating, judging, weighing; but the calculating, weighing and judging process is a continuity of that which is conditioned; so through that, you have not resolved the problem at all; you have only modified it, only altered its course; but the course is still confused.

As long as we tackle our problems on the superficial level, with the conscious mind, opposing idea by idea, argument by argument, cunning by cunning, logic by logic - which are all reactions of the superficial mind - obviously the results which the mind has thought out will be the product of conditioned thought. Therefore in that process there is no fundamental deep psychological revolution. I think what is important now is not the revolution on the superficial level, but the revolution at the deep unconscious level, because we live there much more, and have our being there more than on the superficial level.

So, is it not important to listen, so that the unconscious is absorbing, if I can so put it - so that the revolution is not a conscious revolution? I think it is very important to so listen that the change is unconscious, that our whole outlook on life is not a conscious, deliberate alteration, but that revolution which comes without the deliberate process of thought.

After all we have so many problems at different levels, economic, social, religious; the problem of love, death, the problem of relationship, starvation, what is God, if there is continuity, what is mortality, what is that state of 'timelessness', what is creativity, so on and so on. We have innumerable problems and we have always approached these problems with the intention of solving them by the conscious mind, by the everyday mind, by the mind that has thoughts, by the mind that is the result of time, that is the result of tradition, that is the result of so-called education - which is the process of conditioning to a particular thought or pattern or particular action, such as Communist, Socialist, Capitalist or Catholic. And with that conditioning we approach the

innumerable problems; and obviously, a conditioned mind can never solve these problems.

We need to have quite a different approach, quite a different revolution - psychologically, inwardly, fundamentally. I think that is only possible when you know how to listen to everything, not to me only, but to the conversation that is taking place about you, the talk that you have with your wife, with your husband, with your children, with your boss, on the tramcar, on the bus, when you are listening to the beggar or to a song, when you listen to the birds or to the surge of the sea. If you know how to listen without interpretation, without translation, then there is a possibility of that unconscious revolution taking place. I think that is the revolution which is most essential at the present times - not the chain of leaders, not which political system you should follow; because they have all failed completely; because the systems they have advocated or created are the result of the conditioned mind, and their result will still be conditioned and so you will be everlastingly caught in the net of problems; that way does not lead to human happiness, human creativity, and the discovery of what is true.

The discovery of what is true does not come about through a conscious effort. If we really understood this - it is my intention during these talks to approach this problem from every point of view - we come to that state when the conscious mind realizes it is incapable of dealing with these problems. Then perhaps there is a possibility of uncovering a different source of action, a different source by which or through the discovery of which we shall find a new way of thinking, feeling, living, being.

Our problems are not individual - because there is no such

entity as an 'individual'. The individual, you, may have a different name, a different form, you may live in a separate house; but the content of your mind is the content of my mind also. What you think, I think; you are ambitious, so am I; what you are, I am, and your neighbour is. It is a collective problem, not an individual problem. You, as an individual conditioned to a certain set of ideas, cannot dissolve this problem of existence; you can only resolve it when you and I can think out the problem together and not separately. The collective action can only come, take place, when there is thinking which is not collective. But as we know now, collective action implies collective thinking; collective thinking is conditioned thinking; and that is what we are concerned with, through various forms of propaganda, education, compulsion, concentration camps, and so on and so on. You are made to think collectively, traditionally, whether that tradition is new or old; you are made to conform, to think along a collective line, thereby hoping you will produce collective action; but collective action is not possible as collective thinking is only conditioned thinking.

We will discuss that as we go along. But surely there is a way of acting which is not yours or mine, which is not the Communist, Socialist or Catholic, or the Christian or the Hindu or the Buddhist; that is the way of acting which springs from the discovery of what is Truth. The discovery of what is Truth is not dependent on you and me, on your conditioned mind or on my conditioned mind. That discovery of what is Truth can only come about when you and I recognise our conditioned mind, our conditioned state.

If you and I can discover what is Truth, from there, there is collective action. But collective thinking does not lead to collective

action, it only leads to further misery which is actually shown at the present time. But, if we can, you and I together - because, it is not I who am leading you and you who are following me - we shall uncover the process of our thinking. I cannot uncover it for you and you merely accept or deny; you have to uncover it as we go on together; you have to observe your own state of mind, not only at the conscious level but also unconsciously, at every moment of the day, in your relationships, not only while you are hearing me here but when you have gone away from here.

The feeling that discovery of truth is not individual, that truth is neither collective nor individual but it is truth, can only come about when you understand the whole process of thinking. Thinking is collective; you cannot think independently; there is no individual thinking; what you think is the collective thinking, because you are conditioned as a Hindu, Christian, or a Mussulman; because you are holding yourself in the frame of tradition which is collective thinking. You may be conditioned in the framework of the supposed individual but the framework is collective; or you may be conditioned as a Communist but the conditioning is still collective. The collective can never find what is true nor can the individual, because there is no individual thinking, because all is collective thinking.

Please listen to this; don't reject it; find out the truth of what I am saying.

After all, the words that I am using, the thoughts that I am expressing, the ways of our thinking, all this is the result of collective thought and action; though I may call myself a separate individual, give myself a name, live in a hovel or in a rich house,

the whole process of me is the collective. Can the collective ever find what is true? The collective is the conditioned mind, it is a mind that is bound to tradition, to authority, to every form of fear, conscious or unconscious, it is a mind that is constantly seeking security. Can such a mind which is the collective mind find what is truth? Truth is that which is uncontaminated, which cannot be conceived, which cannot be premeditated or read about in books, which cannot be given to you by another. The only solution of our problems is the discovery of what is Truth. That is the only revolution which will radically affect our existence, our daily everyday life, our daily life of relationship.

As the discovery of what is truth is of vital significance and importance, should we not coming to these talks for the next five weeks or so earnestly enquire if the mind is capable of peeling itself from all its conditioning and perhaps thereby discovering what is truth? This discovery of what is Truth does not come about through any conscious effort. I think it is very important to understand that you cannot come to Truth. Truth can come about only unknowingly when you are not expecting. Every form of expectation, every form of hope, is a form of projection - the projection of `the me', `the me' being the collective. And so our problem is: the understanding of conflict, of struggle, the everyday life, our relationships, our ambitions, our passions and pursuits, our imitativeness and the appalling degradation that is going on within us, the corruption, the darkness, the death that is constantly with us; being aware of all that, to discover something which is beyond the mind. And that state can only come into being when we understand the process of our mind, not when we try to imagine

what it is, or speculate about it. It is only when we understand the process of our thinking, how our minds are conditioned completely, then only is there a possibility of discovering what is Truth, which alone will liberate us from our problems.

After every brief talk I shall be answering questions and I am afraid you will be disappointed if you are waiting for an answer. The mind that is expecting an answer is a schoolboy mind, because you are only concerned with the results, like a schoolboy who looks at the end of the book to find the answer without really studying the problem or going into the problem deeply. When you put questions, you want answers; most of you are not interested in questions, you just want an answer - an answer being an explanation or combination of explanations. So, you who are seeking the answer, are not really concerned with the problem.

Sirs, please don't take photographs. Sirs, may I say something? This is a serious meeting; I regard it as a religious meeting - in the deeper sense of the word, not in the religious sense which is stupid. There must be a certain sense of dignity, and that is not possible when you are asking for autographs, taking photographs, yawning. It requires seriousness. When you are serious, you are quiet; you do not fidget about; you are concentrating, listening. So, please do not take photographs or take notes, because then you are not paying attention, you are not listening. As this is a serious meeting, and as you have come with serious intention, let us spend an hour with the purpose of understanding and finding out, because our problems are tremendous, because we are destroying each other.

As I was saying, a mind that is only concerned with an answer which is a result, which is really the combination of explanations,

is satisfied with words; such a mind can never understand what the problem is. As I am concerned with only the problem and not with the answer, you will be disappointed if you are waiting for an answer. You will say, I cannot put my teeth into it. But if we can see, the answer is in the problem; the answer to the problem is in understanding the truth of the problem. But the discovery of the Truth is a very arduous process. It requires mature thinking - not glib answers or conclusions or judgments, either of the left or of the right, or what you have learnt in your books or from your experiences. It requires real consideration. As we are only concerned to uncover, to discover the ways of our thinking and thereby to find out how to bring about that fundamental revolution, perhaps we can go together into these problems, in the maze of questions.

Question: There is a famine in this country; men starve, and you sit here talking of things which do not fill empty stomachs. Are you not helping us to lose all sense of responsibility to our starving neighbours?

Krishnamurti: If I offered an escape through some means, dialectical or religious, or some kind of phony arguments, that would be an irresponsible action, would it not? But if together we can find out how to solve this problem, not only in this country but throughout the world, then perhaps we shall not be sitting talking in vain. Can these stomachs which are empty now be filled by any system by any economic system, by any revolution at the economic or political level? If you had a new kind of revolution - it does not matter what you call it - which will alter the top layer of bureaucrats, will that solve our problem? We think it will. We hope

that if there is a revolution of values, of economic systems, we shall be able to feed the world. Is that possible? Is revolution economic, or is revolution a total process not just a partial process? After all, we have had revolutions based on economic systems, and they have not fed men. They have always promised that they will feed men; but in that promise there are always concentration camps, tyranny, totalitarianism, wars, destruction, more misery. We are quite familiar with this; the newspaper every morning carries it.

Is our problem the problem of the part - which is, economic revolution - or the problem of the total - which is, revolution in our thinking? When we are talking about starvation, we are concerned about giving food to starving people - which is only the part, though an essential part, and which is only one segment of our existence. The more we concentrate on the one part, one corner of our whole life, we will never solve the problem. We can solve the problem only when we comprehend the whole picture; then we can completely understand; then we can apply our understanding to the part. But from the part we cannot go to the whole. All our revolutions are based on the change of the part, not of the whole.

I am talking of the whole total process of our being, not of the part. Real revolution is and must be always in the total being, in the total thinking and not in the part thinking. We don't live by bread alone. We need bread, we need food, we need clothes, we need shelter; but if we emphasize them, if we are concerned with alterations or with revolution in the economic field only, then we shall invariably end in greater confusion and misery. But if we can understand the total process of our being and bring about a

revolution in the psyche - in the inward nature of our being - then we can apply that revolution, that understanding, to the part.

Surely, that is our problem. Please don't misunderstand. There must be no neglect of food, clothing, shelter; on the contrary, they must be provided. But there must be the right approach to it; and the right approach can only come about, not on the superficial level but only when there is a fundamental revolution in our being, in our thinking, in the psychological state of our existence. We have tried economic revolutions and they have not fed man; on the contrary, there is more misery, more destruction, more wars. It is only possible to end starvation, famine, when we understand the whole and thereby bring about a revolution fundamentally, deeply.

Question: We have heard you for many years. Still we are mean, ugly and full of hatred. Often we feel abandoned by you. We know you have not accepted us as disciples, but need you shirk your responsibility completely towards us? Should you not see us through?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, this is a roundabout way of asking, 'Why don't you become our guru?' (Laughter). Now, Sirs, the problem is not abandoning or seeing you through, because we are supposed to be grown-up people. At least physically we are grown-up; mentally, we are the age of fourteen and fifteen; and we want somebody glorified, a Saviour, a guru, a Master, to lead us out of our misery, out of our confusion; to explain to us the chaotic state; to explain, not to bring about a revolution in our thinking, but to explain it away; and with that we are concerned.

When you put this question, you want to find a way out of this confusion; you want to be free from fear, from hatred, from all the

pettiness of life; and you look to somebody to help you. Or, other gurus have perhaps not succeeded in putting you to sleep by giving you a dose of opium, an explanation; so you turn to this person and say, 'Please help us through'. Is that our problem - the substitution of a new guru for an old one, of a new master for an old one, of a new leader for the old? Please listen to this carefully. Can anybody lead you to Truth, to the discovery of Truth? Is discovery at all possible when you are led to it? If you are led to Truth, have you discovered it, have you experienced it? Can anybody - it does not matter who it is - lead you to Truth? When you say you must follow somebody, does it not imply that Truth is stationary, that Truth is there for you to be led to, for you to look at and take?

Is Truth something to be discovered or something that you are led to? If it is something that you are led to, then the problem is very simple; then you will find the most satisfying guru or leader, and he will lead you to it. But surely the Truth of that something which you are seeking is beyond the state of explanation; it is not static; it must be experienced; it must be discovered; and you cannot experience it through guidance. How can I experience spontaneously something original, if I am told, 'This is original, experience it'? Hatred, meanness, ambition, pettiness, are your problems, and not the discovery of what is Truth. You cannot find what is Truth with a petty mind. A mind that is shallow, gossiping, stupid, ambitious - such a mind can never find what is Truth. A petty mind will create only a petty thing; it will be petty, empty; it will create a shallow God. So our problem now is not to find, not to discover what God is, but to see first how petty we are.

Sir, look. If I know that I am petty, that I am miserable, that I

am unhappy, then I can deal with it. But if I am petty and say, 'I must not be petty, I must be big', then I am running away - which is pettiness. Please understand this.

What is important is to understand and discover what is, not to transform what is into something else. After all, a stupid mind, even if it is trying to become very cunning, clever, intelligent, is still stupid because its very essence is stupidity. We do not listen. We want somebody to lead our pettiness to something bigger and we never accept, we never see what is, actually. The discovery of what is, the actuality, is important; it is the only thing that matters. At any level - economic, social, religious, political, psychological - what is important is to discover exactly what is, not what should be.

Please listen. In this question there are several things implied. The questioner wants someone to help him to free himself from the complications of his life; so he is seeking a leader. The leader whom he seeks is the outcome of his confusion, of his misery; and therefore the leader is himself confused. Sir, don't you know what is happening in the world? You are confused with all this turmoil, and a political leader comes along; you vote for him out of your confusion; and so you have created a politician who is also confused; and he is leading you. Similarly, the guru or the teacher or the leader whom you choose; you choose him out of your confusion, out of your desire for gratification, to get security; so you project what you want, and that guru is your creation. Because he is going to satisfy you, you accept what he gives - which indicates that you are never confronted with what is in yourself, with actually what you are. It is only when your mind is not

running away, avoiding, pursuing the ideal - that is, when the mind says, 'This should not be, but that should be', and so on - that you can discover how to deal with what is. Then you will solve the problem. You can only solve the problem when you discover what is actually 'the me'. If you know that you are petty, that your mind is shallow, that you have hatred for people, when you are aware of that fact, then you can deal with that fact. We can discuss how to deal with that fact. But if you say, 'I must not hate, I must love', then you are entering into an ideological world - which is the most stupid way of escape from what is.

So, in this question, we are not concerned with the understanding of the truth of our problems. It is only the Truth that will free us. Understanding comes only when we are not following anybody, where there is no authority of any kind - either the authority of tradition, the authority of books, the authority of the guru, or the authority of our own experience. Our own experience is the result of our conditioning, and such an experience cannot help us to discover what is Truth.

So those who are really earnest, who really want to find out the truth of these problems must obviously set aside all authority. That is very difficult because most of us are so frightened. We want somebody to lean on, somebody to encourage us, the big brother - the big brother in Russia or in England or in America or behind the Himalayas, or round the corner. We all want someone to help us. As long as we lean on somebody, we shall never understand the process of our own thinking; so, we shall deny the discovery of Truth for ourselves.

Please listen to this; don't reject it because you have not solved

your problem, because you are just as unhappy as you were before. When you are following your guru or your political leaders, you are confused. There is only one way to resolve this problem, and that is through the understanding of yourself in your relationships, from moment to moment, from day to day - the antagonisms, the hates, the passions, the transitory love and so on. You are caught in it and you can only resolve it when you accept it, see it as it is. It is only when you resolve that, there is a possibility of freeing the mind from its own conditioning and thereby letting Truth be.

Question: Do you have a technique which I can learn from you, so that I too can carry your message to those who are full of sorrow?

Krishnamurti: Sir, what do you mean by carrying a message? Do you mean repeating the words - propaganda? The very nature of propaganda is to condition the mind. Every form of propaganda - the Communist propaganda, the religious propaganda, and so on - is to condition the mind, is it not? If you learn a technique, as you call it, a way, and you learn it by heart and repeat it, you will be a good propagandist; if you are keen, clever, if you are capable of using words, you will condition those that hear you, in a new way instead of the old way; but it is still conditioning, it is still limited. And that is our problem, is it not?

Our problems arise because we are conditioned. Our education conditions us. Is it possible for the mind ever to be free from conditioning? You can only discover that state. You cannot say whether it is possible or not possible. When you ask, 'Have you a technique?', what do you mean? Perhaps you mean a method; a system, which you learn like a schoolboy and repeat it. Sir, surely

the problem is something much more fundamental, radically different, is it not? There is no technique to learn. You do not have to carry my message, what you carry is your message, not mine, Sirs.

This existence, this misery, this confusion is your problem. If you understand it, if you can understand the experience of a conditioned mind and go beyond, then you will be the person who is teaching; then there will be no teacher and no disciple. But then, you have to understand yourself, not learn my technique or carry my message. Sir, what is important is to understand that this is our world, that together we can build this world happily, that we - you and I - are related together, that what you do and what I do inwardly matters, that how we think is important, and that thought which is always conditioned will not solve our problem. What will solve our problem is to understand the ways of our thinking. The moment we understand how we think, there will be a radical change inwardly; we will no longer be Hindus, Christians, Communists, Socialists, or Capitalists; we shall be human beings, human beings with passion, with love, with consideration. That cannot come about by merely learning a technique or carrying somebody's message.

You cannot have love through technique. You can have sensation through a technique, but that is not love. Love is something that cannot be told, that cannot be carried across through newspapers or through techniques or through propaganda. It must be felt, it must be understood. But if you repeat love, love, love, it has no meaning. You will know of that love when the mind is quiet, when the mind is free from its conditioning, from its

anxieties, from its fears. And it is that love which is the true revolution that will alter the whole process of our being.

February 8, 1953

BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 11TH FEBRUARY 1953

As we were saying last Sunday, the conscious effort made to bring about alteration in one's attitude to values or ideals does not fundamentally or radically bring about a change. I may have to go deeply into that problem because I feel it is very important that we understand this question of how to bring about a fundamental change, what is the process and how it can come about. Most of us consciously endeavour, in one way or another, to conform to a certain pattern of action - political, religious or so-called spiritual. Consciously we make an effort with deliberate intention to bring about a certain change, either within oneself or within society, economically or culturally. We make every kind of effort, consciously, at the upper level of our mind, to bring about what we call a change. Is such a change a radical revolution: Or does it merely bring about a temporary effect at the superficial level - which is not fundamental transformation. The more we see, the more we observe in the world and in ourselves this superficial change, we see that it only produces more problems, not only within ourselves but in our relationships, in society.

I think it is fairly obvious, if you think it out a little more deeply, that the more we make an effort consciously to change, to bring about a transformation within ourselves, the more problems we have. That is, I want to change: I am angry or I am greedy or what you will. I make a conscious effort to change; and in the process of that change there are various forms of resistances, of suppressions and sublimations; there is constant effort made, and

thereby there are more problems involved in the very desire to bring about a change in myself.

I do not know if you have noticed that the more we make an effort the more the complications, the more the problems. So perhaps there is a different form of approach to this question. However much the conditioned mind may make an effort to change itself, does it not produce further conditions, responses and activities which further increase our problems? So, if we realize that, there must be a different approach to this problem of change, a radical transformation within ourselves. I suggested last Sunday that this transformation, this revolution can only be at the unconscious level, not at the conscious level at all; because all effort is a process of imitation, and therefore there is no fundamental change.

There is only fundamental change, radical transformation, when the conscious mind has ceased to make all effort, which means really that there is understanding at the unconscious level. That is why I said that it is very important how we listen to everything about us, not only to what I am saying but to every incident, to every thought, to the sounds about you, to the voice of the bird, to the noise of the sea, so that as you listen you begin to understand without any conscious effort. The moment you make a conscious effort, the process of imitation is set going, the imitation being conformity to the pattern which is already being established through the experience, through the ideal, through the desire to achieve a result. If we really comprehend this, I think there will be a fundamental revolution in ourselves. If we comprehend that all psychological effort, in any form, leads to imitation, to conformity,

we see that when we desire to be efficient, directive, purposeful in our effort, there must be a process of imitation, conformity; and so, there is no change at all; there is only a change of the pattern of action, from one pattern to another, from one reaction to another; and therefore we only increase our problems.

Is it possible to bring about a revolution outwardly as well as inwardly, without effort? Please, this is not a cynical question to be brushed off easily. We see that every effort we have made has not produced the thing we have searched out and longed for, worked for - politically, religiously or economically. Therefore that approach must be utterly wrong. If that is not the right approach, there must be a different approach to all our problems.

Can the mind which is the result of time, of imitation, of the desire to seek security and conformity, can such a conditioned mind ever - however much it may make an effort - bring about a change? Can such a mind bring about a revolution within itself? That is, to put the question differently, will conscious effort, the action of will, bring about a change? We are used to the action of will - 'I must or I must not; 'I shall be or I shall not be; 'there must be good'. 'there must be bad; 'there must be a different state of society, a different pattern of action; 'I am violent, and I must be non-violent; and so on and on. This is the conscious effort made by will. In that very process of 'must be' and 'must not be', there are innumerable problems of control and of suppression, various forms of psychological desires that arise from suppression and from control, various efforts made, and the struggles, failures, frustrations in the process of achieving that which you think is truth. If you have at all thought about it, if you are aware of it, this

is our problem, not only individually, but collectively, socially in the world. How is a serious person whose intention is to bring about a change fundamentally within himself, to bring about the change? Through conscious effort or by listening to the truth of the falseness of effort?

Seeing the truth of the whole implication of effort, can you just listen without translation, without interpretation, to what is being said? All effort is a process of imitation, imitation is always conditioning, and the conditioned mind can never find the truth of any problem. Can I, can you, listen to that without any interpretation, without any judgment? Can I look, see, hear the truth of it? That can only be done, not at the conscious level but at the unconscious level, when the mind is not struggling to understand, when the mind is not making an effort to imitate. That can only happen when the conscious mind, the mind which is so active all day and all night, ceaselessly building, destroying, altering shaping, when that mind is quiet for a few seconds and hears what is Truth. I think that is our problem, and not what to do, how to feed the poor or how to bring about an economic revolution or what kind of gods and rituals we should have.

Fundamentally our problem is to bring about a revolution in our ways of thinking psychologically, fundamentally. Such a change cannot be brought about by any conscious effort because, as I said, the conscious mind is built around tradition, by experiences which are the outcome of conditioned action. So, a mind that is thinking out, planning out, and acts according to that plan, through compulsion, through conformity, through imitation, such a mind cannot find an answer to all our problems. We have been brought

up from our childhood to cultivate our memories. Memory is essential at a certain level of our existence; but memory does not give the true answer to any problem; it can only translate the problem according to its condition, its experience. After all, if you, as a Hindu, experience something, you will translate it according to your conditioned mind; or if you are a Communist, you will meet the experience or translate the experience in terms of dialectical materialism or what you will. So you are never meeting the experience without a conditional mind; and the conditioned mind creating a pattern, an action, only further creates more problems, more sufferings, more misery. That is what we have to realize. I think it is very important to see that effort in any form, inwardly, is a process of imitation; effort is imitation, conformity; and through conformity there can be no radical transformation.

Now, is it possible for me to hear a statement of that kind and to see the truth of that? I say life is a process of imitation. The very language which I am using is the result of imitation, the cultivation of memory, knowledge. The acquisition of information is a process of imitation. The very desire to be good is the result of fear which urges me to conform. I see that memory, experience, knowledge are essential at certain levels of our existence; because, if I did not know how to use language, I would not be able to communicate. But when I make effort to bring about a change psychologically, inwardly to be different, the very process of becoming different creates other problems. So I am caught in a net of innumerable problems, and there is no release. But there is a release at the unconscious level if I can hear without translation or without interpretation, the truth of anything that is being said. You can

experiment with this yourself and you will find the truth of this.

Sirs, this is not a discussion meeting. This meeting is not open to any kind of discussion.

Here is a very difficult problem; the mind has cultivated memory for centuries upon centuries, and that is the only instrument we have; and we have used that instrument to solve our problems; we worship intellect - which does not mean that we must become sentimental or devotional or sloppy. It is very difficult to see the limitations of the mind. It is very difficult to see that our problems cannot have an answer through the mind, through the application of the process of thought, because thought is always conditioned. There is no freedom of thought, because thought which is memory, which is the result of various past experiences, is conditioned, is limited; and such a thought when used to solve our problems can only increase the problems further, add more problems. Can I realize the truth of that thought, and allow a revolution to take place at the unconscious level? Because, in the unconscious level, there is no limitation, there is no conformity, because the mind there is not interfering to search for a result; there, the mind is not trying to suppress or to be anything; it is only there; the mind can understand what is Truth. Truth is not the process of analysis, nor the mere observation of knowledge. What is Truth can only be understood at the unconscious level. when the mind is very quiet, non-interfering, non-translating. If we once realize this fundamentally, we will see there is a radical change in our ways of thought. But, as I said, the mind is trained to interfere, to constantly seek a result in action. It is only at the unconscious level there can be love. And it is love that can alone bring about

revolution.

Question: Who is the truly religious man? By what will his action be known?

Krishnamurti: What is religion? Before we define what a religious man is, what is religion? Is religion the performance of certain rituals, the acceptance of certain dogmas, the conditioning from childhood by certain beliefs to be a Hindu, a Christian, a Buddhist, or a Mussulman? Does the conditioning of the mind by a belief constitute religion? Because I call myself a Hindu or what you will, does that make me religious? Or, is religion the state of mind in which there is an experiencing which is not of memory, which is a state in which all conditioning by time has ceased? Is religion the belief in God? Is the man who does not believe in God, is he non-religious? And is the man who does good works, who is socially active - feeding the poor, everlastingly active in the performance of his duty, concerned with reform, with the pattern of the betterment of man - is he a religious person? The man who is pursuing virtue, the virtue of non-violence, the virtue of non-greed, is he a religious man? Or is he merely conforming to a particular pattern, projected for his own self-satisfaction? So, must we not first find out what it is that we mean by religion?

Surely the realization of Truth does not depend on any belief; on the contrary, belief acts as a barrier to the realization of Truth. A man who believes, who is caught in dogma can never know what is the real. He can never experience that state of ecstasy, of love. Dogma, belief and experience stand in the way; for experience is merely the continuance of memory. A man who is well-seasoned in memory, in experience, in knowledge, can never find out what God

is; nor can the man who professes continually his belief in God find Reality. Reality comes into being only when the mind is free, when the mind is still, not compelled, not coerced, not disciplined. When the mind is still, then at the unconscious level there is revolution.

Can you judge a man's action by his good work? By that, will you know whether he is religious or not? How will you judge him? Please, this is not a sophisticated, clever argumentation. By what standards, by what conditioning, will you judge him? If he does good work for his neighbour, if he feeds the poor, puts on ashes, puts on a saffron robe, shaves his head, if he renounces, would you call him religious? Renunciation is intoxication, and a man who is intoxicated through his own actions will never find what Truth is. It is only when there is the complete cessation of `the me', of `the I', of the ego, which cannot come about through any effort, any will, through any conscious act, it is only when there is love, that there is a possibility of such a mind being religious.

But to say what is love, to question whether love shall be this or that, to cultivate love, is not love. All this requires a great deal of understanding, great penetration. The penetration of the conscious mind is only to create further entanglement. But when I am aware of this whole process of `the me', of `the I' trying to become something - religiously, politically, socially - I see that as long as `that me' is becoming virtuous or non-violent, it is only conforming to the pattern of respectability, and `that me' which renounces in order to achieve God is only a man intoxicated by his own imagination, and such a man can never find what is love, what is truth.

We know this in our hearts; we have felt deep down in the unconscious that there must be the realization of this; but the world is too much with us. The pressures, the traditions, the examples, are too much, and we are carried away by the things that are trivial, because from childhood we are brought up to follow the example, the hero, the great man; so we ourselves become trivial, we ourselves become petty, and we shall never find what truth is. That which is truth, which is the only religion, can only be found - or rather, it can only come into being - when the mind is utterly still, not wanting, not projecting, not desiring to do or not to do; this does not mean withdrawal from the world, there is no withdrawal; there is no isolation. To be related is life; and in that relationship we shall find out what Truth is, what love is.

Question: I am a writer; I heard you some years ago and since then I no longer feel the urge to write. Is the dearth of outward expression the inevitable result of self-knowledge?

Krishnamurti: Why do you write? Do you write in order to fulfil? Do you write in order to become famous? Do you write in order to earn a livelihood? Or do you write for no purpose - because, inwardly you are so alive, so rich, that it is a natural expression, not a vocation, not a means of self-fulfilment. If it is a means of self-fulfilment, then the more you know yourself, the more you study yourself, the more there is self-knowledge, the less outcome there is in words. As long as you are fulfilling through a state, through politics, through religion, through activity, through doing good, through writing a poem or painting a picture, as long as you are fulfilling yourself through a particular action, the more you know yourself, then the less there is of that activity. Where

there is action through which you gain satisfaction, through which you rejoice, through which you become something professionally, a politician, a great man, a well-known man, as long as you are using the outward activities as a means for your aggrandisement, then the more there is self-knowledge, there is the diminution of that activity. This is very important to understand, because most of us are fulfilling through something, through the wife or the husband, through the children, through virtue. If by addressing a large audience, by writing a poem, you are becoming something, as long as 'the me' is becoming something, the more you have self-knowledge, the less is the becoming. There is no fulfilment of 'the me' through any action.

But you see, from childhood we are brought up to fulfil. We have innumerable heroes, a great many saints, so many authorities to follow, and gurus who will give us what we want; so we are everlastingly caught in the net of our own self-fulfilment. Where there is self-fulfilment there is frustration, and with frustration there is fear; and so we are caught in the net again. But there is a release of creativity which is not the outcome of self-fulfilment. If we really understood this, there would be a tremendous change in our activity. Through our activities, at present, we are not releasing that creative energy; through our social reforms, through our writing, through our building bridges, or through painting pictures, we are not creating. After all, are you not fulfilling when you call yourself a Hindu or a Christian or Communist? When you are active as a Communist or a Socialist or a religious person, does not that activity give you - you, 'the me' - the urge to become, to act, to be, to continue in that activity? Do you not create problems? Are

you not ruthless, do you not divide, destroy, liquidate, have concentration camps and so on? It may be religion to you and release to you; but in that process of releasing, you are creating misery, not only for yourself but for others. Surely, that is not creativity, that is not the real release of the mind from the desire to fulfil.

I say there is a different release, a creativity which is not hedged by conditioned action; that creativity can only come when I understand the process of effort, when there is no imitation. All effort is imitation, and imitation exists when I am trying to become something. It is only when there is the cessation of 'the me', when I am absolutely nothing - which is not a virtue, which is not to be striven after - that a state comes when I understand the whole process of self-knowledge. It is only then that there is a fundamental, timeless release in which there is creativity.

Question: Man is driven to action according to his inherent nature; it is as if he is forced to sin though reluctantly; what is this that drives him to wrong action?

Krishnamurti: What is sin? What is the thing that we call wrong action or good action? Please, Sirs, do listen to this. By listening find out a release from all these words, so that in that release, in that creativity, there is no sin, there is no wrong action, there is only a state of being, a state of love, which is never wrong. Since we do not have that, we have hedged our minds and our activity by what is good and what is bad; we are caught in this duality; and having been caught, we are trying to escape and create another antithesis of duality. To most of us, morality is tradition. We are slaves to circumstances, to society, to tradition, to what our

neighbour, the boss, the government, the party says. Any form of deviation from the party lines is a sin, whether the party be religious or political. Any deviation, any wandering away from the traditional, from the respectable, is considered evil. And we have been nurtured, brought up from our childhood in that state; and so, the desire to go against that which is traditional we call sin. There is also the urge to conform, and the conformity is considered good, to be respectable.

So, our problem is: not what is good, what is bad, what is sin and what is truth; but to be free from fear. The man who is free from fear shall know love; and the man who loves knows no sin, is not compelled by any action or by anything except love. You cannot have love if there is fear; and fear will exist as long as the mind is seeking security - security in the State, security in religion, in belief, in your wife, in your name, in your child, in your property, in your bank account. As long as there is security there must be fear; and a man who is secure, psychologically secure, certain, imbedded in knowledge, such a man in his heart is afraid. Such a man shall always know what sin is, what good is; and he is caught up in the conflict of duality. But the man without fear has a mind that is not seeking security; in such a mind there is love.

It is only when a man loves, he is free from sin, free from all urges which create antisocial activities; for love is the only true revolution. But that is very difficult to come by. When you use the word love, it will have very little meaning if there is fear which expresses itself through conformity, through acceptance of authority. The mind that is traditionally bound by knowledge, that is always seeking a result, such a mind can never be free from fear.

That which is darkness, which is fear, can never find light.

Question: I have been very close to death. The danger has passed for the time being, but I know its inevitability. Teach me how to face death.

Krishnamurti: Sir, it is not a question of being taught. I cannot teach you; do not be disciples of anyone; do not follow anyone, however comforting, however satisfying he may be. Now, this is a very complex question.

What do we mean by death? Dying, ceasing to be. When are you not dying? When do you know you are not dead? Are you ever aware that you are not dying, that you are living? Please follow this. Are you ever aware that you are living? When do you know, when are you conscious that you are living? Are you ever conscious of it? You are only conscious of living when there is friction, are you not? Are you conscious, are you aware when you are joyous, when you are happy, when you love? Can you ever say at any moment that you are happy? And the moment you are aware that you are happy, has not that happiness ceased? It has already become a memory. Please follow all this, Sirs. It is not just an argument, just clever words.

There is a state which is beyond death, and I am trying to convey that, to show that - not to tell you how to get there, but so that you find out for yourself, so that you experience. You cannot accumulate experiences which will guarantee you that state, because the moment you have accumulated experiences, then you are dying, then there is death.

When are you conscious of life, of living? Only when there is disease, only when you know you are unhealthy. When you are

healthy, you are utterly unconscious of your health; it is only when you are in friction, in sorrow, in conflict, in this constant becoming, then you know, then you are aware that you are in a state of friction, in the state of living. When you are well, when everything is smoothly flowing, running without any friction, without any impediment, without any hindrance, then there is no consciousness of living.

So our life is a process of friction. We only live knowing strife, sorrow, pain, misery; and that is our life; we know when we are jealous; we know when we are greedy, when we are running after things - that is our life; and we call that living. The fear of losing a job, the fear of not being, the fear of not accomplishing the thing which we started out to do, the fear of not enjoying tomorrow, or not seeing the one whom we love, all that we call love; that is all we know. We do not know anything else. When we do know of something which we call joy, it is already a thing of the past. We live in memory, the thing that is past; and so the young and the old die. So with us, death is always there. We are always dying, we are always afraid of death. Death is with us; that is all we know.

Because, everything that we do, every action, everything our hand is put to is deteriorating. There is a shadow of destruction always accompanying us. The thing that we love we destroy. The thing we admired has gone. The thing which we have cherished is corrupt. Everything we have touched deteriorates. This is not just a fancy, this is an actuality. So we know death only - the decaying, the deterioration - and that is our life. It is only when we realize it, when we actually see it, as it is, and not try to run away from it, when we are with it and see what it is, that there is a possibility of

going beyond this mind, beyond memory; because, what is continuous must invariably hold within it the seed of deterioration, of destruction.

Please listen to this. We are concerned only with continuity. We want to continue in name, in property; we want to fulfil through the country, the State, through our son; we want things to go on. A thing that has continuity is destructive; in it, there is the seed of deterioration. There is renewal, there is creativity only in things that come to an end. I could have renewal, if I could experience without continuity, if there is an experiencing without memory - which is very very arduous, because anything that we experience, the sunset or the single star in the heaven, is immediately stored away as memory; because the mind wants to accumulate, to store up, to hold together; and the mind is afraid of losing that.

What is it that we are? We are a mass of confusion, of burning desires, of conflicts, of everlasting travail. Since we are dying all the time, because with us death is always there, we are only concerned with continuity. And if you really hear this without interpreting, without comparing it with the Bhagavad Gita or the Upanishads; if you listen to what I am saying; if you directly experience this thing even for a second - direct experiencing is that state in which the mind is not caught in time, in which there is no experience as memory, in which time is not, in which the mind is just quiet - then you will see there is no death, because every moment is an ending. This is not a poetical phrase. This is an actuality which you can experience; and the experiencing of it does not come about through any pattern of action, through any pursuit of virtue. It must come to you. Truth can only come to you, you

cannot invite it. It can only come when you are open, when you do not want anything. It is only when your cup is empty, completely empty, when you know you are dead, that there is that state when the cup is full, when it can never be empty. Then there is only Love which can never come to an end.

February 11, 1953

BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 15TH FEBRUARY 1953

I think it is one of our greatest difficulties to be serious because we are surrounded with so many frivolities and distractions, with so many teachers and systems and philosophers, that it is very difficult for us to choose what is right. It is especially difficult if we are very learned, if we are already committed to a particular pattern of action. The more we are committed to a certain pattern, or type of thought, ideal or action - though we may appear to be very earnest, very serious - we are really not alert or intelligent; because, the very acceptance of any particular system - religious, political, scientific or social - is obviously a conditioning and a deteriorating factor in our existence. It seems to me that it is very difficult for most of us to be serious without being entrammelled in a particular system of thought or without being caught up in a groove of action; because, the moment we are serious, we want to be something, we want to act, we want to throw ourselves into a particular action, reform, revolution; and we think that which is not immediately translated into action is not serious.

I think it is very important to consider this: not that there should not be action, not that there should not be a certain revolution, a certain change - economic, social and so on - but before we plunge into any activity, should we not be very clear what we mean by seriousness and what we mean by being intelligent? Are all serious people intelligent, and are all intelligent people serious? Is the so-called intelligent, well-read man who is up-to-date in scientific knowledge or philosophical systems of thought - is he serious? Is it

not important for each one of us to find out what it means to be serious? Because without seriousness, without real earnestness, life has very little significance.

In the case of most of you who are attending these talks regularly, if you are merely caught up in the travail of curiosities, if you want to find a solution for a particular problem, an answer, should you not consider in what way it is important to be serious? You will hear these talks and you will go away. What effect has this on your lives, what does this do in your lives? Is it merely a repetition of certain phrases, words? Is it the learning of a new technique, new words, a sharpening of the mind? Or is it that by really listening, not merely hearing - there is a distinction between hearing and listening - one may find out what this seriousness is? It is not the seriousness of the man who pursues a particular virtue. The pursuit of a virtue only leads to respectability and therefore it is a thing to be avoided; for, the respectable man will never find joy, will never be creatively happy.

So is it not important to find out for ourselves to what extent, to what depth, we are serious? Because, we have to be serious. Does not seriousness go with intelligence? A man who is really intelligent must be a serious man. Let us find out what this intelligence implies.

Now, if I may suggest, let us repeat what I said the other day, without too much boredom; if you can listen rightly, without interpreting or comparing what you have already read about or heard, listen as though you were enjoying yourself, and try to find out, to enquire, not to block, not to hinder, but to really find out - which is entirely different from hearing lectures. We are used to

going to talks. We hear lots of speeches made up of words, very brilliant or crudely put together. But the effect of true listening is much more revolutionary than that particular action. If I know how to listen to you, to music, to the sound of a wave, if I know how to listen to it, if I let it penetrate into me without any barrier, then that very listening brings about an extraordinary activity which is not a conscious endeavour on my part.

So, perhaps we can try this way of listening - which is not 'being mesmerized' to any particular attitude or action. I am not suggesting any kind of activity or any kind of attitude. I am only trying to find out, you and I together, what is this intelligence which is so essential, which will bring about a seriousness, a dedication, an involuntary dedication to life and not to a particular action; because, life is not a particular activity, it is a total process. Is it not possible to dedicate oneself unconsciously, involuntarily, freely, to the totality of existence? To do that, one must have extraordinary intelligence, native insight; one must be uncorrupted. And is that intelligence possible? Because the more we read, the more there is comparison and the more we are caught in all this confusion of knowledge.

Is it not possible to find out what is true intelligence, so that with the operation of that intelligence we shall find out true action? True action is action which is not imposed by anyone - by Marx, by the Socialist, or by the Capitalist, or by some other clever human entity - which is not dominated by one's ambition, knowledge, erudition. Since we probably have never had that intelligence, we have been dominated by others; and the very process of being dominated destroys the cultivation or the

discovery of true intelligence.

Intelligence, it seems to me, is devoid of all authority. There cannot be intelligence where there is authority - the authority of the party, the authority of tradition, the authority of books or the authority of one's own experiences. Because, where there is authority, domination, there must be choice. And where there is choice there is no intelligence.

Please listen to this; just let what I am saying penetrate; listen to it and you will find the truth of it as we go along. I depend on my experience, thinking that it will bring about intelligence. But, is my experience capable of such intelligence? Is experience ever capable of producing intelligence? What is my experience? It is a series of reactions to invariable challenges of life. You may flatter me and I react to it, or I react to beauty. This constant relationship between challenge and response is experience, is it not? And that experience is based on a conditioned background. So, the conditioning, the conditioned background, responds to other challenges; and from the challenge I begin to choose, I begin to react according to my background, according to my choice. So my experience gradually becomes authority - the authority from which I am, from which I choose, from which I think. So choice is authority, authority of knowledge which is experience - whether mine or yours or of all the well-learned people.

Is there intelligence where there is the capacity to choose? Choice is the result of experience, mine or another's; and experience is the recording on the conditioned background. All our life is based on choice. I choose this material or that material. I choose this flower or that scent; I choose this philosophy, I choose

that guru, that political system, leader, and so on. All my life is based on a series of interpretations and choices; and the higher I choose, the more I think I am capable of distinguishing, the more I think I am intelligent. Is that so? Obviously, choice is necessary at certain levels of existence, in certain fields of thought, of life, of action; but psychologically, inwardly, does not choice based on authority cripple intelligence? Because, after all, when I choose psychologically - I am not talking about the physical fact of choice - but when I choose psychologically, is not that choice the result of my conditioning, my experience? And so the more I choose according to my experience, the more my mind is conditioned. and so the more I choose according to a particular system of thought, according to tradition, according to my conditioning.

Does not the very process of choice based on authority, destroy intelligence? And is not intelligence essential, specially in a world where there are a series of crises, where there is domination and the imposition of authority? Is it not essential to free ourselves from all authority - which means, from all choice - and to discover what is truth? Because, what is truth is not the result of choice, is not the outcome of authority. If I choose, then it is not truth. I choose according to my background, according to my experience, or according to the authority which gives me security, the authority through which I shall fulfil, through which I shall carry out certain series of actions which will guarantee what I want. So, choice as we know it, as we exercise it every day, will that lead us to intelligence? And if it does not, is it not important to find out what it is that prevents this functioning of intelligence which is the freedom from authority of every kind.

Is it possible to live in a world whose structure is not based on authority, on the social, economic, religious cultural imposition and domination of authority? Is it possible to live without authority, without some form of compulsion, some form of resistance, to hold us in a certain groove of action? Is it not important for us to find out if it is possible to be earnest with this intelligence in which there is no choice? Because, then there is action without reward, without an end - it is a constant revolution; and such action is necessary, specially in us, because we are confused. All the teachers, all the gurus, all the books, everything has failed; all the heroes are merely on the walls - not in our hearts and minds - since they have all failed. Is it not important for us to be free from every kind of authority and to enquire what is truth, without authority, without choice? Because the moment we do not choose, the moment we do not interfere with that activity in which there is no choice, such an action will obviously produce a revolution, not superficially only but also fundamentally, deeply, inwardly.

It is that creative action which is essential - creativity without choice in which there is no authority of any kind. Because then the mind is free from fear; it is only the mind that is afraid that chooses, and the mind that is afraid is not intelligence. And is not all choice based on fear, and can the mind be utterly free from fear? The mind can only be free from fear when the mind is not seeking an end, when the mind is not pursuing a result, when it is not conditioned by any belief, by any authority. Then only is there a possibility of bringing about a revolution, a regeneration, a transformation of the human mind and heart.

Question: My body and my mind seem to be made up of deep-rooted urges and conscious and unconscious fears; I watch the mind but often it is as if these basic fears overpower me. What am I to do?

Krishnamurti: Sir, let us find out what we mean by fear. What is fear? Fear exists only in relation to something. It is not something by itself. It is only in relation to something - to what you might say of me, to what the public may think of me, to the loss of a job, in having security in my old age, or the fear of the mother's or the father's death, or God knows what. It is the fear of something.

Now, how am I to be free from fear? Will discipline of any kind dispel fear? Discipline is resistance, the cultivation of resistance to learn. Will that free the mind from fear? Or will it only hold it away from it - like building a wall, but on the other side there is always fear? Fear obviously cannot be got rid of by resistance, by the cultivation of courage; because, the very nature of courage is the opposite of fear, and when the mind is caught up in fear and courage, there is no solution but the cultivation of resistance; so there is no overcoming of fear through cultivation of courage.

How am I to get rid of fear? Please follow this, Sirs. This is our problem, yours and mine, of every human being who wishes to be free from fear, because if I can be free from fear then 'the me', the self, which is creating so much mischief, so much misery in the world, can disappear. Is not the self, in its very nature, the cause of fear? Because I want to be secure, if I am not economically secure, I want to be secure politically, socially in name, I want to be secure in the hereafter, I want to have God's assurance to pat me on the back and say, 'You will have a better chance next life; I want

somebody to tell me, to encourage me, to give me shelter, refuge. So, as long as I am seeking security in any form, there must be fear from which all the basic urges spring. So, if I can understand what fear is, perhaps then there may be a release from that constant choice.

How am I to understand what fear is? How am I - without disciplining, without resisting, without running away from it, without creating other illusions, other problems, other systems of gurus, of philosophers - to really face it, to understand it, to be free of it and go beyond it? I can only understand fear when I am not running away from it, when I am not resisting it. So we have to find out what this entity is that is resisting. Who is 'the I' that is resisting fear? Do you understand, Sirs? That is, I am afraid; I am afraid of what the public might say about me, because I want to be a very respectable person, I want to succeed in the world, I want to have a name, position, authority. So one side of me is pursuing that; and inwardly, I know that anything I do will lead to frustration, that what I want to do will block me. So, there are two processes working in me; one, the entity that wants to achieve, to become respectable, to become successful; and the other, the entity that is always afraid that I might not achieve.

So, there are two processes in myself operating, two desires, two pursuits - one that says, 'I want to be happy', and the other that knows that there may not be happiness in the world. I want to be rich and at the same time I see millions of poor people; and yet, my ambition is to be rich. So long as the desire for security confronts me, drives me, there is no release; at the same time there is in me compassion, love, sensitivity. There is a battle going on endlessly

and that battle projects, becomes antisocial and so on and so on. So what am I to do? How am I to be free from this battle, from this inward conflict?

If I can observe one process alone and not cultivate the dual process, then there is a possibility of dealing with it. That is, if I can observe fear in itself and not cultivate virtue, not cultivate courage, then I can deal with fear. That is, if I know 'what is' and not 'what should be', then I can deal with 'what is'. With most of us we do not know 'what is'; for, most of us are concerned with 'what should be'. This 'should be' creates the duality. 'What is' never creates duality. 'What should be' brings about the conflict, the duality.

So, can I observe 'what is' without the conflict of the opposite, can I look at 'what is' without any resistance? Because, the very resistance creates the opposite, does it not? That is, when I am afraid, can I look at it without creating resistance? Because, the moment I create resistance against it, I have already brought into being another conflict. Can I look at 'what is' without any resistance? If I can do that, then I can begin to deal with fear.

Now, what is fear? Is fear a word, an idea, a thought or an actuality? Does fear come into being because of the word fear, or is that fear independent of the word? Please, Sir, think it out with me. Don't get tired. Don't let your minds go off. Because, if you are really concerned with the problem of fear - which you are, which every human being is - fear of death, fear of your grandfather or grandmother dying, since you are burdened with that extraordinary darkness, should you not go into the problem and not just push it aside? If we go into this problem carefully, we see that as

long as we are creating a resistance against fear in any form, running away from it, building barriers against it, like cultivating courage and so on, that very resistance brings about conflict which is the conflict of the opposites. And through the conflict of the opposites, we will never come to an understanding.

The idea that conflict between thesis and antithesis will bring about a synthesis is not true. What brings about understanding is comprehending the fact of 'what is' and not by creating the opposite. So, can I face fear, look at fear, without resisting, without running away from it? Now what is this entity that is looking at fear? When I say I am afraid, what is the 'I' and what is the 'fear'? Are they two different states, are they two different processes? Am I different from the fear, which 'the I' feels? If I am different from the fear, then I can operate on fear, then I can change it, then I can resist it, push it away. But if I am not different from fear, then is there not a different action altogether?

Is this a little bit abstract and too difficult for you, Sirs? Please, let us go into it. Listen to it, just listen; don't bother to argue, because by listening, not throwing up arguments, by just listening, you can comprehend what I am talking about.

As long as I am resisting fear, there is no freedom from fear, but only further conflict, further misery. When I do not resist, there is only fear. Then is fear different from the observer, 'the me' that says, 'I am afraid'? What is this 'me' that says 'I am afraid'? Is not 'the me' composed of that feeling which I call fear? Is not 'the me' the feeling of fear? If there was no feeling of fear, there would be no 'me'. So 'the me' and the fear, are one. There is no 'me' apart from fear; so fear is 'me'. So there is only fear.

Now there is the enquiry: is fear merely the word? Does the word fear, the idea, the symbol, the state, is that created by the mind independent of the fact? Please listen. Fear is `me; there is no independent `I', apart from me. The man, `the I' says `I am greedy', the authority is the `I'. The quality is not different from `the I'. So long as the `I' says `I must be free from greed', it is making an effort, it is struggling. But that very `I' is still greedy, because it wants to be non-greedy. Similarly, when `the I' says `I must be free from fear', it is cultivating a resistance; and so there is conflict, and it is never free from fear. So there is only freedom from fear when I recognise the fact, when there is an understanding of the fact that the fear is `the I', and the `I' cannot do anything about fear. Please see `the I' that says `I am afraid, I must do something about fear'. As long as it is acting upon fear, it only creates resistance and therefore increases further conflict. But when I recognise that the fear is `me', then there is no action of the I; it is only then that there is freedom from fear.

You see we are so accustomed to do something about fear, about an urge, about a sexual urge, that we always act upon it as though that urge is independent of `me'. So, as long as we are treating the desire as independent of `me', there must be conflict. There is no desire without `me'. I am the desire; the two things are not separate. Please see this. It is really a tremendous experience when there is this feeling that fear is `me', that greed is `me', that it is not apart from `me'.

There is no thought without the thinker. As long as there is the thought, there is the thinker. The thinker is not separate from thought; but thought creates the thinker, puts him apart because

thought is everlastingly seeking permanency and so creates `the I' as a permanent entity, `the I' that controls thought. But without thought there is no `I; when you don't think, when you don't recognise, when you don't distinguish, is there `the I'? Is there `the me'? The very process of thinking creates `the me', then `the me' operates on thought. So the struggle goes on indefinitely.

If there is the intention to be free from fear completely, then there must be the recognition of the truth that fear is `me', that there is no fear apart from `me'. That is the fact. When you are faced with a fact then there is action - an action which is not brought about by the conscious mind, an action which is the Truth, not of choice, not of resistance. Then only is there a possibility of freeing the mind from every kind of fear.

Question: My life is one constant adjustment with my husband, with my relations. I thought I was happy; but I have heard you, and the bleakness of my life has been laid bare. What is the use of my listening to you if what you talk about does not bring light to my ordinary everyday life?

Krishnamurti: Is it not important to be stripped off of all Illusions? Is it not important to find out what actually one is, to find out the events in the world? You cannot do it through a Socialist, Communist, Capitalist or religious point of view; you must see them as they are. Then you can deal with them. But if you live in an illusory world and through that illusion look at various problems, then there is no resolution of those problems.

The question appears to be this: should one be stripped of these illusions to see exactly what one is? Is it not necessary to be aware, to be conscious of this bleakness? After all, we are human beings

without joy, without happiness, in sorrow, exploiting others; that is our actual state - using others for our fulfilment, either the State or the party or the idea. We are empty human beings. Inwardly, we are very lonely, afraid, dependent on so many people, on so many ideas, without love; that is what actually we are. Can't we look at it and must we not know of it? Can we avoid it? We try to avoid it by going to cinemas, reading books, doing various activities; but the fact still remains that, behind these activities, we are dull human beings, unhappy, living in miserable conditions. Is it not important to face that fact, to know exactly what we are? When we know what we are actually, then what happens? Then we try to alter that, to consciously bring about a change. Do you understand Sirs, what I am saying?

We are living in a world of escapes, in a world of mass illusion; we run away from things as they are actually; and when somebody, anybody, brings them to us and makes us look at the actuality of them, we don't like it. And then we try to do something about 'what is', the actuality; this is again creating resistance, again running away from it. So that is our difficulty. If I know I am lonely, if I am antisocial, if I am greedy, if I am afraid, I want somebody to tell me what to do. If I am aware of my greed, if I am conscious of it, then my immediate reaction is to act upon it, to do something about it. So I set the chain going again - which is, to do something about it, to create resistance against it. If I can look at it, be with it, live with it, if I can get acquainted with all the intricacies of it, then there is a possibility of going beyond it. But as long as I am desirous of operating on what I am, I can never deal with it. I am lonely, I am afraid, I am unhappy; if I can look at this

without any kind of compulsion, without any kind of interpretation, then an unconscious revolution takes place.

We want to act consciously and our conscious action is very limited; because, our minds are conditioned all the time. It does not matter whose thought it is, all thinking is conditioned, all thinking is reaction; and thought is not productive, it does not bring about freedom. What brings about freedom is when the conscious mind is quiet, when the whole being is quiet with the fact - with the fact of loneliness, with the fact of fear, with the fact that 'I hate', with the fact that "I am ambitious". When the mind is silent with the fact, then there is an unconscious revolution. The revolution is in releasing creativity. It is that revolution that is so essential in bringing a creative society into being. But, you see, we never come to that point; we are always wanting to do something about the fact - the fact that I am unhappy, the fact that I am depressed, ambitious. The moment I recognise the fact, my mind is operating upon it to alter it, to see whether it can control it, to shape it. That is the mind.

The conscious mind does not face the fact and remain with the fact, without any desire to alter, to bring about a change in it. Real acceptance means seeing the thing as it is. Then I assure you there is the revolution of the unconscious, the revolution without motives. That is the only true revolution; because, in that revolution, there is the release of creativity, that creativity which is love.

Question: I hear you and sometimes I feel I understand. Another uses your words and there is no understanding. What is it that is understood?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by understanding? When do you understand? When I say 'I understand you', what do I mean by that? Do I hear merely the words or is it a deeper process at work? Is understanding on the verbal level? That is, I hear you, I translate what you say and I say 'Yes, I have understood'. Is that what we mean by understanding? Or, is understanding something entirely different? Under-hearing, but the comprehension of the truth of what you are saying, or of the falseness of what you are saying.

What is it that understands? Is it a state, is it a reaction? Please listen to this. It is very important to find it out, because we may find the key to the whole process of comprehension, of understanding. Do we listen when we are interpreting? Do I understand what you are saying, when I am translating what you are saying? When you say, for instance, 'be good', what effect has that on me? Do you say it with full intention, with the feeling of being good without any sense of reservation, without any sense of inhibition? And am I capable of listening to it without translating, without saying, 'How am I to be good in my circumstances'? Am I capable of listening without translating what you are saying to suit my circumstances? Can I listen to you without any barrier? Is it not, only then, that understanding comes?

Is not understanding something which is not brought about by any effort? If you are making an effort to understand me, all your knowledge is gone in making the effort; you are not listening to me. If you are not making an effort, if you are merely listening without any compulsion, without any translation, without any interpretation, without comparing - which means, you are allowing the words, the thought, the feeling, the thing that is said, the whole

of the thing implied, to penetrate - then, is there not a direct communion of something which I see and you also see? Then that understanding - not yours or mine, it is understanding - is the flash of something true. So understanding is not personal. It is not yours or mine. It is a state of being when the mind is capable of receiving what is Truth. And the mind is incapable of receiving what is Truth if it is bound by authority, by tradition; then the mind is comparing what is said with the Bhagavad Gita, with the Bible, with this, with that. So understanding surely is a state in which the mind is not comparing, in which there is no authority; it is choiceless awareness; so, the mind directly sees without any interpretation, without any mediator. So, if you and I both can see, if you and I be in that state, obviously there is immediate perception of what is true.

But with most of us, our knowledge, our experiences, authority, compulsions, various activities of daily life prevent us from experiencing directly something which is true. However much you may hear me, your minds are so crippled by authority, by knowledge, by experience, that you are incapable of seeing things directly. So, understanding comes only when the mind is really quiet, not compelled, not coerced, when the mind in its quietness and stillness is capable of reception. If understanding is not accumulation, you cannot gather understanding; you cannot keep it in store. Understanding comes in flashes or in a series of flashes or in a long flash, which indicates the mind must be extraordinarily quiet, listening, without making any choice. But a conditioned mind, a mind disciplined, held up, hedged by compulsions - such a mind cannot understand, cannot directly experience what is Truth.

And it is that experiencing of what is Truth, from moment to moment, which brings about creative release.

Question: You talk of the revolution in the unconscious; but as the unconscious is a dimension unknown to thought, how can I be aware that there has been any deep revolution? Are you not using these words to hypnotize us into imagining a state?

Krishnamurti: Is not the unconscious also the conscious? That is, consciousness, as we know it, is strife. I am only aware when there is friction, when there is a challenge. when I am in misery, when I make conscious effort to do or not to do. But behind that conscious effort, are there not many motives hidden, many compulsions, urges, traditions, which I have inherited after centuries? I am both the conscious as well as the unconscious. Both are the process of thought, are they not? Suppose I perform rituals, puja; it is an action which is the outcome of the great tradition in which I have been brought up; that tradition is based on fear, on the desire to find peace, hope, reward and so on; that is the unconscious motive which makes me do a certain action. Is not the whole process of consciousness the result of thought? You may not think of the idea; the unconscious may not have thought it out; but is not the whole of that the process of thinking? I may not have thought out puja, but someone else has thought it out and I have been conditioned in that - that is the unconscious, deep down in me. I have been brought up as a Capitalist, as a Communist, or as a Socialist; and from that I act and from that I respond. The unconscious motives, the urges, the conditions, are the result of thinking by me or by another, by society, by circumstances.

Can thought bring about a revolution? Please follow this.

Thought being conditioned, thought being always conditioned, can it bring about a revolution - which is so essential - a radical revolution, not an economical or partial revolution? Can a deep fundamental revolution be brought about by thought? Thought, both conscious and unconscious, is a total process. My unconscious may be covered up and I may not have dealt with it. But that unconscious is still there, and it is the result of thought, my forefathers' thoughts, the thought of the books, the knowledge, the experience, all that is 'the me', the conscious as well as the unconscious; it is the product of thought. So I recognise that this whole process is thought, and I see that thought conditions; how then can thought bring about a radical revolution? But there is a revolution which is beyond thought; and it is there, beyond the conscious, beyond thought, that there must be a revolution.

Is Love something to be cultivated? Do I know when I love? Is love a conscious process? If I know I love you, is that not sensation and therefore not love? If I am conscious that I am humble, if I am aware that I am kind, is that humility, is that kindness? So, is not love, is not humility, something which is a state of which I am unconscious, in the sense of thought - thinking?

The revolution which I am speaking of is only possible when thinking as a reaction, as the conditioned state, comes to an end. It is only then that there is a revolution. Sirs, don't push it aside as some crazy idea, but find out, investigate, feel it out. You will see that every form of thinking is conditioned - the Communist, the Socialist, the Catholic, or the thinking of a religious person. It is conditioned; and as long as we are acting in a conditioned field, you will have further problems of conditioned actions: and in that,

there is no release, there is no creativity. There is creativity, there is release, only when the mind is completely silent. That silence is not a thing to be cultivated consciously. I cannot cultivate it, because the conscious effort to bring it about is the outcome of a conditioned thought, a desire, an end; therefore there is no revolution, there is always an ending, a result; and a mind that is seeking a result is not revolutionary.

So, only a mind that is still, is capable of receiving what is true - not something extraordinary, but what is true every moment, the Truth of what one sees, the word, the thought, the feeling. It is only when the mind is really quiet, without any compulsion, without any urges, that the revolution takes place. The revolution is a revolution of thought which Truth brings about, not through any form of cultivation, but when you listen to what is being said. But you cannot listen if you are arguing with me - which does not mean I am hypnotizing you. After all, you are being hypnotized every day by newspapers, by the politicians, by do-gooders, by your religion, by the Bhagavad Gita, by the Bible, by people dominating or pushing, by directive or purposive action. Is not all this a process of hypnosis? The whole process of propaganda is a way of hypnosis, and you are caught in it.

I am talking of something entirely different. The two are not compatible, they are of two different worlds. All that I am saying is: if we can listen, then the truth will release creative activity in human beings; and without that creativity, we become utterly chaotic, destructive; however noble our intentions are, all our actions lead to misery, mischief. That creative activity is love. Without love there is no revolution, and love is not a conscious

action. Love is something beyond thought. It can only be understood, felt, known, experienced when the mind is utterly still; and only then is there a possibility of bringing about a fundamental revolution in the world.

February 15, 1953

BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 18TH FEBRUARY 1953

It seems to me that one of our greatest difficulties is communication. I want to tell you something, and naturally I have to use words. The words are so loaded with different varieties of meaning that it is very difficult for most of us to communicate directly and simply what we want to say to each other. And especially it is difficult when we are dealing with something which is a little more subtle, which is not too definite, and which therefore requires not only mere verbal communication, but also communication that is beyond mere words. The mind rebels against something which it cannot get hold of, put its teeth into.

The difficulty with most of us is that we want a definite course of action. We want to find out what to do, how to behave, specially when we are confused, when the very object of our choice is the outcome of our own confusion. When we choose, out of our confusion, the leader or the idea or the system, it can only lead to further confusion, further misery, further sufferings. Because, if I, out of my confusion, choose an action, that action is bound to lead to further confusion. That is an obvious fact which unfortunately most of us do not consider. Since most of us are anxious to find a way, a course of action, it seems to me important to find out not what to do but how to think.

Most of us are accustomed to find out what to do. We have examples, we have heroes, precepts, ideals that we can follow. But what is important is the manner of our thinking, because, if there can be a revolution there, then perhaps it is possible to bring about

a revolution in our action. So, is it not important to find out how to think, not what to do? Because the moment we are conditioned by an activity, by a system of thought, our actions become more and more complex, more and more confusing, more and more irksome, conditioned, disciplined, shaped; and therefore out of that, more confusion arises. So it seems to me what is important is to find out how to think; and perhaps then there is a possibility of changing that thought, bringing about a revolution in our thinking, and thereby creating a new way of life, a new way of action. There is a state of being which is revolution; and there is a state of becoming which is confusion. Most of us are accustomed to becoming - becoming something more, altering a course of action and adjusting it to a particular pattern of thought, following a leader, developing a virtue, changing from greed to non-greed, cultivating or practising certain ways of thinking; and all that implies, does it not?, a becoming in which there is no change at all, no revolution at all. Becoming is only a form of continuity; in that, there is no revolution, there is no transformation ever possible. A transformation and revolution is only possible in a state of being. Now, the becoming can never understand the being. When the becoming watches the being, the being is not.

Please follow this literally. I think it is very important to understand this, because our minds are so accustomed to becoming, to accumulating, to gathering experiences from which to proceed further; our thinking is based on knowledge, experience, examples, memory, which are all in the pattern of continuity; there is a modified change in that continuity, but there is no revolution, there is no transformation.

The becoming always tries to transcend, go beyond itself. I am the result of time, of memory, of experience, of constant choice, of differentiation; I am the continuity in the past of time; my mind, following, rejecting, accepting, resisting, is all in the pattern, in the field, of 'becoming', is it not? I am something today and I will be something tomorrow. The projection, tomorrow, is the continuity of today. This is what my mind is accustomed to, which is the result of accumulation, of memory, is it not? This is not complicated. You observe your own thinking; you observe the various ways of your action, your desires; and you will find this is so. We are always trying to become something - the clerk becoming the manager, the manager the executive, the politician becoming the greatest leader and so on and so on. There is a becoming something continuously; and in that, we hope to bring about a revolution, a transformation. But it is not possible, because that which continues can never bring about a transformation within itself.

Now with that mentality, with that mind, with the process of that thought, we observe the being - the true god or what you will, of which we do not know. The becoming always speculates about the being; the becoming always watches the being trying to grasp it, to take hold of it to adjust itself to it. So when you the becoming, the me tries to capture that being, that being is not. Because my mind is accustomed to think in terms of time, because my mind is the product of time, I cannot think in any other terms than becoming or not becoming. So in the very process, becoming there is conflict, and through the conflict we hope to achieve a result; that is our life. We want to achieve a result, an end, and we

proceed through various means to achieve - always with an effort, with struggle, complications, choice, desiring to be this, shaping and accepting that, so on and so on. That is our life, is it not? So, the becoming is ever trying to follow a course of action - worship of the hero, the cultivation of virtue and so on. It everlastingly trying to capture the state which is the being, in which alone there is revolution. It is important, it seems to me, that we should understand that, in becoming there can be no change, no radical transformation. Then what is one to do? Do you follow?

I want to tell you something and I have to use words. And you are going to translate those words according to your conditioning and so communication ceases between you and me. I want to tell you a very simple thing which is: there is no happiness, transformation, no revolution in becoming; and it is only in being that there is a possibility of fundamental radical transformation. But the becoming can never understand the being. The more you observe, the more the becomer observes the being, then the being becomes static, it never moves. So what the mind chooses is caught always in this becoming, in the wanting to do something. Do you see the problem?

How can I who have been conditioned - my whole education, my upbringing, my religion, my every endeavour is to become - how can I stop becoming? I do not know if you have ever thought over this problem; but as I am talking, how do you regard this problem? How do you feel about it? All our textbooks, all our religions, all gurus, all the process of thought is to become something - you must be communal, then national, then the world; first you are a child, then maturity and death; you must go through

the evolutionary process till you reach the ultimate reality. Our mind is conditioned to the way of thinking that gradually the world can be changed, that a revolutionary state cannot be brought about immediately, that it must come through a gradual process of time, that we must all be dedicated, that we must all be educated in a certain way, that we must think in a certain way of action and so on. With that process of thinking we are familiar. I say that through that way there is no revolution, there is no change, there is no possibility of any kind of transformation. Yet, transformation is essential in order to produce a different world.

You see the starving beggars on the road, the baby outside. The baby needs care, it needs food, it needs love, it needs freedom of the right type, it needs education to be without fear. Now, is it possible, for the world to change immediately, not in a few centuries? Is that not your problem also? There is that child starving and we have invented a Socialistic, a Communistic theory which will ultimately feed that baby; in the meantime, that baby dies. And in the course of building a system, there are a great many complications, destructions, misery, liquidation, concentration camps - which are all the process of becoming, are they not?

So, there must be a different approach to this problem, Can my mind which is so conditioned in becoming ever stop and be capable of receiving that being which cannot be observed, which cannot be understood by the becomer? How can I who am the product of time, memory, who am always becoming something accepting or denying something positively or negatively, how can I bring about in myself a fundamental revolution of values, of thought, of desires, of everything, radically, so that there can be

happiness not only in me but in my relationship with the world, with my fellowbeings? Is that also not your problem? And if it is your problem as well as mine, how do we act? Do we act in terms of becoming or in terms of being? There is no being if there is becoming.

As I have said previously, please listen. It is very important to listen to something which is true, because that very listening to what is true has an extraordinary effect on the mind. If I know how to listen, if I can see beauty without interpretation, that beauty has an extraordinary effect on me. If I am sensitive enough to see the beauty as well as to see the ugliness of life, to see without interpreting, just to see it, it has an extraordinary effect. Similarly, if I know how to listen to something that is true, to something that is right, without translating, without comparing it to what has already been said by some teacher, by the Bhagavad Gita or some book, if I can listen without any translation, then that very listening, the receptivity to what is Truth has an extraordinary effect. An unconscious revolution is taking place, if I can listen.

Please listen to this: there can be revolution only when there is being from which action which is true can take place. But as long as the mind is caught in the everlasting process of becoming, there can be no revolution, there can be no change, there can be no love; there can be only misery, more hate, more wars. So, what is the mind to do? It cannot go over to the other state. The mind which is in itself the becoming process cannot go over to the other state and bring it to itself; it cannot become the being. It cannot search the being. The moment it is conscious, it is aware of the being, the being is dead; the being is no longer a vital thing, it does not dance,

it does not live, it has no purposive action. So, what is the mind to do, which realizes that it cannot bring about a revolution within itself? Please listen, don't answer my question. Just listen.

Action is necessary, wars must be stopped, there must be no starvation. We recognise that a revolution is essential - a revolution which is fundamental, wide, not narrow, not partial, not limited. A total revolution is necessary. On investigation, we see that the mind cannot bring about such a revolution. The Communist, the Socialist, or the so-called religious person cannot bring about a revolution that is total; they can do partial reformation, partial change, but it will all be modified continuity. A total revolution is necessary in order to bring about a different world, a world which is not yours or mine but ours together; and that revolution can only come about when there is being and not becoming. So whatever effort you make in the revolution of being is a denial of that revolution. That is, if I make an effort to understand that state of being in which there is a radical revolution, that being becomes a dead state. So when my mind understands this whole thing, my mind becomes very quiet; then it does not make an effort to be or not to be. Please follow this. The mind becomes quiet, and then you understand the whole process of becoming.

The mind cannot invite the being. The being can only come into existence when the mind is completely quiet, without any pursuit, without seeking any result, without becoming virtuous. Because, the self is the becoming, `the me' is the becomer; and as long as `the me' exists, there cannot be being. `The me' can take on different garments of different colours and think it is changing, is bringing about a revolution; but at the centre, `the me' is still there,

and `the me' cannot come to an end by discipline, by control, by sacrifice, by following examples. `The me' exists because of the very effort, it makes, to be or not to be. So listen.

As long as the mind makes an effort, that very effort gives strength to `the me' - `the me' identifying with the State, with the party, with virtue, with certain system of thought, with religion, or what you will. Therefore through that process there is no revolution, there is no transformation; there is only more misery, more confusion, more war, more hatred. When I realize that, when the mind realizes that, then there is tranquillity; then there is that silence which is so essential for the being; and it is only then that there is a possibility of radical revolution.

Question: I feel like committing suicide; life to me has no purpose, no meaning whatsoever. Wherever I look, there is only despair, misery and hatred. Why should I continue to live in this monstrous world?

Krishnamurti: Why do we commit suicide? Are there not different ways of committing suicide? Do you not commit suicide when you identify yourself with the country? Do you not commit suicide when you become a party member, join any sect? Do you not commit suicide when you believe in something? That is, you give yourself over to something greater; the something greater is your projection of what you think you ought to be; the identification of yourself with something greater - the greater being your desire for something nobler - is a form of committing suicide. Do listen to it; don't throw it out, Sirs.

Many of you have identified yourself with this country; you have been to prisons, you have struggled. Have you not committed

suicide for something which is very small? Another commits suicide because he has no belief; he is a cynic, all his intellectual life has led him to nothing but despair and misery, and so he commits suicide. The man who believes and the man who does not believe have both committed suicide, in their own ways, because both want to escape from themselves. They want to escape through the country, through the idea of nationalism, through the idea of God; and when God and nationalism fail, or the country or the ideal for which the country stood for fails, then they are in darkness. And when I or you depend on a friend, on the person whom we love, when that dependence is taken away, we are again on the edge, ready to throw ourselves into darkness. So all of us - through identification with something greater, through belief, through various forms of escapes - try to run away from ourselves; and when we are thrown back upon ourselves we are lost, we are lonely, we are in despair; so we are ready to commit suicide. That is our state, is it not? One whom you love turns away, you are jealous; it reveals the emptiness of your heart and mind, and that frightens you; and therefore you are ready to run away to another form of escape; and so on and on.

So, as long as we do not understand ourselves, we are always on the edge of darkness. We say the world is a terrible place, a miserable place. But the world is what we have created, the world is your relationship to another. If, in that relationship, there is dependence, then there is fear, there is frustration, there is disillusionment; and from that there is the desire for suicide. And if you have a very strong belief, it holds you; and that very belief consciously conditions your mind so that you have no regard for

inner search; that very belief acts as an escape from yourself. The more you are religious the less you are inclined to commit suicide.

The more you question, the more you investigate, there is the constant fear of coming to that very close knowledge which is the emptiness of one's own loneliness. So must you not face that emptiness, without depending upon anything? Must you not come to that state when you are completely lonely, and understand that state? Must you not be alone in order to find that which is alone, that which is not contaminated, which has not been thought about? But you cannot come to that aloneness if you are afraid of your loneliness. Most of us are afraid to face ourselves, and therefore we have many avenues of escapes; and when these avenues of escapes fail, we are thrown back upon ourselves; and it is that moment which we have to regard to look into ourselves; we have to understand this emptiness, not run away from this emptiness through rituals, through any form of distraction, knowledge or belief.

You can only look at this emptiness when the mind is completely absorbed in it, when you know of it without any sense of translating it or without desiring it to change - which is a very arduous process. Since most of us are lazy, we escape into some form of belief or commit suicide. So it is only when a person understands what loneliness is and goes through it, that that person is purified to be alone; and only that aloneness can meet that which is the being in which there is not 'the me' with all its efforts, contradictions and confusions.

Question: I have known moments of quietness, a sense of complete equilibrium, but the moment is fleeting: how can this

balance be sustained?

Krishnamurti: Why do you want to sustain this balance? Is it not the same desire to continue, the same desire to hold on to something which you have. Happiness is an experience, a sense of quietness, a stillness. You have had that experience and so you want to hold on. The very desire to hold on is to give it continuity, is it not? And that which has continuity can never experience the new. That is our trouble, is it not?

We are so traditionally bound, our mind is so conditioned by tradition, by yesterday's beauty by yesterday's sorrow, by yesterday's experience. The mind is saturated by the many yesterdays and no new experience can possibly penetrate; and when by some chance it does, we want to hold on to it; and so the quiet moment becomes a habitual moment, the moment of tradition; and so it is no longer a still mind. It is a mind that is weighed down by acquisition. And the mind that is burdened by the weight of the past is incapable of being still, it only lives on memory, like an old man. A mind that is old, that is burdened by the past, cannot possibly understand a still mind. Please listen to this and you will find out how to put aside the past and to have a fresh mind.

Our difficulty is not the adoption of new methods, new systems of what to do, but how to be creative. We are not creative in our lives, in our ways of thinking, in our activities. We are just machines of routine, and our education is a cultivation of that routine which is memory; and since we are not creative, any new creative breath becomes the old, gets caught in a tradition and is lost. So if you can really listen and understand that, you will see

that any accumulation of virtue or of money or of possessions burdens the mind, and therefore the mind is incapable of knowing the new, being new; and that what is essential in the world at the present time is the new mind, a creative mind - not an inventive mind. A creative mind is not possible when the mind is becoming, is possessing, is caught in the process of memory.

So, a mind that accumulates happy experiences is not a creative mind. A mind that is burdened by the past and therefore by fear, is incapable of bringing about the revolution of being. If you can listen to this and let the truth of this operate unconsciously, without any purposive action by the conscious mind, then you will see that the mind becomes free from the past, not in some distant future but immediately. That means, you must have the capacity to listen, to listen very attentively, without interpretation. Then only is there a possibility of the mind being creative.

Question: I understand, Sir, your emphasis on the need of revolution in the human psyche, and your determined refusal to bless mere ideas; but, Sir, our way of life influences our psyche; why do you not preach voluntary re-distribution of land and property, and thus help to create a right atmosphere for the understanding of your teaching by common men and women. Why do you not lay down the minimum condition that a truth-seeker must fulfil?

Krishnamurti: Sir, what is important in this question? The minimum standard for the truth-seeker? You have them in your books, have you not? Have you not been told from the very beginning that there must be generosity, that you must do good to others, that you must give what little you have to another, that you

must love, that you must not be greedy? Those are all ideals which are good, are they not? Because you have no generosity of the heart, to you the generosity of the heart is an idea. And it is the fact that is more important than the minimum of what you should be.

Will the re-distribution of land create a right atmosphere? Will everybody having enough land, enough food, enough clothing, enough shelter create a right atmosphere for the truth-seeker, for the human being? Sir, what is the essence of this question? Our minds are petty, small; and we think we can enlarge that mind by regulation, by creating a right atmosphere, by re-distribution of land, by economic revolution. The problem is not the distribution of land or what kind of economic system we should have; the problem is the pettiness of our minds. We do not see that.

What constitutes the petty mind? The question that has been put to me is not important; but the questioner is important because it indicates the mind that puts these questions. The question itself can be understood. We can resolve the problem of distribution of land, giving food, clothing, shelter; all these things can be arranged, organized. But, it is the mind that is behind the organization and that is the thing that must be understood. It is there that there must be a revolution, and a petty mind cannot bring about a revolution. The mind even when it thinks of God, is still petty because the mind in itself is petty. When the mind creates a revolution, it must be a petty revolution; because, the mind, do what you will, is still petty, because thought is conditioned. Do what you will, thought is always conditioned - conditioned according to Marx, according to Christianity, Buddhism, or Hinduism and so on. As long as the mind is conditioned, it is a petty mind; and such a mind cannot

create a revolution. It can bring about reforms here and there; but that reformation brings more misery, that very reformation which the petty mind creates ends in tyranny, in concentration camps.

So our problem is not re-distribution of land or a better economic system, but how to break this mind that is so small, so that the mind cannot think at all. Sir, it is very important to understand this question, because we all want to do something in this world. There is so much misery, starvation, lack of love, unkindness, brutality; we all know the absolute absence of love in our daily life. We want to do something but our minds have never produced a revolution; they have produced reformations, but those reformations have produced greater wars, greater miseries. Please see this, hear it, let it penetrate; you will understand it. So thought can never produce a happy world. Thought can produce more confusion, more misery because our thought is always conditioned. There is no free thought because thought is based on memory. Memory is experience; experience is conditioned reaction; from childhood you are brought up as a Hindu, as a Communist, a Socialist or what you will; you are conditioned, shaped, hedged about to be in a frame. The revolutionary man says that that frame is no good and he will put you in a new frame; and if you do not fit into his frame, he will liquidate you; so, that is the constant process of modifying, changing thought; that is not revolution; that is not transformation; that is mere modification, the changing superficially. So, as long as we are concerned with thought, with ideas, with experience, our world will be in a state of confusion and misery.

So our problem is not how to redistribute land or to sacrifice or

to give up something, but how to think, how to bring about the silence of the mind so that a new state can come into being. This revolution is possible only when thought has come to an end. And thinking can only come to an end when I understand the whole process of thought, how thought arises. Thought arises through memory, thought is words. All our action is based on experience, on knowledge which is always conditioned; and if I make an effort to put an end to thought, it is still conditioned. So the mind, realizing this, becomes very quiet. That is true meditation. When the mind - without discipline, without compulsion, without resistance - comprehends this whole process of thought and so becomes quiet, then only is there a possibility of a deep fundamental revolution from which action can take place, which will not be a conditioned action. Therefore there will be possibility of producing a different world in which this conflict between human beings - you have everything and I have nothing - has come to an end; and in that world, though you may have something more than me, I do not care because I have something else.

It is only when the mind is no longer seeking to aggrandize itself, seeking a result, seeking to bring about an action through ideas, that there is a possibility of a revolution which is not of the mind, which is not the product of thought. That revolution is the revolution of being, of truth, of love. This is not sentimental, a superstition, a religious bogey. This is not a myth but a reality that can be discovered by each one. That reality can only be found when you are really earnest, when you know how to listen to something which is true and let that Truth operate, let that cleanse the mind of all thoughts.

February 18, 1953

BOMBAY 5TH PUBLIC TALK 22ND FEBRUARY 1953

For most of us prejudice or bias is a very strong influence in our lives. Most of us are not aware of our prejudices and of the way they condition our life, and we derive a great deal of strength from prejudices; so, it is almost impossible for anything new to penetrate through the thick wall of prejudices and conditioning influences. And the more we make an effort to break through consciously, not only do we further strengthen the prejudices that we have but also cultivate new ones. I do not know if you have observed that any form of conscious effort to get rid of some particular quality or bias or prejudice brings about another form of prejudice, another conditioning, another wall which creates a resistance and from which we derive strength to act, to live, to continue.

It would be unfortunate if we, in listening this evening to the talk here, try to break through any particular wall of prejudices in order to capture a certain meaning or significance of what I am saying. I think therefore it is very important to listen rightly. I do not think I can repeat it too often that there is an art of listening, which is not the cultivation of a new thought or a new resistance. On the contrary, the very process of listening is really a very unconscious awareness. In that unconscious awareness, in that listening, a new perception, a new understanding can come into being; and any effort made destroys and nullifies understanding. You understand only when the mind is fairly quiet, when you are willing to find out the Truth of the matter; but the Truth of a matter is not revealed when you make an effort and therefore create

resistance. So, if I may suggest, let us try to listen, not to mere words or to the definition of a particular word, but to the whole content of any particular statement. The more one listens in that way without any effort, without any directive purpose to use what has been said, to do something in life with it, to use it to act, to use it as an instrument to clear our conflicts and miseries, the more we are capable of listening with a passive awareness, with an easy awareness in which there is no choice, with an alertness in which the meaning, the significance comes without any effort on our part.

I want to discuss, if I can, this evening, the thing that we call influence, the motive power, the faith, the strength which keeps us going, the machinery of dull routine, the so-called purpose which having established itself gives us a certain driving power, and that very force of an idea, of a purpose, of an aim, of wanting to achieve a result, which gives us a great deal of strength to continue. For most of us there is ambition, the desire to achieve a result - whether particular, or national or of a party or of a group of people - and when we identify ourselves with a particular idea, we derive a great deal of strength from it, and that keeps us going, that gives us an energy, a drive; and the more we use that energy, the greater is the capacity to achieve a result. But in the wake of that capacity there is always pain, there is always suffering, there is always frustration; and so gradually we lose confidence.

I do not know if you have noticed in yourselves that if you strive after an idea, if you strive after a result, you may achieve it; but in the very process of that achievement there is always a frustration in which there is fear, there is a lack of confidence; being aware of this lack of confidence, you identify yourself with

something which sustains you, from which there is strength, and that strength keeps you going. If I have no particular ideal, I have faith in God, and that faith keeps me going; all the troubles I translate with that faith, or that faith sustains me through trouble. But most of us have really no faith at all; we have a verbal assertion of faith and so we are always looking for something, some idea, some person, some guru, some political party, some system; we identify ourselves with a country, with an idea, from which we derive strength and so keep going; and those of us who have capacity use that capacity as a means to sustain our effort.

As long as there is an outward or inward faith, there is always fear. Most of us try to awaken self-confidence through some kind of experience, the experience of God or the experience of knowledge, or the experience of a conditioned state. I believe in a particular religion, in a particular ideal, in God; from that belief, I derive strength that sustains me; and then in the very process of the energy of sustaining, there is the cultivation of the me, of the I, the self, the ego. If we have no confidence in ourselves, we try to learn the technique of certain practices, and so establish routine, a habit of thought which gives us vitality, the energy with which to confront our daily conflicts and struggles. The more intelligent, the more alert we are, the less faith we have in anything.

So, is there not a way of life in which self-confidence is non-existent? Let us go into it a little bit. I depend on my parents when I am young; and as I grow older, I depend on society, on a job, on capacity; and when these fail me, I depend upon faith; there is always a dependence, a faith in something; that dependence sustains me, gives me vitality, energy; and as with all dependences

there is always fear, and so I set conflict going. Or, having no faith, I cultivate consistency, to be constant in my life according to my idea, and that very consistency endangers my self-confidence; the more I am consistent the less I am strong, vital, clear-cut. Self-consistency - to be consistent to a certain form, to a certain action - is what most of us are striving for, which is the cultivation of self-confidence.

So wherever we try, there is always this desire to depend on something to give us strength - on a person, on a particular idea, on a political party, on a system, or on an experience. So there is always a dependence on something to sustain us; and as we depend more and more, there is the cultivation of fear. Dependence arises because in ourselves we are insufficient, in ourselves we are lonely, in ourselves we are empty. I depend and therefore I cultivate faith; therefore we must have more knowledge; and as we become more and more civilized, more and more learned - materialistic or spiritual - we must have faith or we turn cynics.

Now, is there not a drive for action - to do something, to live - without being dependent on anything inwardly? For most of us self-confidence is necessary, and for most of us confidence is merely the continuation of an experience or the continuation of knowledge. Does self-confidence ever free the mind from its own conditioning influence? Does this confidence derived through effort bring about freedom or does it merely condition the mind? And is it not possible to free the mind, to remove all dependences? That is, am I capable of being aware of my loneliness, of my complete emptiness, being aware of it without running away from it, and not being consistent through any particular form of

knowledge or experience? What is our problem, is it not? Most of us are running away from ourselves as we are; we cultivate various forms of virtues to help us to run away. We cultivate various forms of confidence, knowledge, experience; we depend on faith; but underneath it all, there is a sense of immense loneliness; and it is only when we are capable of looking at it; living with it, understanding it fully, that there is a possibility of acting without bringing about a series of efforts which condition the mind to a particular action. Please listen to this and you will see it.

All our life we try to be consistent to a particular thought or to a pattern of thought, and the very desire to be consistent creates energy, drive, gives us strength and so narrows down the mind. The mind that is consistent is a very small mind, a petty mind. A small mind has enormous capacity for energy; it derives a great deal of strength from its pettiness, and so our life becomes very small, very limited, very narrow. Can we realize this process of dependence from which we derive strength, in which there is conflict, in which there is fear, envy, jealousy, competition, that constantly narrows down all our efforts so that there is always fear?

Is it not possible to look, to be aware of our loneliness, of our emptiness and understand it without trying to escape from it? The very understanding of it is not to condemn it, but to be passively aware of it, to listen to the whole content of that loneliness. It means really to go beyond the self, beyond the `me' and from there act, because our present action is within the confines of the `me'. It may be enlarged, extended, but it is always the `me' identifying with a person or an ideal; and that identification gives us a great

deal of strength to act, to do, to be, and that identification strengthens the `me', the `I', the self in which there is everlasting conflict, everlasting misery; and so all our actions lead to frustration. Recognising that, we turn to faith, we turn to God as a source of strength; and that too is the enlargement of the `me', the strengthening of the `me', because the `me' is running away from itself, from that loneliness in itself. When we are capable of facing that loneliness without condemnation or judgment, looking at it, understanding it, hearing the whole content of the `me', of that loneliness, then only is there a possibility of having strength which is not of the `me'. Then only is there a possibility of bringing about a different world or a different culture.

Question: You have talked so much of beauty. Now tell us of ugliness.

Krishnamurti: We avoid ugliness, we turn our back upon it. We put away the thing that we call evil, and cultivate the thing that we call good. We resist the thing called sin and cultivate virtue. We avoid those things which are ugly - the ugly street, the ugly faces, the ugly habits - and always pursue the thing we call beauty, the good, the noble. Now in this process what happens? When we turn our back on the ugly, and turn our faces to beauty, what happens? We become insensitive, do we not?

When you put away the ugly, resist it, turn your back upon it, and turn your face to what is considered beautiful, what are you doing? You are only observing one side of life, not the whole process of life; and the whole process of life, the total process of life, includes the ugly and the beautiful. Is there such a thing as ugliness? And must not the mind be totally sensitive to both,

beauty and ugliness? Must it not be aware of hatred as well as of love, not as opposed to each other, not as a dual process? Please follow this. For us, hate and love are two opposites; we want to avoid hate and we want to cultivate love. In the very avoidance of hate we are cultivating resistance, we create ugliness, we are becoming insensitive; we are insensitive to the whole section which we call ugly and we try to be sensitive to the whole part which we call beauty.

So there is a dual process going on, the avoidance of that which we call ugly and the capturing of that which we call beauty; and in that conflict the mind becomes dull, the mind becomes insensitive, unaware. It is like walking down the street and only looking at the beautiful sky or only looking at the trees, the stars. Life is not only the sky, the stars and the trees but also the dirt, the squalor, the ugliness, the misery, the children that are starving, the tears and the laughter. The whole process is life. But the mind does not want to be sensitive to understand the whole process, it wants to pursue a particular pattern of thought. And the pursuit of a particular thought is considered noble, good, virtuous; that only leads to respectability, and the respectable mind will never find God. (Laughter). No, Sirs, don't laugh! That is what we want. We want to be respectable because we all want to be consistent, and that very consistency gives us self-confidence; and where there is the strengthening of the self, there is respectability, whether through virtue or through denial of virtue.

So life is not merely the pursuit of the beautiful, but also the comprehension of that which we call sin, ugly. It requires a great deal of sensitivity and alertness, a passive awareness of both; and

then we will find that there is no ugly, no beautiful, but only the state of the mind. But you cannot come to that state of mind by the cultivation of any particular virtue or by pursuing a particular thought which you consider beautiful. That state of mind comes only when we understand the total process of our whole being - anger, envy, jealousy, love, hate, the ugly things of our existence, the tears and the laughter, the whole thing. The man who avoids the squalor and hangs a picture in his room and worships that picture psychologically or physically, is never satisfied.

Surely what is important is not the cultivation of the beautiful or the avoidance of the ugly, but to understand the total process of our existence, everything that we are. And there can be no understanding of everything we are if we are merely concerned with judgment; because, most of us derive strength from judging others or judging our own character, our own state. We have values and according to those values we judge people, experiences, ideas; that very judgment gives us strength; and in that strength, in that judgment we live; and from that, we derive confidence for further action. Such an action, such an activity, such judgment obviously cripples our capacity to understand the whole process of existence. That is why it is very difficult for most of us to live completely open inwardly, psychologically, without any background, to live from moment to moment without the psychological accumulation of judgment, of any pursuit, of virtue, of the denial of sin; because, we are not quite aware of the total entity, consciously or unconsciously, we are not aware of the whole.

You are both hate and love; but by merely cultivating love and making a conscious effort to pursue it, love is no longer love. The

man who is conscious of love does not know love; likewise, the man who is conscious of his humility surely ceases to be humble; there is only concern with the cultivation of the partial. So what is important in understanding this question is not what is ugly and what is beautiful but to be totally sensitive to the whole process of life which is you, to the total process of relationship. After all, society is relationship, and if I understand that relationship, conflict, pleasures, pain, sorrow, ugliness, bitterness, the whole of that, then I am a mature human being. But to understand the whole, the total process of life, the conscious as well as the unconscious, requires a great deal of listening to the whole content of myself - which means, there must not be condemnation, judgment.

You see how difficult it is to live without condemnation, to live without comparison; because, our mind is always comparing, everlastingly judging; and with that comparison, with that judgment, there is vitality, there is strength; and we are satisfied with that vitality and strength - which is very destructive. If I want to understand, there must be no comparison, there must be no judgment, I must listen, I must go into it. And that requires enormous patience, affection, care - which implies an openness of mind, not a blankness but a passivity of mind. But the mind will resist all this. The mind exists only in comparing, judging. That is the function of the mind. And when you deprive it of judgment, of comparison, there is no longer the mind, there is no longer the anchorage of it in which the mind can live; so we are afraid of that, and so we cultivate various forms of beauty and avoid various forms of ugliness; and so we are caught everlastingly in the conflict of duality. But if we can understand it as a total process, a

unitary process, then there is no conflict of duality, then there is a possibility of the mind going beyond itself, a possibility of quietness, stillness, so that you can receive that which is true.

Question: How can I be free from envy?

Krishnamurti: What is envy? Is not envy the desire for the more? The more knowledge, the more power, the more love, the more adulation, the more understanding; having more and more of things, of ideas, of knowledge. The more implies comparison, does it not? Please listen.

You will see that one can be free from envy completely, not at some future date but immediately, if one knows how to listen to the Truth of the statement, 'The mind is the seat of envy'. The mind is everlastingly asking for more and more, and our whole civilization is based upon the acquiring of the more, the demand for more properties, more money, more, more and more; therefore there is always comparison, therefore everlastingly struggle. Knowing envy, we say we must cultivate non-envy, which is another form of the more, negatively. So is it possible for the mind not to think in terms of the more at all, not to compare, not to judge what it is. This is not stagnation; on the contrary, when the mind is not seeking the more, when it is not comparing, you are no longer concerned with time.

Time implies 'the more' - 'I will be something tomorrow', 'I will be happy in the future', 'I will be a rich man', 'I will fulfil', 'I will be loved', 'I shall love' and so on. The comparative mind, the mind that is asking for the more, is the mind of time, of tomorrow, is it not? So, when such a mind says, 'I must not be envious', it is again another form of time, is it not? Another form of comparison

is, 'I have been this, I shall be less than that'. So, can the mind which is seeking the more, stop completely from the demand of the more which is envy? Do you understand the problem, Sirs?

The problem is not how to be free from envy - which is a very small affair - but how, not to think in terms of the more; how not to think comparatively, how not to think in terms of time, how not to think 'I will be'? Can the mind ever not think in terms of the more? Do not say it is not possible. You do not know. All that you do know is the more - more knowledge, more influence, more clothes, more property, more love. If you cannot get the more, then you want the less and less and less.

Now, is it possible for the mind not to think at all in those terms? First put the question. Do not help me to be free of envy. Can the mind cease to think in terms of the more? Put that question and listen - not only now, but when you go home, when you are taking the tramcar, sitting in the bus, when you are walking alone, when you see a sari. When you see a man going in a big car, the big politician, the big businessman, put that question and find out and listen to it. Then you will find the truth of the matter; then you will find that the Truth frees the mind from the more. The mind then is not the conscious mind making an effort to denude itself of the more. When the mind makes a conscious effort of not asking for more, it is another form of negation of the same thing, of the more; so in that, there is no answer. But if you put that question, you can only listen to it when you are not judging, when you don't want a result, when you don't want to use it to produce a certain action. It is only when you are listening, that it is possible for Truth to come into being, which will free the mind from the more.

Question: You have talked of a state of non-recognition. How does that state come into being?

Krishnamurti: First of all, let us find out how this state of recognition comes into being. Without memory there is no mind. Without naming there is no mind. If I do not recognize, I have no experience, is there? There is no experience without recognition, is there? If I do not recognize you, I do not have an experience of meeting you, have I? So all experience is a process of recognition, is it not? The mind is the process of recognition. Naming, verbalizing memory is all recognizing. So, my mind which is the mechanism of recognition can never see the new. It can only recognize what has been. All experiences are conditioned. They are never liberating; because, every experience is recognized by me as good, beautiful, ugly, worthwhile or non-worthy. The very process of recognition, that very process of experience through recognition strengthens the conditioning of the mind. So there is no freedom through experience because, after all, experience is the process of recognizing. I recognize because of a similarity in the past, so that the past is the process of recognition. We say that experience is the liberating force. We say that the more we experience, that the more we recognize an experience, understand it, store it away, the more there is wisdom. Is that so? Every experience only conditions my thinking, does it not? And thinking is the process of recognizing, verbalizing, naming, terming. So my mind is conditioning itself, limiting itself, confining itself through the experience which is already recognized, which has come from the background, from the mind itself. So my mind which is the mechanism of recognition can never know what Truth is, what

Reality is.

Reality is the original, the new, the completely unrecognizable. If I can recognize it, it is my projection, something I have already known; therefore it is not Truth. Please follow this. Please listen to this rather than following it. All the gods, all the experiences, all the images and symbols which man pursues in his desire for happiness are projections of his recognition, of his experiences. There is no freedom through knowledge, accumulation of recognition which is the process of experience.

We know, we are aware that the moment I recognize an experience, it is not new. Can the mind ever be in the state of non-recognition? Do not say, 'No'. Please do not shake your heads, but listen and find out. If the mind can never be in a state of non-recognition, then there is no possibility of anything new, there is no possibility of Truth or God. The Truth which is recognizable, the God which is recognizable, is not Truth, is not God but only a projection of my past. You have to see the truth of the fact that so long as the mind is recognizing, there is nothing new, there is no creativity at any time, there is nothing beyond the state of recognition. Now, is there a state which is not of recognition? If I say, 'Yes', it would be no answer, because it is my statement which has no value; but you have to find out the truth of it. And to find the truth of it, is to put the question, to go into it, to let the mind, the unconscious, the deeper things, give hints of the thing which is not recognizable. Have you not experienced this at any time? The mind is quiet, still - it may be for a fleeting second - when it is in a state when something new is happening inwardly to it; but that state of non-recognition is immediately captured by recognition, by

past memories, by past desires. That state is the new, but the mind captures it, recognizes it and wants more of it. That is all its concern, the more.

Is there not a state when the mind is not recognizing, when it is absolutely still, when it is no longer asking even for an experience, when the whole desire for the more, when the whole demand for acquiring, has completely ceased? It is only in that state that there is a possibility of the state of non-recognition. When the mind is so still, so quiet, without any process of recognition, it is only then that Truth can come into being. But the moment you recognize it as Truth, it is no longer Truth; it is already caught in the net of time. Because Truth is something which comes into being from moment to moment, it is not to be accumulated, to be stored away, to be used. If it is stored away, if it is to be used, to be captured, then it is no longer Truth; then it is only a memory, a thing that has come and gone. Truth is not to be accumulated. The mind can never understand Truth, because the mind is a process of recognition. The mind can never experience Truth. Truth is a living thing; and a living thing cannot be understood by the mind because the mind is the result of the past, it is a dead thing.

And as Truth, that Reality, is something not of time, the mind cannot comprehend the timeless. The mind can create all kinds of illusions, project various forms of desires, symbols; but that is not Reality. That Reality comes only when the mind is in a state of non-recognition, and that state is not to be cultivated. You cannot cultivate a state which you do not know. If you knew it, it is not truth. It is only memory which is conditioning you to a particular action. So the mind enquiring what is truth, what is Reality, can

never find it. It can invent, it can theorize, but it can never know what Reality is.

That Reality can only come when the mind recognizes its own process, how it is conditioned, and when there is then a freedom from its own recognizing process. Then only is there a possibility of the mind being so still that it is capable of receiving that which is Truth. Truth is timeless. It is of no time. Therefore it cannot be captured, put away for use, or remembered, re-named. Therefore, Truth is creative. It is everlastingly new, the mind can never understand it.

February 22, 1953

BOMBAY 6TH PUBLIC TALK 25TH FEBRUARY 1953

I think it is important to understand the problem of discontent. Perhaps we may find the right answer to our enormous problems if we can search out the deeper significance of discontent. Most of us are dissatisfied with ourselves, with our environment, with our ideas, with our relationships. We want to bring about a change. There is discontent from the villager up to the most learned man, if he is not caught in his knowledge, if he is not a slave to his learning. There is a spreading discontent which makes us do all kinds of actions, and we want to find a way to contentment. If you are dissatisfied, you want to find a way to happiness. If you are battling within yourselves, you want to find a way to peace. Being dissatisfied, discontented, you want to find an answer that will be satisfactory. So the mind is ever groping, ever probing to find out the truth - the true answer to its discontent. Some find an answer in their satisfaction, in an aim, in a purpose of life which they have established for themselves; and finding a means to their desire, they think they have found contentment.

Is contentment to be found? Is peace a thing to be found by the process of the intellect? Is happiness a thing gotten by the understanding or by the creation of the opposite of what it is? This misery, and this discontent - is it essential in our life? The fact is we are discontented with what is, discontented with things which we have, with what we are; and the discontent arises because of comparison. I am discontented because I see you are learned, rich, happy, powerful. Is that the cause of discontent? Or does

discontent come into being when I am seeking a way away from what is? If I can understand the way of discontent, perhaps there will be happiness, there will be contentment. There is no way to happiness, to contentment. That contentment and that happiness are not the process of stagnation because if I am discontented and if I want to be contented, then that way leads to contentment which is stagnation; and that is what most of us want. But is there a way?

Can we find out, can we probe into the question of discontentment without trying to create its opposite, without trying to seek its opposite? Because after all, when we are young, we are discontented with society as it is. We want to reform, we want to bring about a change. So we join a society, a party, a political group, or a religious association. And soon our discontentment is canalized, held and is destroyed. Because, then we are only concerned with carrying out a way, a system which will produce a result, and thereby put aside our discontent. Is that not one of our greatest problems? How easily we are satisfied!

Is not discontent essential in our life, to any question, to any enquiry, to probing, to finding out what is the Real, what is Truth, what is essential in life? I may have this flaming discontent in college; and then I get a good job and this discontent vanishes. I am satisfied, I struggle to maintain my family, I have to earn a livelihood and so my discontent is calmed, destroyed, and I become a mediocre entity satisfied with things of life, and I am not discontented. But the flame has to be maintained from the beginning to the end, so that there is true enquiry, true probing into the problem of what is discontent. Because the mind seeks very easily a drug to make it content with virtues, with qualities, with

ideas, with actions, it establishes a routine and gets caught up in it. We are quite familiar with that, but our problem is not how to calm discontent, but how to keep it smouldering, alive, vital. All our religious books, all our gurus, all political systems pacify the mind, quieten the mind, influence the mind to subside, to put aside discontent and wallow in some form of contentment. And is it not essential to be discontented in order to find what is true?

Why is it that we are discontented, and does discontent produce revolution, change, transformation? And does transformation revolution, come about only when we understand the nature of discontent? And with what is there discontent? What is it that we are discontented with? When you can really probe into that question, then you may find an answer. What is it that we are discontented with? Surely with `what is'. The `what is' may be the social order, the `what is' may be the relationship, the `what is' may be what we are, the thing we are essentially - which is, the ugly, the wandering thoughts, the ambitions, the frustrations, the innumerable fears; that is what we are. In going away from that, we think we shall find an answer to our discontent. So we are always seeking a way, a means to change the `what is' - that is what our mind is concerned with. If I am discontented and if I want to find a way, the means to contentment, my mind is occupied with the means, the way and the practising of the way in order to arrive at contentment. So I am no longer concerned with discontent, with the embers, the flame that is burning, which we call discontent. We do not find out what is behind that discontent. We are only concerned with going away from that flame, from that burning anxiety.

Surely we are discontented with `what is'. And it is enormously difficult to probe into the actual `what is', not `what should be' but into what I am from moment to moment. This is not the enquiry, the probing, into the higher-self which is a fabrication of the mind, but into `what is'. This is enormously difficult because our mind is never satisfied, never content in the examination of `what is'. It always wants to transform `what is' into something else - which is the process of condemnation, justification or comparison. If you observe your own minds you will see that when it comes face to face with `what is', then it condemns, then it compares it with `what it should be', or it justifies it and so on, and thereby pushes away `what is', setting aside the thing which is causing the disturbance, the pain, the anxiety.

Is not discontent essential, not to be smothered away, but to be encouraged, enquired into, probed into, so that with the understanding of `what is' there comes contentment? That contentment is not the contentment which is produced by a system of thought; but it is that contentment which comes with the understanding of `what is'. That contentment is not the product of the mind - the mind which is disturbed, agitated, incomplete, when it is seeking peace, when it is seeking a way away from `what is'. And so the mind through justification, comparison, judgment, tries to alter `what is', and thereby hopes to arrive at a state when it will not be disturbed, when it will be peaceful, when there will be quietness. And when the mind is disturbed by social conditions, by poverty, starvation, degradation, by the appalling misery, seeing all that, it wants to alter it, it gets entangled in the way of altering, in the system of altering. But if the mind is capable of looking at

`what is' without comparison, without judgment, without the desire to alter it into something else, then you will see that there comes a kind of contentment which is not of the mind.

The contentment which is the product of the mind is an escape. It is sterile. It is dead. But there is contentment which is not of the mind, which comes into being when there is the understanding of `what is', in which there is profound revolution which affects society and individual relationship. So, discontent is not to be calmed, to be set aside, to be drugged by some system of thought. It is an essential thing. It must be kept alive, burning, in order to find out.

We are in conflict with each other and our world is being destroyed. There is crisis after crisis, war after war; there is starvation, misery; there are the enormously rich clothed in their respectability, and there are the poor. To solve these problems, what is necessary is not a new system of thought, not a new economic revolution, but to understand `what is' - the discontent, the constant probing of `what is' - which will bring about a revolution which is more far-reaching than the revolution of ideas. And it is this revolution that is so necessary to bring about a different culture, a different religion, a different relationship between man and man.

Question: Who are you? Whom am I listening to? You say, `Do not rely on any guru', you say, `Listen to me', listening to you is to listen to the greatest guru of all. I am puzzled. What am I to do?

Krishnamurti: Does it really matter very much who the speaker is? Surely it does not matter much by whom the microphone is made; but it matters very much what the microphone conveys to

your ears. The voice is of no importance. Whose it is, whether it is educated, whether it is the voice of the cultured, it does not at all matter; but what is important is what it says, conveys. And what it says, and the understanding of it depends upon you, not on the guru, not on the voice, but on how you understand it, how you translate it, how you put it into action. So again the voice is not important; what is important is listening.

How do you listen? Do you listen with your projections, through your projection, through your ambitions, desires, fears, anxieties, through hearing only what you want to hear, only what will be satisfactory, what will gratify, what will give comfort, what will for the moment alleviate your suffering? If you listen through the screen of your desires, then you obviously listen to your own voice; you are listening to your own desires. And is there any other form of listening? Is it not important to find out how to listen not only to what is being said but to everything - to the noise in the streets, to the chatter of birds, to the noise of the tramcar, to the restless sea, to the voice of your husband, to your wife, to your friends, to the cry of a baby? Listening has importance only when one is not projecting one's own desires through which one listens. Can one put aside all these screens through which we listen, and really listen?

What does this listening mean? That is all we are concerned with - not who the speaker is, it is utterly irrelevant; not whether he is good or bad; not whether he is the guru, small or big. But in listening to the speaker, you are going to find out how you are listening, how you are watching yourself. Do not merely listen to me, but watch the process of your own mind - how you project,

how you ward off, how you feel shy of certain statements, how you will resist and how you will put aside a new idea, a new way of looking; all that reveals the process of your own mind, does it not? And when you discard, put aside all these projections of the mind, is there any other way of listening? Can one put them aside and really listen?

Then, is there a guru at all? Then, is a guru necessary at any time? We all think a guru is necessary from the beginning to the threshold. If the guru is not necessary after the threshold, then he is not necessary from the beginning, because the end lies in the beginning, and the man who is seeking the threshold of reality must seek at the beginning, not at the end. And because we are sluggish, impatient, doubtful, discontented, we want to find somebody to lead us away from our discontent. The understanding of this is essential, not the entity who leads away, not the system, not the thought that will take us away from what we actually are.

So, is it not important to know how you are listening? And when you listen without these projections, what happens? Please follow this. What happens when you are not projecting your desires through which you hear, through which you translate to suit your particular temperament, your particular idiosyncracies? When you are not projecting your desires, how do you listen? Is your mind capable of listening? Will it allow you to listen? And then when you are so capable of listening, and when you are listening, what happens? What happens to the mind that is so listening? This is important but not whether there is a guru or not, not whether you are hearing the voice of the guru who is promulgating the Truth to which you are listening and which makes the guru essential for

you? What are you listening to when you are not listening through the screen, through the layers of your own projections? Do you understand?

We are always listening to something - to a noise, to the voice of somebody, to the restless sea. But if you are not listening through your projections, then are you listening to anything? Please watch your own mind, not what I am saying. If you watch what I am saying, you are dependent on me; and if you depend on me, then you have fear; then you are fettered to me, and that is a bondage; that is a travail from which you have to go beyond. So from the very beginning, do not be dependent on any one. Do not follow any one, because it matters what you are from the beginning, not what you are at the end.

So when the mind is no longer following, no longer listening to the voice of its own projections, its desires, ambitions, satisfactions, then what is the mind listening to? Is there a listening to anything? Is it not a complete openness, a complete state in which there is no reaction, no listening to anything, in which there is no concentration, no absorption with an idea, in any idea? Is it not a state of complete passive activity, when the mind is very quiet, not listening to anything in particular, but listening, not projecting, but thoroughly still. Then in that state, is there a guru? And in that state, is a guru necessary? Is that state not possible from the very beginning? That is, if I want to understand something fundamental, must I not be in that state always? Most of you are projecting your own desires, so most of you do not listen. You are always listening to something. You are not merely listening. You are always listening to your own voice, and that

voice always assumes the voice of despair, of hope, of pleasure, of security. But if you are not listening to something if you merely listen, then is there not an utter stillness of the mind which is not the result of any discipline to be achieved at some far end, but which is to be understood right at the very beginning, from now on for the rest of your lives?

Can you completely and totally discard this whole idea of the guru, the awakener, the giver of comfort, the man who will lead you to Truth? I say you can completely wipe it away when you see that listening to something is listening to your own projections, to your own desires, that it is translating them to suit yourselves; when you understand that, then there is no listening to anything; then there is only listening; that listening is eternal because it is not of time, because it is not of the mind.

Question: What is happiness? Is it not the search for happiness that makes the mind crave for new experiences? Is there a state of happiness that is beyond the mind?

Krishnamurti: Why do we enquire 'what is happiness'? Is that the right approach? Is that the right probing? We are not happy. If we were happy, our world would be entirely different; our civilization, our culture would be wholly, radically different. We are unhappy human beings, petty, miserable, struggling, vain, surrounding ourselves with useless futile things, satisfied with petty ambitions, with money and position. We are unhappy beings, though we may have knowledge, though we may have money, rich houses, plenty of children, cars, experience. We are unhappy suffering human beings; and because we are suffering, we want happiness; and so we are led away by those who promise this

happiness, social, economic or spiritual. So we want to escape from 'what is' - the suffering, the pain, the loneliness, the despair. We want to run away from it, and the very running away gives us experience; and that experience we call happiness. Is there any other kind of happiness?

What is the good of my asking if there is happiness, when I am suffering? Can I understand suffering? That is my problem, not how to be happy. I am happy when I am not suffering; but the moment I am conscious of it, it is not happiness. Is it not so? Because the moment I know I am virtuous, I cease to be virtuous. The moment I know I am humble, courageous, generous, the moment I am aware of it, then I am not that. So happiness, like virtue, is not a thing to be sought after, not a thing to be invited. Virtue when cultivated becomes immoral, because it strengthens the 'me', the 'I', leading to respectability which is the self. So, I must understand what is suffering. Can I understand what is suffering when a part of my mind is running away seeking happiness, seeking a way out of this misery? So must I not, if I am to understand suffering, be completely one with it, not reject it, not justify it, not condemn it, not compare it, but completely be with it and understand it?

Can I listen to the voice of suffering without projections? I cannot listen when I am seeking happiness. So my probing, my enquiry is no longer what is happiness, nor if there is happiness beyond my mind, nor whether it is permanent or impermanent, nor whether it is an experience and therefore to be stored. The moment I do any of these things, it is already gone; therefore it is no longer happiness. But the truth of what is happiness will come if I know

how to listen. I must know how to listen to suffering; if I can listen to suffering I can listen to happiness because that is what I am.

I suffer; I am fearful of death; I desire to be secure after death; I desire to be permanent, to have position, wealth, comfort; I am filled with the ache of loneliness. So can I listen to all that? Then, my problem is no longer a way to happiness but to find out how to listen to the voice of suffering, just to listen without trying to interpret it. And that is a very arduous process because the mind continuously objects to live with suffering, to look at it, not to interpret it, not to justify it, not to translate it, not to condemn it, but to look at it, to know its content, to be acquainted with it, to love it. The mind is capable of listening to that voice which is beyond suffering, only when the mind is not running away from it into some futile imagination or illusion or some desire for satisfaction.

So what is important is not if there is happiness, but from the very beginning to enquire what is suffering, and to stay with that till the right answer comes. The right answer cannot come if you are seeking. The moment you search for the right answer, the mind is projected because it wants the answer; therefore it is not concerned with the listening to suffering. It is not concerned with listening, but it is concerned with the answer which will reject this suffering. The moment you wish to reject something then you will find an answer which will be satisfactory; and so it will be that satisfaction which the mind seeks and not the understanding of suffering. After all, that is what we all want. We want satisfaction, either in a position, in relationship, or in ideas. And the more we are satisfied the more the suffering. Because, the mind that is

satisfied is never let alone; it is always being challenged on every side of life, So a mind realizing that it is seeking satisfaction - the very desire to find an answer for suffering is to be satisfied - totally puts aside all this. Therefore it is only listening, seeing the whole process how the mind runs away, how it never can stay with suffering - such as facing fear. Fear comes only when you are running away from it. Fear exists in the process of flight, not when you are confronted with the thing. It is only when you are running away from the thing, in the very running away, fear is created - not when you are watching the thing, the `what is'.

So, similarly, can I look at suffering without running away - which creates sorrow, which creates fear which prevents me from looking at it? If I can look at it, then there is a possibility of listening to suffering without interpretation, without judgment without translating or asking for a result. Then only is there a possibility of listening, of trying to find something beyond the mind.

We cannot find what is beyond the mind, if we do not know, if we are incapable of facing `what is'. And it requires enormous attention, great passive awareness to observe without justification, without judgment, just to observe, just to listen. In that, there is transformation. In that, there is happiness which is not measured by time, by the mind.

Question: You talk so much of intelligence. What is it to be intelligent?

Krishnamurti: Again, can a stupid mind see what is intelligence? Can a petty mind, a shallow mind find out what is greatness? Please, Sirs, listen to this. A petty mind enquires after

God. It is like the rich man who builds temples after exploiting people; after putting away money, he enquires 'What is God'? Shall such a man find what is God? His mind is corrupt, his mind is cruel, ungenerous, unkind, petty, small and clothed by his own beliefs; shall such a man find what is Truth, what is Reality, what is God? He may surround himself with images, symbols, prayers, words, books; but shall such a mind find what is God? His mind is petty, and his God is also petty. So a stupid mind enquiring what is intelligence can never understand what is intelligence; but if it is aware that it is stupid, then it is already intelligent. Do please listen to this; it is not a matter of emotional nervous laughter.

As most of us are petty, small, narrow, we create the world in our image, not in God's image. So what is important is not what is intelligence, but to be aware of our own narrowness, of our stupidity of our pettiness without trying to alter it, without saying, 'I must make it intelligent, I must make it clever. When the petty mind which is aware that it is petty tries to alter its pettiness, then its activity will still be petty. If I realize that I am stupid, if I am aware that I am stupid, and if I set about to alter that stupidity, that very action is born of stupidity, is it not? But can I be aware that I am stupid, and listen to it, follow it, understand it, and not challenge it? The stupid mind is still a stupid mind it cannot alter its course which is choice; all that it can do is to see that whatever it chooses is still petty. Please observe your own mind. Don't listen to me only, but watch your own minds and see the truth of what I am saying.

Because choice is a factor of deterioration, choice is petty under all circumstances; there is no great choice and no little choice. All

our cultural; religious processes are from discrimination to discrimination, climbing higher and higher through choice. But the choice is made by the petty mind, because where there is choice there is pettiness of the mind. A mind which is the result of hate, which is the result of prejudice, which is the result of conditioning, whatever such a mind chooses is still conditioned; whatever its experiences, they are still conditioned. Therefore a mind that is petty, in choosing, is not liberated from its pettiness. Therefore when a mind chooses something great, the great is still the petty. When the petty mind chooses the guru, a particular guru to follow, it is the petty, mind that chooses; therefore the guru is petty. And so all gurus are petty because you have chosen them.

So intelligence is surely something that is not cultivable through the process of choice, through the process of experience, through knowledge. A petty mind remains a petty mind though it has innumerable experiences, because at the centre it is still petty. You may read all the Vedas, all the Upanishads, the Gita, all the sacred books of the East and the West; the mind is still petty; so your knowledge is still petty. Is not the mind always petty? Can it be anything other than petty and small? So is it not important to find out not what is intelligence but in what way the mind is choosing, acting, discriminating? Is it not important to find out for yourselves - not to listen to me, not to read a book on what is intelligence - to observe the state of your own mind? Only in the uncovering of 'what is', intelligence comes into being. In the understanding of 'what is' there is that intelligence which is creative.

Question: Every religion advocates prayer. Will you please explain the power of prayer and how prayer differs from

meditation?

Krishnamurti: You pray, do you not? And when do you pray? Is it when you are happy? Or is it that you pray in the moment of strain and suffering? You pray every morning when you are doing puja. That is a routine, that is traditional and dull and without much significance. When you are suffering, you pray, do you not? You supplicate, petition, to find an answer for your suffering. And there is a prayer in which there is no routine, which is not the outcome of supplication, but which is complete listening.

The routine prayer of repetition of words, obviously produces a certain result; the more you repeat the more quiet you are. But that quietness of repetition is stagnation, because the mind is put to sleep by repeating a phrase, and you think you have done marvellously if you can quieten the mind by repetition; but that quietness is not creative, is it? It is dull, it is like the petty human being who is concerned with household things and prays, repeats words because, in repetition, it is peaceful in its smallness.

Then there is prayer, supplication, petitioning when there is suffering. Please follow all this, listen to all this. When I suffer I want an answer. When my son dies, I want to find comfort; I want somebody to tell me that he is all right. When I am dying in my old age, I want an assurance from some guru or from the book or from some friend that everything is all right, that I am secure. So I beg, I petition, I enquire, I ask. When I petition, when I ask, when I beg, I receive what I want; because, what I want is security, comfort. Because I am confronted with the abyss of darkness, with loneliness, with utter extinction, and not knowing what it is, I ask somebody to give me the answer which I want - which is, to

guarantee that on the other side there is light, there is companionship, there is the Father. So when I suffer, I pray; and my prayer is answered according to my desire. This is not a cynical reply, but it is the actual fact.

I am suffering, and somebody comes and tells me that I am suffering because of all the misery that I have inflicted on thousands of people, the way I have behaved. I do not want to face it, I want to be pacified, I want comfort and I seek the person who satisfies me. Or in that suffering, when I pray, I think about something - about light, about the bird, the sea, about a picture - and my suffering goes; I temporarily put it aside. Have you not noticed that if you can turn your mind from your physical suffering there is less suffering? Similarly, in praying, if you can turn your mind away from the present conflict, from the present misery, there is peace. But that is an escape. In that, there is deterioration. But it gives you a certain tranquillity, a peace; your mind is at rest; and this peace acts as a drug. You might as well take whisky as pray, because all that you are concerned with is not to suffer, not to enquire, not to find out, not to go beyond; all that you are concerned with is some comfort. So prayer answers what you want; and the more you want, the more strongly you desire, the greater is your satisfaction.

But can one use that word prayer which has been so misused, for something quite different? If I can understand what is meditation, then I shall perhaps understand what is prayer - the right prayer, not the stupid prayer of the petty mind.

What is meditation? To find out what is meditation, you must know what the meditator is - not some higher entity, but the

meditator, the one who meditates, the one who sits down, closes his eyes and begins to meditate. Without knowing that entity, the process is all a waste, and you cannot know meditation because you cannot separate meditation from the meditator. There is no meditation without the meditator, and without the meditator understanding himself there is no peace. So to find out what is meditation one must understand what is the meditator; and in the understanding of the meditator there is self-knowledge, there is wisdom. Don't listen just to words, but understand yourself.

Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and a small mind meditating will, even at the end of ten years, still be a small mind; and that is the tragedy of people who meditate. They have enclosed themselves so deeply in their conditioning that nothing can penetrate; and they remain petty, anxious, everlastingly seeking. The meditator must set about to understand himself from moment to moment, from day to day - what it is he is, what it is he is not, at the time when he is getting into the tramcar when he is talking to his wife, when he is scolding his servant, when he is snobbish - he must study himself at all those moments.

Then in that self-knowledge he will find out the operations of the meditator, how the meditator comes into being; then he will find that there is no meditator apart from meditation, that there is only meditation - not the meditator meditating. Then only, when there is only meditation, there is peace, because the mind then is no longer meditating upon something, because the mind is no longer seeking through meditation to find something. There is only meditation as there is only listening. There is not the meditator meditating upon something. Then the observer is the observed.

Then fear is not. Then only is there peace, and that peace cannot be sought by the mind because the mind is everlastingly petty, small. The mind can never be great. What is great cannot be invited by the mind. The mind can only invite its own pettiness. It cannot invite the great. It cannot invite the Truth, the Real. And so, the mind can only be quiet, receptive, alone, listening.

February 25, 1953

BOMBAY 7TH PUBLIC TALK 1ST MARCH 1953

One of our problems, it seems to me, is this question of mediocrity. I am not using this word in any derogatory sense, but the obvious fact is that the vast majority of us are mediocre. Will any technique, religious or mechanical, release us from that mediocrity? Or must there not be a revolt against the whole idea of technique? Because it seems to me that the more and more one observes there are less and less people who are creative. I am not using that word, 'creative', in the sense of the man who paints, who writes poems or who produces inventions, a genius. We shall find out as we go along what it is to be creative.

But should we not enquire before we find out what it is to be creative; why is it that most of us are so easily influenced? Why do so many of us allow interference in our lives? Why do we want to interfere, and why are we so efficient in judging others? And perhaps we shall find out when we enquire into this, that in the things that we have so carefully cultivated - judgment, the capacity to develop a technique, mechanical or so-called spiritual - there may be the very root of mediocrity, and that, as long as there is no revolt against technique, there will be imitation, authority, the development of capacity, the following of certain ideas, a mind that is constantly consistent - which all indicate the structure of a mind that is mediocre.

Please listen, don't take notes. This is not a class. I am not a professor speaking to you, so that you can take notes which you can think over afterwards. Let us think out together as we go along. I am only saying what is very obvious or fairly obvious; and if you

do not listen, you may not experience immediately that state of creativeness which perhaps we can discover together by understanding - that is, by hearing directly what it is that makes for mediocrity.

Creativeness is a state of aloneness. When the mind is not completely alone there is no creativeness. It is only when the mind is capable of shedding all influences, all interferences, of being completely alone, without dependence, without a companion, without any moulding influence and judgment, that in that state of aloneness there is creativeness. But that state of aloneness is not understood by the mediocre mind, by the mind that is cultivating a practice, the 'know-how', the way to something.

In the world, more and more technique is being developed - the technique of how to influence people through propaganda, through compulsion, through imitation, through examples, through idolatry, through the worship of the hero. There are innumerable books written on how to do a thing, how to think efficiently, how to build a house, how to put machinery together; so gradually we are losing initiative, the initiative to think out something original for ourselves. In our education, in our relationship with Government, through various means we are being influenced to conform, to imitate. And when we allow one influence to persuade us to a particular attitude or action, naturally we create resistance to other influences. In that very process of creating a resistance to another influence, are we not succumbing to it, negatively?

Are we not the result of innumerable influences? Is not our mind, our structure, our being, a network of influences - economic, climatic, social, cultural, religious? It is a mind that is put together,

and with such a mind we want to find out what we want to create. But such a mind can only imitate; it can only put other things together; that is why the world is developing more and more technologically. A man who is technologically trained can never be a creative human being. He may produce a marvellous house, put an aeroplane together; but he is not a creative entity. Because his mind is put together, his mind is not a whole mind, it is not an integrated mind.

How can there be an integrated mind when we are segments of various forms of influences? Our mind is the result of these influences; our mind is conditioned by all these influences, as a Hindu, as a Mussulman, as a Christian. And being conditioned, being subjected to various kinds of influences, we say, 'I will choose a particular influence, a guru, the good, the noble; and I will cultivate through various practices, various methods, that nobility.' But our mind is still a mind influenced, controlled, shaped, pursuing a deliberate end; and such a mind can never be in revolt, can it? Because the moment such a mind is in revolt, it is in a state of chaos. So a mediocre mind can never be in revolt, it can only move from one conditioned state to another, from one influence to another.

Should not the mind always be in revolt so as to understand the influences that are always impinging, interfering, controlling, shaping? Is it not one of the factors of the mediocre mind that it is always fearful and, being in a state of confusion it wants order, it wants consistency, it wants a form, a shape by which it can be guided, controlled; and yet these forms, these various influences create contradictions in the individual, create confusion in the

individual. You are conditioned as a Hindu or a Mussulman; and there is another who is conditioned in being noble, or who is conditioned by certain ideas, economic or religious. Any choice between influences is surely still a state of mediocrity. A mind that chooses between two influences and lives according to that particular influence is still a mediocre mind, is it not? Because, it is never in a state of revolt, and revolt is essential to find out anything.

When the mind is never alone, can it be creative? When you examine your mind, you will find how fearful it is of going wrong, of making a mistake. The mind is constantly seeking security, certainty, safety in a particular consistent pattern of thought; and can such a mind which is never alone, be creative? By alone, I do not mean that loneliness in which there is despair; I mean that aloneness in which there is no dependence of any kind on anything - on tradition, on a custom, on a companion. And must not the mind be in such a state in which there is no fear of any kind? Because, the moment I depend, there is the birth of fear; and all initiative, all originality - not eccentricity but the capacity to think out - is lost. Must not the mind have the capacity to fathom - not to imitate, not to be shaped - and to be without fear? Should not such a mind be alone and therefore creative? That creativeness is not yours or mine, it is anonymous.

Please listen to all this, because most of us are mediocre. Is there a possibility of complete and immediate transformation into this creativeness? Because, that is what is needed at the present time in the world - not reformers, not ideologists, not great philosophers but you and me who, realizing our mediocrity,

immediately bring about that state of aloneness in which there is no dependence, no fear; which is completely alone, uninfluenced; which cannot be interfered with, which is not imitative, not following. Can you and I produce together immediately such a state of mind? Because, without such a mind, do what you will, your reforms will produce more misery and more chaos.

Is it possible for a mind that has been mediocre, that has been interfered with, put together, shaped, controlled, that is dependent, immediately to realize that aloneness? Do not say, 'It may be possible, but I cannot do it; someone else can do it', but just listen, not to the words but to the meaning of words. Can a mind that has been interfered with, that is the result of interference, that is the result of time, of influence, can such a mind put away everything and be alone? For, in that aloneness there is creativity. It does not matter what words you use. That creativity is not of time, it is not yours or mine, it is completely anonymous. And as long as you are cultivating a technique, there is no anonymity, because most of our minds are occupied with how to do this, how to stop being influenced how to break away from our conditioning. When one says, 'I will practise this and I will get it', 'I will discipline myself and then I shall not be influenced', or 'I shall build a wall around myself against all influences', it indicates that the mind is enquiring the way, the technique. Is such a mind capable of ever being free, ever being in revolt? And is not such a mind mediocre? Therefore such a mind can never be alone.

If you have to create a new world, a new civilization, a new art, everything new, not contaminated by tradition, by fear, by ambitions, if you have to create something anonymous which is

yours and mine, a new society, together, in which there is not you and me but an oursness, must there not be a mind which is completely anonymous, therefore alone? This implies, does it not?, that there must be a revolt against conformity, a revolt against respectability, because the respectable man is the mediocre man, because he wants something, he is dependent on influence for his happiness, on what his neighbour thinks, on what his guru thinks, on what the Bhagavad Gita or the Upanishads or the Bible or the Christ says. His mind is never alone. He never walks alone but he always walks with a companion, the companion of his ideas.

Is it not important to find out, to see, the whole significance of interference, of influence the establishment of the 'me', which is the contradiction of the anonymous? Seeing the whole of that, does not the question inevitably arise: Is it possible immediately to bring about that state of mind which is not influenced, which cannot be influenced by its own experience or by the experience of others, a mind which is incorruptible, which is alone? Then only is there a possibility of bringing about a different world, a different culture, a different society in which happiness is possible.

Question: I am a cripple since I was 40 days old. You talk of securities, but I have none - no home, no friends, no job. How am I to face my life? Krishnamurti: How do we face life, whether we are healthy or unhealthy? Actually how do we face it?

If you are secure financially, if you have a gift, if you have capacities, if you have a backing or influence, you can face it fairly well, can't you? But the vast majority of people have no security, no influence with the big ones; they are crippled, mentally, physically; and how are they to face life? Surely as best as they

can. That is what is actually taking place.

But those who are capable of thinking anew of this whole problem, who are not crippled, who want to find out a different way of existence - that is, you and I, we who are not mentally crippled - can those find a different process of action, a different way of thinking? Surely you and I are responsible to create a new world because you have leisure, you have the capacity to think, you are fairly secure, economically. It is your responsibility, is it not?, to help those who are not capable of thinking, who are crippled physically, mentally, intellectually, who have to face life with dread, with fear? It is our responsibility, is it not? And if you do not do it, who is going to do it?

Is there any other way for this questioner to find a job? Most of us are not able to give him a job. If we do, we are always critical, bossy, we are incapable of giving a little of the little we have; we have lost our generosity; we have not, if we ever had it. So we keep the weak always weak, and we always look up to the strong and so keep ourselves weak.

So, that is our life - confusion, mediocrity, pain, insufficiency inwardly; and outwardly, the burning with innumerable desires which we suppress - and we cannot really create a different world unless there is a complete revolt from all this - a revolt not to join some society, not a revolt from this group to join a Communist group or a Socialist group. I am talking of a total revolt, because then only is there that strength which comes when the mind is alone, when it is no longer capable of being influenced - which does not mean obstinacy, which does not mean the strength derived through experience, through knowledge; that is not being alone;

there is dependency when there is knowledge and experience. This aloneness is totally devoid of all the crutches of the mind. It is in revolt not only towards something, but in revolt as a total process. Then only can there be a different world, then only can the questioner find a right answer to his problem.

Question: Will you please explain the interval of which you speak, between a thought and a thought? Most of our thinking is trivial and of no significance. Is it necessary to pursue such trifling thoughts?

Krishnamurti: Sir, have you noticed in your thinking that there is a gap between two thoughts? However trivial, however stupid the thoughts be, there is an interval, is there not? It is not one continuous thinking. If you observe, if you are aware, you will see that there is a gap, an interval. Merely to pursue, analyse, be aware of any particular thought is utterly useless, if we have not understood or observed the interval between two thoughts. Because, after all, when I think out a particular thought, however small, the mind that thinks it out is still a trivial mind, a small mind, a mediocre mind, a mind which is judging, comparing, condemning; and such a mind when pursuing a thought cannot understand. And to say, 'I must not judge, I must not compare', still binds thought all the more, it limits thinking, because the moment I say I must not judge, I have already limited thought, I have already put a resistance against judgment, and so conditioned the mind more. But if I observe that there is an interval between thoughts, if my mind is concerned with that interval, watching being aware of it, then I will see that the trivial thoughts will fade away without judging, without comparing without disciplining, without

compelling. Because in that interval there is no thought functioning. There is an interval, it may be a second; but the moment you want that second to become ten seconds, you have set mediocrity into action.

Please follow this; you will see it clearly if you are rightly listening. That is, if you observe an interval between two thoughts, and being aware of that interval the mind wants to continue in that interval, to lengthen that interval, and when you so desire, have you not set into motion a particular influence which you want, and thereby crippled the mind to a particular influence, to a particular experience, and thereby reduced the mind to mediocrity, to a state of pettiness, smallness, narrowness? When the mind desires to experience a particular experience and to maintain that experience, does it not indicate consistency? And is not a mind that is consistent a mediocre mind, a mind that is frightened; Therefore, however much such a mind may pursue or analyse a particular thought, the analyser is still the entity which is caught in mediocrity.

So being aware of that interval is sufficient if there is no pursuing, no trying to establish that, no lengthening that interval - which means really, infinite self-knowledge, does it not? Because you cannot maintain that interval, in that interval, a new and different feeling can come into being; but the moment you pursue that interval and try to lengthen that interval, the mind is interfering with it; and a mind that interferes, influences, conditions. So the more you are aware of the process of thought and of the interval, the greater is the self-knowledge - self-knowledge not from a book, not according to any pattern of thought, but the understanding of

yourself as you are from moment to moment, from day to day, from month to month. This is an extraordinarily arduous process. Without that knowledge, the conditioning influence cannot be understood, and so the mind submits to every form of influence and interference; and therefore the mind is in a perpetual state of imitation, dependency and fear.

Please listen to this. If you really understand this, you have not to do a thing consciously. You do not have to do a thing because all conscious interference is conditioning. That is why it is important to listen so that there is unconscious deep revolution, not the revolution brought about by the mind, by the upper level of the mind, because the upper levels of the mind are the result of influence, of interference, of conditioning. Such interference by the mind cannot produce something new, something totally different. So, is it not important to know oneself without judgment, to know oneself as one is, not according to judgment?

We only know ourselves when we compare. At least we think we do. But comparison prevents the understanding of the thing as it is. I am ugly, I am greedy, I am envious. The moment I compare myself with somebody who is envious, have I not used my energy, dissipated my energy, distorted it? And must I not be completely concerned with `what is? Because, when I compare, I want to change `what is' into something that it is not. And is not the desire to change `what is' into something which is not, an utter waste of energy and time, and is it not an escape? Can I, without comparison, see "what is'? Is it possible to look at `what I am' without comparative knowledge? Please follow this. When I say I am greedy, is that not itself comparative? I only know greed

because I am comparing the feeling - the feeling of the more, the wanting more power, more position, more security, more experience, more knowledge. The `more' is the comparative. Can I look at my thought without comparison, when my mind is comparative? So the moment I find my mind is capable of thinking, looking, observing, without comparison, will greed exist? Please follow all this.

Because my mind is comparative, when the mind says `I must not be greedy', which is the condemning, that very condemnation creates a comparative state. It strengthens the comparative state. Is it possible for me to look at greed which is the product of the `more', which is the result of the `more', which is the desire for the `more', without comparison? And is that not the only way to free the mind from all greed?

So, self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. And this wisdom cannot be bought. No guru, no book, no experience will give it; because experience is of time, experience is accumulative; it implies the `more', the cultivation of technique through experience. It is the revolt against experience, against technique, against the `more' that will bring about the liberation of the mind so that it is completely alone.

Question: What is forgiveness? Are forgiveness and compassion identical? To forgive another may be possible, but is it not necessary to forgive oneself?

Krishnamurti: What is forgiveness? And when do you forgive? And is forgiveness ever necessary? I have hurt you, you store that hurt. Either time heals it or you deliberately set about cultivating forgiveness. First you store the hurt, you accumulate it, you guard

it; and later on you forgive. But if there was no storing, there would be no necessity for forgiveness.

Is not forgiveness different from compassion? Can a man who is hurt and is forgiving - can he ever know compassion? Surely love is a state in which there is no hurt. Hurt exists only, does it not?, when the `me' is dominant in that love, when I am expecting something in that love. When I want to be loved, in that love I am still the dominant factor. When the `me' or the `I' is wanting - I want to be loved', `I want to be looked after', `I miss the person' - I am still the centre, and that centre gets hurt or pleased; and when it gets hurt. it stores it up; and later on, it forgives, according to pressure, interference, influences, fears. Is compassion a state in which the `me' - the centre, the ego, the self - is ever conscious of itself, to be compassionate? In compassion, is consciousness of the `me' necessary?

When you know that you are compassionate, when you are conscious that you are compassionate, is that compassion? When you know you are forgiving, is that forgiveness? And the moment I am conscious of virtue, is that virtue? So, does not the conscious act of forgiveness, of being hurt, the conscious act, does it not strengthen the entity, the `me', that is always gathering, always accumulating, comparing, judging, weighing? And can such an entity ever be free, ever know what it is to love, what it is to be compassionate? Please find out for yourself, don't listen to my words.

What is it to be compassionate? Please find out for yourself, feel it out, whether a mind that is hurt, that can be hurt, can ever forgive. Can a mind that is capable of being hurt, ever forgive?

And can such a mind which is capable of being hurt, which is cultivating virtue, which is conscious of generosity, can such a mind be compassionate? Compassion, as love, is something which is not of the mind. The mind is not conscious of itself as being compassionate, as loving. But the moment you forgive consciously, the mind is strengthening its own centre in its own hurt. So the mind which consciously forgives can never forgive; it does not know forgiveness; it forgives in order not to be further hurt.

So it is very important to find out why the mind actually remembers, stores away. Because, the mind is everlastingly seeking to aggrandize itself, to become big, to be something. When the mind is willing not to be anything, to be nothing, completely nothing, then in that state there is compassion. In that state there is neither forgiveness nor the state of hurt; but to understand that, one has to understand the conscious development of the 'me', the 'me' that is growing, becoming big, virtuous, respectable, the 'me' that is ultimately going to find God. That is, one has to understand the emphasis on the self, the cultivation of the self, the ego, whether one places that ego on the higher level or on lower level.

So, as long as there is the conscious cultivation of any particular influence, any particular virtue, there can be no love, there can be no compassion; because, love and compassion are not the result of conscious effort.

Question: How can I be free from the past?

Krishnamurti: Perhaps if I can understand what my mind is occupied with then I shall perhaps see how to free the mind from the past.

What is your mind occupied with? Is it not occupied with something of the past, with what you should have done, what you should have thought, with what your experiences are, how sorrowful you are, how you want to be happy, how you have been hurt, how you would like to fulfil? Your mind, your consciousness is the past, is it not? The 'what you should be' is the outcome of what you have not done. The future is the projection of the past, is it not? So our minds are occupied with the past. Our mind is the past, and you ask, 'How am I to be free from the past'? But I who ask that question am still the past, the I is not different from the mind which is the past. That is my mind which says, 'I want to be free from the past'. That I is part of the mind - is it not? It is part of thought, is it not? And that thought is the result of the past.

When the mind says, 'I must be free from the past', is it not separating itself from the past? And is not the desire to free itself from the past a total process, a unitary process, not the I separate from the past? Is there not only one state, the past, which projects into the future? So when the mind, the consciousness, is occupied with the past, how can such a mind ever free itself? Please follow this: How can my mind which is the result of the past, which is the result of time, how can such a mind be free from the past? When you examine what the mind is, you see that the mind is memory, the mind is experience, the mind is the growing in time - which is the past.

So the mind is time, is the past; and when the mind asks, 'Can I free myself from the past' is that valid? And when you see this whole total process, what happens to the question which you have put: 'Can I be free'? If I say you can be free, it has no validity; it is

not your experience, it is not a fact. All that you will then do is to make an attempt to be free, to free the mind from all the occupations of the past. But if you understand the whole structure of the past, then you will never put that question. And by not putting the question, you will find the right answer; because, the mind which is the sum total of experience, of influences, and which is put together, can never see the eternal, can never see that which is not made up; because the mind can never experience or understand or comprehend what is the eternal. The eternal is something entirely apart from the mind, because it is not of time. The mind is of time. If the mind realizes that it is time, that it is the product of time, the product of memory, the product of experiences, of influences, of interferences, when the mind completely realizes that, then there is a revolution in itself, a revolution which is not created by the mind. As long as the mind is seeking the eternal through experience, it will never find it. That is why you put the question: Can the mind be free from the past? It can be, when it understands the total process of itself, when it is aware that it has put that question and thereby is aware of its structure. You will find that any movement from that structure is still the outcome of the past. When the mind realizes this, there is no movement at all; therefore, there is complete stillness of the mind. Any movement from the past is of time, and such a mind cannot understand, cannot be in a state to receive the eternal.

Question: God is not something so easily denied. You are attacking the very concept of God. What then have you to offer to this world? Without belief in God, life is sterile, vicious and can only lead to darkness.

Krishnamurti: Whether you believe or do not believe, whether I brush aside or destroy the concept of God, Reality exists. That Reality cannot be found through any belief, for belief is the outcome of the desire to be secure. The mind that is fearful, anxious, wanting something to depend on, seeing the transiency of the world, creates an idea, but the idea of God is not God. God is not something projected by the mind; so, the mind cannot possibly at any time comprehend God.

Your belief in God surely has separated man, has put man against man; because, to you, God is not important, but belief is. And do you not make the world darker by your belief? Look at the innumerable beliefs that you have! In the name of God you kill, do you not? The man who throws an atomic bomb, he believes in God, destroying thousands in a few seconds. And the man who does not believe in God, the Communist, he also destroys in order to produce a better world. So you are not very much different, are you? Those who believe and those who do not believe both bring destruction and misery to man. The Christian believes and the Hindu believes; they are poles apart, fighting, wrangling, ambitious, destroying, liquidating, believing; and yet, they all profess to believe in God. And is God to be denied? And is God the projection of our minds?

Surely Reality, or whatever name you call it, is something beyond the mind. But you cannot find that Reality if the mind does not understand itself. If the mind is not still, quiet, it cannot know what that Reality, that extraordinary thing, is.

But belief is not what makes the mind quiet. On the contrary, belief cripples the mind, belief conditions the mind, belief shatters

the mind. The mind that is fearful, seeking security, something to hold on to - such a mind has no value. Then belief acts as a personal security. Belief becomes then not anonymous, but something upon which you can depend. Belief divides people, it destroys people. And can such a mind ever find Reality? Seeing all this, must not the mind be alert, free itself from all beliefs - which means, be free of fear? Then only the mind becomes very quiet, still, without any projection, without any desire, without any book, without any hope. A mind in despair can never find Reality. When the mind is in despair it seeks hope, and hope then becomes the Reality projected by a despairing mind.

So, seeing all this, the mind is very quiet. It is only then that Reality comes. You cannot invite it. You cannot bribe it. There is no sacrifice that you can make in order to get it. There is no virtue that will reward you with that Reality. It is only when the mind is completely still - not expecting, not hoping - that Reality can come to that mind which is still.

March 1, 1953

BOMBAY 8TH PUBLIC TALK 4TH MARCH 1953

I think it may be said that most of our lives are very confused; and being confused and in constant struggle we try to find a way out of the confusion. So we turn to anyone who can give us help. When we are economically strained, we turn to the economist or the politician; and when there is confusion psychologically, inwardly, we turn to religion. We turn to another to find a way, a method, out of our confusion, out of our misery. And I would like, if I can this evening, to find out if there is a method, a way to overcome our sufferings through any accumulation of knowledge or experience; or, if there is quite a different process, quite a different attitude, quite a different way that is far more important than the search for a system, a technique, or the cultivation of a particular habit.

So if I may, I would like to quietly and hesitatingly explore this question; and, in this exploration, you are going to take part also, because it is also your problem. The problem is a way out, a system, to help me fundamentally to resolve the cause, the substance or the very nature of the mind that creates the problem. Is that possible through any form of accumulation, both of knowledge and of experience? Knowledge is the outward accumulation which is the gathering of technical knowledge, and the inward accumulation of psychological experience the 'knowing' the capacity to know. Will these actually help to bring about complete freedom - not a momentary alleviation but a total freedom - from this constant battle within myself? Because, it is this battle, this conflict, this incessant uncertainty, that creates outward activities which produce mischief, which produce chaos,

which bring about the expression of personal ambition - the desire to be somebody, the aggressive attitude towards life.

I think it is very important to understand whether by the cultivation of any particular attitude or by the development of any particular knowledge or technique, suffering can come to an end? Or can suffering come to an end only with a mind that is not seeking, that does not know, that is not gathering? Most of us have certain attitudes towards life, certain values with which we approach our activities, which create the pattern which we have established, culturally, outwardly or inwardly; and we say, 'I know, I know what to do'. Do we know what we know? And should we not very earnestly endeavour to probe into the question of what we call 'knowledge', whether we can know anything at all, and whether it is fallacious thinking to say, 'I know'? Is it not very important to find out, when a mind says 'I know', what it does know? And will that knowledge at any time, dissipate the conflicting process of the mind which creates such innumerable conflicts within one, so many frustrations, fears?

The problem is: can knowledge dissipate suffering? We know that technological knowledge at one level can dissipate suffering when the body is ill physically, psychologically. At one level knowledge is essential, is necessary. Knowledge is also necessary when we are concerned with the evil of poverty. We have the technological knowledge to put an end to poverty, to have plenty, to have sufficient clothing and shelter. Scientific knowledge is essential to make life more easy, purely on the physical level. But the knowledge that we accumulate, the knowledge that the mind gathers, in order to be free, in order not to have suffering; the

practices; the techniques; the meditations; the various adjustments the mind makes in order not to have conflict; will they bring about the cessation of conflict? You read various books and try to find a method, a way of life, a purpose of life; or you go out to find it from another; and according to that purpose you act, you try to live; but the suffering goes on, the conflict goes on.

The constant adjustment of 'what is' to 'what should be' is the deteriorating factor of struggle. So our life inwardly is full of tears, turmoil and suffering and there must be a way of meeting life not with the accumulated knowledge of experience, but a different way in which this battle is not going on. We know how we meet life, how we meet the challenge always with knowledge, with experience, with the past. That is, I say, 'I know', 'I have accumulated experience', 'Life has taught me; so I always begin with knowledge, with a certain residue of experiences; and with that, I meet my suffering. The suffering is the conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be'. We know the inward nature of suffering: the death of someone, the suffering of poverty, the psychological inward frustration, the insufficiency, the struggle to fulfil and the everlasting pain of fear; and we meet suffering always with knowledge, do we not? So I say, 'I know what to do', 'I believe in reincarnation, in Karma, in some experience, in some dogma', and with this, I meet the everyday occurrences of life.

Now I want to question that knowledge, that thing with which we say we meet life. There is never a sense of complete humility in a mind that says, 'I know'. But there is a complete humility which says, 'I do not know'. And is that not an essential state, an absolute necessity when you meet life, when you meet a problem, when you

meet suffering, when you meet death? That sense of humility is not induced, is not cultivated, is not brought about, is not put together. It is the feeling that you do not know.

What do you know? What do you know of death? You see bodies being burnt, relations dying; but what do you know except the things that you have learnt, the beliefs? You do not know what is the Unknown. Can the mind which is the result of time, which is the result of accumulation, which is the result of the total past, can such a mind know the Unknown, namely 'What is after death'? Hundreds of books have been written about what is after death, but the mind does not know.

So is it not essential in order to discover anything true, to have that complete sense of humility of not knowing? Then only is there a possibility of knowing. It is only when I do not know what God is, there is God.

But I think I know. I have already tasted the idea of what God is - not God, but the idea of God. I have sought him out, I have suffered; therefore I go to the guru, to the book, to the temple. My mind has already got a glimpse of what is Reality; I know, I have a little experience, I have read, I have tasted. So there is, in essence, vanity, a strange sense of vanity which is based on knowing.

But what I know is only a memory, an experience - which is a conditioned response an everyday movement of life. So I start with vanity: 'I know God speaks to me', 'I have knowledge', 'I have visions; and I call that, wisdom - which is absurd. I organize schools of thought, I gather; and there is never a moment when I can honestly say with complete humility, with complete integration that 'I do not know'. Because, I think I know. But what I know is

the past accumulation of experience, of memory; and that does not solve my problem of suffering, nor the problem of how to act in life with all its confusion, its contradictions, its pulls, its influences and urges.

Can your mind which is already contaminated by vanity, by knowledge, by experience, can such a mind be completely free? Can it have that feeling of complete humility? Not to know is humility, is it not? Please follow, please listen. When you realize that you do not know, then you are beginning to find out. But the state of not-knowing-ness cannot be cultivated. The state of not knowing comes only with complete humility. Then when such a mind has a problem, it is not knowing, and the problem gives the answer - which means, the mind that is giving answers must completely, totally, inwardly, deeply, profoundly be without vanity, in a state of complete not-knowing. But the mind objects strongly to that state. Watch your own minds, Sirs. You will see how extraordinarily difficult it is for it to face itself and to say, 'I do not know'. The mind objects to that statement because it wants something to lean on. It wants to say, 'I know the way of life', 'I know what love is', 'I have suffered', 'I know what it means' - which is really a mind clothed in its own knowledge. Therefore, it is never innocent. It is the innocent mind, the mind that says, 'I do not know,' which has no vanity, no trimmings; it is such a mind that can find the Real which is the true answer. It is only a mind that says 'I do not know', which receives that which is Truth.

When the mind enquires the way to freedom, the way to Truth, the way of any psychological technique, all that it is concerned with is the accumulation of knowledge by which it hopes to dispel

this constant struggle within itself. But that knowledge does not dissolve it. You know that, don't you? From your books, from the experiences of your everyday life, you know sufficiently; but has that prevented you from suffering?

Is it not possible for a mind to be completely in a state of not knowing, so that it is capable of sensitivity, so that it can receive? Is not the highest form of thinking the completely negative state of the mind in which there is no accumulation, in which therefore there is complete poverty of mind - poverty in the most dignified, profound sense? It is new soil, it is a mind in which there is no knowledge; therefore, it is the Unknown. It is only then the Unknown can come to the Unknown. The known can never know the Unknown. Sirs, this is not just a statement; but if you listen to it, if you listen to the real meaning of it, you will know the truth of it. But the man of vanity, the man of knowledge, the scholar, the man who is pursuing a result, can never know the Unknown; therefore he cannot be a creative being. And at the present time it is the creative being - the man who is creative - that is essential in our daily life, not a man who has a new technique, a new panacea. And there can be no creativeness if there is already a residue of knowledge. The mind must be empty to be creative. It means, the mind must be totally and completely humble. Then only is there a possibility of that creativity to come into being.

Question: In a world that needs collective action, why do you emphasize the freedom of the individual?

Krishnamurti: Is not freedom essential for co-operation? Must you not be free in order to co-operate with me or I with you? And does freedom come into being when you and I have a common

purpose? When you and I intellectually, verbally, theoretically establish a common purpose, a common aim, and you and I work together, are we really working together? Does the common end bind us? You think I have a common aim; but when I have a common aim, am I free? I have established an aim, a purpose, because of my knowledge, because of my experience, of my erudition; and I say that is the purpose of man. When I have established it, has that aim not caught me? Am I not a slave to it? Therefore, is there creativeness? To be creative, we have to be free of common purpose.

Is collective action possible, and what do we mean by collective action? There can be no collective action because we are individuals. You and I cannot paint a picture together. There is no collective action, there is only collective thinking, is there not? It is collective thinking that brings us together, to act together. So what is important is not collective action but collective thinking.

Now, can there be collective thinking? And what do we mean by collective thinking? When do we all think alike? When we all are Communists, when we are all Socialists, Catholics, then all of us are being conditioned to a certain pattern of thought, all of us are acting together. And what happens when there is collective thinking? What happens? Does it not involve concentration camps, liquidation, control of thought, so that you must not think differently from the party, from the whole which the few have established? So collective thinking leads to more misery; collective thinking leads to destruction of people, to cruelty, to barbarity. What is necessary is not collective thinking, but to think rightly - not according to the right, not according to the Communist,

Socialist, but to know how to think, not what to think.

We think that by conditioning the mind to what to think, there would be collective action. But that only destroys human beings, does it not? When we know what to think, has not all creative investigation, the sense of complete freedom come to an end? So our problem is not collective action or collective thinking, but to find out how to think. And this cannot be learnt from a book. The way to think what is thinking, can only be found in relationship, in self-knowledge. And there cannot be self-knowledge if you have no freedom, if you are afraid you are going to lose a job, if you are afraid of what your wife, your husband, your neighbour says.

So in the process of self-knowledge there comes freedom. It is this freedom that will bring about collective action, not the conditioned mind that is made to act. Therefore, there is no collective action in any form of compulsion, coercion, reward or punishment. It is only when you and I are capable of finding what is Truth through self-knowledge, that there can be freedom; then there is a possibility of real collective action.

There is no collective action when there is common purpose. We all want a happy India, a cultured India, a cultured world; we all say that is our aim; we know that, we repeat it; but are we not throwing it away all the time? We all say there must be brotherhood, there must be peace and love of God; that is our common aim; and are we not destroying each other though we profess we have a common purpose. And when the leftist says there must be collective action through collective thinking, is he not destroying, bringing about misery, war, destruction? So a common purpose, a common idea, the love of God, the love of

peace, does not bring us together.

What brings us together is love which comes into being with self-knowledge and freedom. The `myself' is not a separate unit; I am in relationship with the world; I am the total process. So in understanding the total process which is the `me' and which is the `you', there is freedom. This self-knowledge is not the knowledge of `me' as a separate entity. The `me' is a total `me' of everyone of us, because I am not isolated; there is no such thing; no being can exist in isolation. The `myself' is the total process of humanity, the `myself' is `you, in relation with one another. It is only when I understand that `myself', there is self-knowledge; then in that self-knowledge there is freedom. Then the world becomes our world - not your world, or a Hindu world, or a Catholic world, or a Communist world. It is our world, yours and mine, in which to live happily, creatively. That is not possible if we are conditioned by an idea, if we have a common end for all of us. It is only in freedom which comes with the understanding of the `me' which is the total process of man, that there is a possibility of collective thought and action.

That is why it is important in a world that is torn apart by religions by beliefs, by political parties, that this should be very clearly understood by each one of us. Because, there is no salvation in collective action; that way lies more misery, more destruction and more wars; it ends in tyranny. But most of us want some kind of security. The moment the mind seeks security, it is lost. It is only the insecure that are free, but not the respectable, not the man who is secure. Please listen to this. In any enriching of the mind in any belief, in any system, there is never freedom. And because the

mind is secure in some form or pattern of action, because of its bondage, it creates action which produces more misery. It is only the free mind - that is, when you understand the process of the self, the 'me' with all its contents, the mind is free - that can create a new world. Then that is our world; it is a thing we can build together, not create to the pattern of some tyranny, of some god. Then you and I can work; then it is our world to be built, to be nurtured, to be brought into being.

Question: When I see and hear you, I feel myself before an immeasurable sea of stillness. My immediate response to you is reverence and devotion; surely that does not mean that I establish you as my authority. Is it not so?

Krishnamurti: Sir, what do we mean by reverence and devotion? Reverence and devotion surely is not to something. When I am devoted to something, when I reverence somebody, then I create an authority, because that reverence and devotion, unconsciously, deep down, gives me comfort, a certain sense of gratification; therefore, I depend upon it. As long as I am devoted to somebody, as long as there is reverence towards something, I am a slave; there is no freedom.

Is reverence, devotion, not capable of existence by itself? That is you reverence a tree, a bird, the child in the street, the beggar, or your servant; the reverence is not to something, it is not to somebody; but it is in yourself, the feeling of respecting. The respect of somebody - is that not based on fear? Is not the feeling of respecting more important and essential than respect to some deity, to some person? If that feeling exists then there is equality. The equality which the politicians, the lawyers, the Communists,

are trying to establish, is not equality, because inequality will always exist when you have a higher capacity, better brains, more gifts than I. But when I have that respect, not to somebody but the respect in itself, then that inherent respect is love, not love of something. When I am conscious that I am revering something outside of me, a person or an image, then there is no love; then there is the division between you whom I revere and me who am lowly.

So devotion and reverence surely are inherent when I begin to understand the whole process of life. Life is not merely the 'me' in action, but the life of the animal, the life of nature, the child begging in the street. How often do we look at a tree? Do you ever look at a tree or a flower? And when you do, is there a sense of reverence - not to the flower that is going to fade away, but to the beauty of the flower, to that strange thing that is life? This means really, the complete sense of being humble without any sense of begging. Then your mind in itself is still; then you do not have to see somebody who is still. And in that stillness there is no you and I, there is only stillness. And it is in that stillness you will find that there is respect, not in something but in itself. Life is then extraordinarily vital, there is no authority, the mind is completely still. Question: When I am aware of my thoughts and feelings, they disappear. Later, they catch me unawares and overwhelm me. Can I ever be free from all the thoughts that plague me? Must I always live between depression and elation?

Krishnamurti: Sir, what is the way of thought? What is thinking? I am asking you a question; I am sure you have an answer. Your mind immediately jumps and answers. It does not

say, 'I do not know; I am going to find out'. Watch your own mind and you will find an answer to this.

What is thinking, not right thinking and wrong thinking but this whole process of thinking? When do you think? Only when you are challenged. When you are asked a question, you begin to respond according to the background, according to your memory, according to your experience. So thinking is the process of response to a challenge, such as: 'I am unhappy, I want to find a way out; so I begin to enquire. 'I want to find a way out' - that is my problem, that is my question. If I do not find the answer outside, then I begin to enquire within myself. I depend on my experience, on my knowledge; and my knowledge, my experience, always responds - which is, to find a way out. So I start the process of thinking.

Thinking is the response of the past, the response to the past. I do not know the way to your house and you tell me because you know it. I ask you what God is and you immediately respond, because you have read, your mind is conditioned, and that condition responds. Or if you do not believe in God, you will respond also according to your conditioning. So thinking is a process of verbalization to the reaction of the past.

Now the question is: can I be aware of the past and thereby put an end to thinking? The moment I think fully, focus fully, there is no thinking. Observation of an idea, of an action - the concentration in something - still implies thinking because you are concentrating, in which there is exclusion. The mind is focussed, concentrated on an idea, writing a letter, in thinking out a problem; in that concentration, there is exclusion. In that, there is a process

of thinking, conscious or unconscious.

But when there is total awareness - awareness not of an idea, not the concentration on an idea, but the awareness of the whole problem of thinking - there is no concentration; there is awareness without exclusion. When I begin to enquire how to be rid of a particular thought, what is implied in it?

Please follow this and you will see what I mean by awareness. There is a particular thought that is disturbing you and you want to get rid of it. And so you proceed to find a way out of resisting that particular thought. But you want to keep the pleasant thoughts, the pleasant memories, the pleasant ideas. You want to get rid of those thoughts that are painful, and hold on to things which are pleasurable, which are satisfying you, which give you vitality, energy and drive. So when you want to get rid of one thought, you are at the same time holding on to the things that give you pleasure, memories which are delightful, which give you energy; and then what happens? You are concerned not with the total process of thinking, but only how to hold on to the pleasant and how to get rid of the unpleasant. But here we are concerned with the whole, with the total process of thinking - not with how to get rid of a certain thought. If I can understand the whole past and not just how to get rid of a particular past, then there is the freedom of the past, not of a particular past.

But most of us want to hold on to the pleasant and put away the unpleasant. That is a fact. But when we are enquiring into the whole question of the past from which there is thinking, then we cannot look at it from the point of view of the good thought and the bad thought, what is the good past and what is the un-pleasant

past. Then we are only concerned with the past, not with the good and the bad.

Now can the mind be free from the past, free from thought - not from the good or bad thought? How do I find out? Can the mind be free from a thought, thought being the past? How do I find out? I can only find out by seeing what the mind is occupied with. If my mind is occupied with the good or occupied with the bad, then it is only concerned with the past, it is occupied with the past. It is not free of the past. So, what is important is to find out how the mind is occupied. If it is occupied at all, it is always occupied with the past, because all our consciousness is the past. The past is not only on the surface, but on the highest level, and the stress on the unconscious is also the past. So can the mind be free from all its occupations? Watch your own minds, Sirs, and you will see.

Can the mind be free from occupation? This means - can the mind be completely without being occupied, and let memory, the thoughts good and bad, go by, without choosing? The moment the mind is occupied with one thought, good or bad, then it is concerned with the past. It is just like the mind sitting firmly on the wall watching things go by, never occupied with anything as memory, thought, whether it is good, pleasant or unpleasant - which means, the total freedom of the past, not just the particular past. If you really listen - not just merely verbally, but really, profoundly - then you will see that there is stability which is not of the mind, which is the freedom from the past.

Yet, the past can never be put aside. There is a watching of the past as it goes by, but not occupation with the past. So the mind is free to observe and not to choose. Where there is choice in this

movement of the river of memory, there is occupation, and the moment the mind is occupied. it is caught in the past: and when the mind is occupied with the past, it is incapable of seeing something real, true, new, original, uncontaminated.

A mind that is occupied with the past - the past is the whole consciousness that says, `this is good; `that is right; `this is bad; `this is mine; `this is not mine' - can never know the Real. But the mind unoccupied can receive that which is not known, which is the Unknown. This is not an extraordinary state of some yogi, some saint. Just observe your own mind; how direct and simple it is. See how your mind is occupied. And the answer, with what the mind is occupied, will give you the understanding of the past, and therefore the freedom from the past.

You cannot brush the past aside. It is there. What matters is the occupation of the mind - the mind that is concerned with the past as good or evil, that says, `I must have this' or `I must not have this', that has good memory to hold on to and bad memory to let go. The mind that is watching the thing go by, without choice, is the free mind that is free from the past. The past is still floating by; you cannot set it aside; you cannot forget the way to your home. But the occupation of the mind with the past - in that there is no freedom. The occupation creates the past; and the mind is perpetually, everlastingly, occupied with good words, with virtue, with sacrifice, with the search for God, with happiness; such a mind is never free. The past is there, it is a shadow constantly threatening, constantly encouraging and depressing. So, what is important is to find out how the mind is occupied, with what thought, with what memory, with what intention, with what

purpose.

Question: Talk to us of 'Meditation'.

Krishnamurti: Are you not meditating now? Meditation is when the mind, not knowing, not desiring, not pursuing, is really inquiring, when the mind is really probing, not towards any particular idea, not to any particular image, to any particular compulsion; when the mind is merely seeking - not an answer, not an idea, not to find something. When do you seek? Not when you know the answer, not when you are wanting something, not when you are seeking gratification, not when you want comfort. Then, it is no longer seeking. It is only when the mind, understanding the whole significance of comfort and of wanting security, puts aside all authority, only when the mind is free, that it is capable of seeking. And is not that the whole process of meditation? Therefore, is not the seeking itself devotion, is not the seeking itself reverence?

So, meditation is the stillness of the mind, when it is no longer wanting, vibrating, searching out in order to be satisfied. It is not meditation when it is repeating words, cultivating virtue. A mind which is cultivating virtue, repeating words, chanting - such a mind is not capable of meditation; it is self-hypnosis and in self-hypnosis you can create marvellous illusions. But a mind that is capable of real freedom - freedom from the past - is a mind that is not occupied; therefore it is extraordinarily still. Such a mind has no projections; such a mind is in the state of meditation. In that meditation there is no meditator - I am not meditating, I am not experiencing stillness - there is only stillness. The moment I experience stillness, that moment it becomes memory; therefore, it

is not stillness; it is gone. When a mind is occupied with something that is gone, it is caught in the past.

So in meditation there is no meditator; therefore, there is no concentrator who makes an effort to meditate, who sits cross-legged and shuts his eyes to meditate. When the meditator makes an effort to meditate, what he then meditates on in his own projection, his own things clothed in his own ideas. Such a mind cannot meditate; it does not know what meditation means.

But the man who understands the occupation of his mind, the man who has no choice in his occupation, such a man will know what is stillness - the stillness that comes from the very beginning, the freedom. Freedom is not at the end; it is at the very beginning. You cannot train a mind to be free. It has to be free from the very beginning. And in that freedom the mind is still, because it has no choice; it is not concentrating, it is not absorbed in anything. And in that stillness, that which is Unknown is concentrating.

March 4, 1953

BOMBAY 9TH PUBLIC TALK 8TH MARCH 1953

Perhaps if we can go into the question of initiative then there may be a possibility of understanding self-fulfilment. For most of us fulfilment in some form or other becomes urgent, becomes necessary. In the process of fulfilling, so many problems, so many contradictions, so many conflicts arise; and there is everlasting misery in fulfilment. And yet, we do not know how to escape from it; how to act without fulfilling; for, in the very fulfilment of action there is sorrow.

Action is not merely doing something, but is it not also thinking? Most of us are concerned with doing something; and if that action is satisfactory if it sufficiently guarantees the fulfilment of one's desires, cravings, longings, then we are easily pacified. But if we do not discover the incentive that lies behind the urge to fulfil, surely we shall always be haunted by fear, with frustration; so is it not necessary to find out what this incentive is, that is driving us? It may be clothed in different paints, with different intentions, with different meanings; but perhaps if we can hesitatingly, tentatively explore this question of incentive, then we shall begin to understand an action or a thought which is not always born from this consciousness of fulfilment

Most of our incentives spring from ambitions, from pride, from the desire to be secure or to be well thought of. Now, you may say or I may say that my action is the outcome of the desire to do good, or to find the right values, or to have an ideology, a system that is incorruptible, or to do something that is essentially worthwhile, and so on. But behind all these words, all these pleasant sounding

phrases, is not the motive - the urge in some form or another - ambition? I seek the Master, the guru; I want to achieve; I want to arrive; I want to have comfort, to know a certainty of mind in which there is no conflict. My incentive is to achieve a result and to be assured of that result, in the same way as the man who accumulates money and who also seeks security; so in both these forces, there is the drive which we call ambition, upon which all our activities, our outlook, our energies, are spent. Is it possible to act without these ambitions, without these desires to fulfil? That is, I want to fulfil - I want to fulfil through my nation, through my children, through property, through name - I want to be 'somebody'. And the pride of being somebody is extraordinary, because it gives extraordinary energy without doing anything, merely the sense of being proud in itself is sufficient to keep me going, to keep me resisting, controlling, shaping.

You watch your own minds in operation. You will see the activities and you will see that, behind them, however much you may cover them up with pleasant words, the drive is for fulfilment, for being somebody, to achieve a result. In this drive of ambition, there is competition, ruthlessness; and our whole structure of society is based on that. The ambitious man is looked upon as being worthwhile, as being somebody who is good for society, who will through his ambition create a right environment and so on and so on. We condemn ambition when it is worldly; we do not condemn it when we call it spiritual. A man who has given up the world, renounced it, and is seeking, he is not condemned. Is he not also driven by ambition to be something?

Everyone of us is seeking fulfilment - fulfilment through ideas,

fulfilment through capacity, fulfilment through release in painting, through writing a poem, in loving, in being generous, in trying to be well-thought of. So, are not all our activities the outcome of this urge to fulfil? And behind that urge, is ambition. When I hear that, when I know that, and when I realize that where there is fulfilment there must be sorrow, what am I to do? Do you follow what I mean?

I realize my life is based on ambition. Though I try to cover it up, though I suffer, though I sacrifice myself for an idea, all my activities are an outlet for self-fulfilment. You see me burnt out and you set yourself to do something worthwhile; that 'worthwhileness' is still the urge for fulfilment. This is our life, this is our constant urge, our constant pursuit, conscious as well as unconscious. When I realize this, when I know the content of all this struggle, what am I to do?

This urge to fulfil is one of our most fundamental problems, is it not? This urge to fulfil is in little things and in big things - to be somebody in my house, to dominate over my wife, my children, and to submit myself in the office, in order to rise, in order some day to be somebody. So, that is the process of my life, that is the process of all our lives. Then how is such a mind to put aside the desire for fulfilment? How am I to free myself from ambition? I see that ambition is a form of self-fulfilment, and where there is fulfilment there is always the sense of being down and out, of being broken, frustrated; there is fear, a sense of utter loneliness, of despair and everlasting hope. That is our life, is it not? That is our state from day to day. Behind everything there lurks this desire to fulfil, this urge to be ambitious, this ambition for power, position

prestige, to be well-thought of. Knowing the whole content of that, what is the mind to do?

Is there any activity, any form of movement of the mind, which is not based on this? Do you understand? If I brush aside, control, shape ambition, it is still ambition, because I say, 'It does not pay me to do this; but if I do that, that will pay me'. If I say I must not fulfil, then there is the conflict of not fulfilling, the resistance against the desire; and the very resistance against the desire to fulfil becomes another form of fulfilment.

Why is the mind seeking fulfilment? Why is the mind, the 'me', which is the thought, why is it proud, ambitious? Why does it want to be well-thought-of? Can I understand that? Can the mind realize what it is that is pushing outwardly all the time? And when the outward movement of consciousness is cut, then it turns inward, and there again it is thwarted.

So our consciousness is this constant breathing in and out - to be important and not to be; to receive and to reject - this is our daily life of consciousness. And behind it, the mind is seeking a way out. If I can understand that, if the conscious can dwell on it, can know its full significance, then perhaps it is possible to have action which is not of ambition, which is not of pride, which is not of fulfilment, which is not of the mind.

To seek God, to try to find God, is another form of pride; and is it possible for me and you to find out what it is that is making us continuously go out and come in, go out and come in? Are we not aware of a state of emptiness in us, a state of despair, of loneliness, the complete sense of not being able to depend on anything, not having anybody to look up to? Don't we know a moment of

extraordinary loneliness, of extraordinary sorrow, without reason, a sense of despair at the height of success, at the height of pride, at the height of thought, at the height of love; don't we know this loneliness? And is this loneliness not pushing us always to be somebody, to be well-thought-of?

Can I live with that loneliness, not run away from it, not try to fulfil through some action? Can I live with it and not try to transform it, not try to shape and control it? If the mind can, then perhaps it will go beyond that loneliness, beyond that despair; which does not mean into hope, into a state of devotion; but on the contrary. If I can understand and live in that loneliness, not run away from it, but live in that strange loneliness which comes when I am bored, when I am afraid, when I am apprehensive, not for any cause or with cause; when I know this sense of loneliness; is it possible for the mind to live with it, without trying to push it away?

Please listen to this; do not just listen to the mere words. As I talk, if you have observed your own minds, you will have come to that state of loneliness. It is with you now. This is not hypnosis because I suggest it; but actually if you have followed the workings of your own mind, you will have come to that state of loneliness; to be stripped of everything, every pretence, every pride, every virtue, every action. Can the mind live with that? Can the mind stay with it without any form of condemnation? Can it look at it without interfering - not as the observer looking at it? Is not then the mind itself that state? Do you follow? If I look at loneliness, then the mind operates on the loneliness, tries to shape it or control it or run away from it. The mind itself, not as the observer, is alone, lonely, empty. It cannot tolerate for a single minute a state in which it is

completely empty, a state in which it does not know, a state in which there is no action of `knowing; so a mind seeing that, is fearful of it; it runs away into some activity of fulfilment.

Now, if the mind can stay in that very extraordinary sense of being cut off from everything, from all ideas, from all crutches, from all dependences, then is it not possible, for such a mind to go beyond, not theoretically but actually? It is only when it can fully experience that state of loneliness, that state of emptiness, that state of non-dependency, then only is it possible to bring about an action which is without ambition. Then only is it possible to have a world in which there is no competition, no ruthless pursuit of self-enclosing activity. Then that action is not the action through the narrow funnel of the `me'. That action is not self-enclosing. You will find that such an action is creative, because it is without motive, without ambition, it is not seeking a result. But to find that, must the mind go through all this? Can it not suddenly jump?

The mind can jump if I know how to listen. If I am listening rightly now, without any barrier, without any interpretation, with an open door to discover, there is freedom; and through freedom alone I can discover.

That freedom is the freedom from fear, the freedom from being well-thought of, the freedom from pride, the freedom from the desire to fulfil. And that freedom cannot come about except through the realization of the complete negation of all thought, when the mind is totally empty, lonely, when the mind is in a state in which there is neither despair, nor fulfilment. Then only is there a possibility of a world in which ruthlessness, brutality, competition can come to an end.

Question: You have been talking of freedom. Does not freedom demand duties? What is my duty to society, to myself?

Krishnamurti: Are freedom and duty comparable? Can the dutiful son be free? Can I be dutiful to society and yet be free? Can I be dutiful and yet be revolutionary in the right sense, not in the economic sense? Can I, if I follow a system, political or religious, ever be free? Or do I merely imitate, copy? Is not this whole system imitation? Being a dutiful son, doing what my father wants me to do, doing the right thing according to society - do these not themselves connote a feeling of imitation? My father wants me to be a lawyer; is it my duty to become a lawyer? My father says I must join some religious organization; is it my duty to do so?

Does duty go with love? It is only when there is no love, when there is no freedom, that the word 'duty' becomes extraordinarily important. And duty then takes the place of tradition. In that state we live, that is our state, is it not? - I must be dutiful.

What is my duty to society? What is my duty to myself? Sirs, society demands a great many things of you: you must obey, you must follow, you must do certain ceremonies, perform certain rituals, believe. It conditions you to certain forms of thought, to certain beliefs. If you are finding what is Real - not what is dutiful to society, not trying to conform to a particular pattern - if you are trying to find out what is Truth, must you not be free? Being free does not mean that you must throw something aside, that you must be antagonistic to everything: that is not freedom. Freedom implies constant awareness of thought; it implies that which is unfolding the implications of duty, and out of which, but not by merely throwing aside a particular freedom, freedom comes. You cannot

understand all traditions, you cannot grasp the full significance of them if you condemn or justify or identify yourself with a particular thought or an idea.

When I begin to enquire what is my duty to myself or to society, how shall I find out? What is the criterion? What is the standard? Or, shall we find out why we depend on these words? How quickly the mind that is searching, seeking, enquiring, is gripped by the word duty! The ageing father says to his son, 'It is your duty to support me', and the son feels it his duty to support him. And though he may want to do something else, to paint pictures which will not give him the means of livelihood to support his father and himself, he says his duty is to earn and to put aside what he really wants to do; and for the rest of his life he is caught, for the rest of his life he is bitter; he has bitterness in his heart and he gives money to his father and mother. That is our life, we live in bitterness and we die with bitterness.

Because we really have no love and because we have no freedom, we use words to control our thoughts, to shape our hearts and feelings; and we are satisfied. Surely love may be the only way of revolution, and it is the only way. But most of us object to revolutions, not only superficially, the economic revolutions, but the more essential, the deeper, the more significant revolution of thought, the revolution of creation. Since we object to that, we are always reforming on top, patching up here and there with words, with threats, with ambitions.

You will say, at the end of this question, that I have not answered your question, 'What is my duty to society, to my father and to myself'. I say that is a wrong question. It is a question put by

a mind that is not free, a mind that is not in revolt, a mind that is docile, submissive, a mind that has no love. Can such a mind which is docile, submissive, without love, with that shadow of bitterness, ever be dutiful to society or to itself? Can such a mind create a new world, a new structure?

Do not shake your heads. Do you know what you want? You do not want a revolt, you do not want a revolution of the mind, you want to bring up your children in the same manner in which you have been brought up. You want to condition them the same way, to think on the same lines, to do puja, to believe what you believe. So, you never encourage them to find out. So, as you are destroying yourselves in your conditioning, you want to destroy others. So the problem is not what is my duty to society, but how to find or how to awaken this love and this freedom. When once there is that love, you may not be dutiful at all.

Love is the most revolutionary thing; but the mind cannot conceive that love; you cannot cultivate it, it must be there; it is not a thing to be grown in your backyard; it is a thing that comes into being with constant inquiry, constant discontent and revolt, when you never follow authority, when you are without fear - which means, when you have the capacity to make mistakes and from the mistake to find out the answer. A mind that is without fear is really not petty, and it is capable of real depth; then such a mind shall find out what love is, what freedom is.

Question: Please explain to us what you mean by Time, and what you mean by the Timeless. Can there ever be freedom from Time?

Krishnamurti: Explanations are comparatively easy. Words put

together are explanations, and most of us are satisfied with explanations, with conclusions. But to really experience requires an extraordinarily arduous mind, not a mind that says, 'Words are enough for me'.

Surely the mind is the process of time; thought which is the verbalization of a reaction is the result of time; words are of time, as explanation is of time. A mind which is content with words, explanations, with time, tries to go beyond time through explanation, through words, through symbols, through the symbol of eternity. Though the mind tries to use the symbol to go beyond, obviously, it is still within the field of time, time being memory what I remember of yesterday and the projection of yesterday to today and to tomorrow. The yesterday, today and tomorrow is the process of time, is the process of thought.

Then there is time that is implied from childhood, to manhood, to death - time as progress. I will be something tomorrow or in the next life; now, I am a clerk; in three years time I am going to be the boss. There is time as implied in the cultivation of virtue: I am afraid, I am violent; I will cultivate non-violence - which is sweet deception. The mind that is violent can never be non-violent, however much it may practise non-violence. The very practice of non-violence is violence. Sirs, listen. Do not smile.

The very practice of virtue strengthens the violence which is the 'me'. That is time. The mind, caught in this time, says, 'Please explain to me what is the Timeless; please help me to experience something which is not of myself'. The mind is, in its very essence, the past; the past is time, the past is the future, the past is what is present. Such a mind is enquiring, trying to find out what is the

timeless. It can only find what it projects; it cannot find the timeless, because the instrument itself is of time.

The mind can speculate, it can argue, it can project what should be the timeless and so on; but it can never experience the timeless; and if it experiences the state of timelessness for a few seconds, then it expresses it and puts it away into memory. For instance, 'I have experienced the beauty of the sunset yesterday; now I must have it again today.' So everything the mind does is the process of capturing that extraordinary movement of life and putting it into the past.

Please listen. The problem now is not to find out what is the timeless, not how I can find the timeless, not how the mind can find the timeless but to find out the state in which the mind can experience the timeless, which is a state of experiencing, not experience. The moment I am conscious that I have experienced, it is already in the past, the particular experience is of the past.

Please listen; you will find out what I am talking about; it is not mysterious. You do not have to go into the deep intoxication of renunciations and pujas and controls; what you have to do is to understand the structure of the mind, the anatomy of thought. When you understand it, when the mind sees how it is caught in time, then the mind becomes fully focussed; it is all full attention, the attention that is not exclusive. In that attention, there is the coming and going of the conscious; there is the reacting to that noise of the train; and the reaction is memory. At the same time, the mind is not concentrated but is fully focussed - focussed not through any volition, not through any action of will; but the mind is fully called to pay attention to itself; on the periphery, on the

outskirts, there are always the impression and responses going on.

But when the mind sees what the function of thought is, the whole process of time, then it is completely focussed, completely attentive, not to something but listening, when the mind is completely still, then there is the Timeless. But a man who makes the mind still is caught in the net of time. So it requires enormous vigilance and that state is experiencing, there is no experiencer experiencing, there is only experiencing. At that moment, there is no experiencer, there is only experiencing; a moment later it becomes the experiencer and so we are caught in time.

Can the mind be in a state of experiencing, not in a state of experience which is what we know, which is the accumulative past, which is of time? Please put the question and listen to the question; you will find the answer for yourself. I am not hypnotizing you by words.

Can the mind be in a state of experiencing? That is the state of experiencing what is timeless; and in that experiencing, there is no accumulation, no knowledge, no entity that says, 'I am experiencing'. The moment there is the experiencer, he is introducing time.

So, can the mind be in a state of experiencing God? That is meditation - the meditation which is not of pursuit, not of a particular idea, the meditation which is not the mere concentration which is exclusion. In that meditation, there is experiencing without the experiencer. And I assure you it is very arduous. It is not just sitting down and closing the eyes and getting some kind of fancy visions and ecstasy.

If I know how to listen rightly, if I know how to listen to

thought, then thought will inevitably bring about this state, the state in which there is no experiencer, therefore no accumulator, the person that gathers, holds. Therefore, experiencing is a state of constant unknowingness; therefore, it is timeless, it is not a thing of the mind.

Question: Modern scientists have placed vast powers of destruction in the hands of political rulers of America and Russia. There seems to be no place for simple kindness between man and man. What is the meaning of human existence in this age of cruelty?

Krishnamurti: The questioner says: There is no human kindness, the simple kindness between man and man. Have you and I that simple kindness? Because we have not got it, we have created America and Russia. Please don't separate yourself from America and Russia. We have the potential capacities of being Americans and Russians. We are Russians and Americans at heart. We pose in the name of liberty, and given that liberty we become tyrants. Are you not tyrants in your homes, over your children, in your offices, over your wives and the wives over you? (Laughter). Yes Sirs, how easily we laugh at these things!

Though we may live thousands of miles away from Russia and America, we have created this world, you and I; our problem is the world problem, because the `you' is the world. You, Mr. Smith, and you, Mr. Rao, you are the world living in Russia and America; their misery is our misery. Though we might like to separate ourselves, though we may like to condemn them and say that they are politically this and they are politically that, that they are trying to use this and that - you know the things that newspapers cultivate

as propaganda - you and I are the Russians and the Americans. We all want power, position, prestige. We are all cruel, we all feel proud, we are all full of pride. Then how can we be kind, unsuspecting, innocent? We cannot. And it is no good condemning Russia and America; and to fight them is to become like them.

So, there must be a revolution in the ways of our thinking. When there is no identification with India, with any political or religious system; when we are common humanity, not labelled as Hindus, Russians, Germans, English, Americans, Christians and so on; then only there is a possibility for peace to be; till then, there is no possibility. Stalin will come and go and others will come. There will be war till there is a real revolution in our heart.

That revolution is not possible through any economic revolution, through any superficial change, because such a change is merely a modified continuity whereas a revolution is not. The revolution that is necessary cannot come about by any compulsion. It must come spontaneously out of ourselves. Because we do not want it, we resort to war, we resort to various forms of reforms which need further reforms; and so, we are everlastingly caught.

Question: What is God? What is Love? What is Death?

Krishnamurti: It is not possible to experiment to find out what is God, what is Love and what is Death? As we are sitting here, can we not find out? Do not just listen to my explanation. I am not going to explain, because explanations do not satisfy the hungry man; the description of food will not satisfy me if I am hungry.

Since I am hungry to find out what is God, what is Love and what is Death, can I find it out? I can only find out if the mind can completely free itself from the known. If the mind can put aside

everything it has learnt, the Bhagavad Gita, all its experiences, everything that the Upanishads have said, if all its conditions can completely be wiped out, then only is it possible to know, to experience that state of living.

Can one know what death is? Death is the Unknown. But a mind that clings to the known which is the continuity of what I am from day to day, cannot know the Unknown. The Unknown is Death, is it not? Death has no `knowing'. Though I may have read many descriptions of it, I have to leave all symbols. All words must be put aside, must they not? And can I put them aside - not with any effort, but just as I am listening?

Can I completely enter into the state of `Unknowing'? Then though I am living, there is the `Unknowing' which is death. That means, there must be no fear, no fear of dying - the dying being the ending of continuity. That which continues deteriorates; it is only the ending that is creative.

So, can I know death while I live? `Death' is not the word, not the corpse not the thing that you see being carried down the road to be burnt, but the thing which is not the word, which is a state of `Unknowing'. Surely I can feel it out.

And is God a thing to be found by the mind? God is not of time. I may imagine, I may think this is God, that is not God; but I do not know what God is. The word is not God. So, as I do not know, can the mind be in a state in which there is no ending; when the mind is completely empty, completely still, without any formulations, without any hope to find, innocent, in which there is no demand, no asking? The moment you ask, you are given; and what you are given is given with a curse. The mind can never ask, because it can

only hear the answer according to the words, according to the past. So can the mind, listening, be still, without asking, without expecting?

And is not Love also something which is not brought into being by the mind? The moment the mind is conscious that it loves, surely it is no longer love, is it? And can I not feel even for a second, in the stillness of the mind, this thing that we call God - the word - and to go beyond the word, and to see and to experience that state in which there is no knowing, which is Death? And that word Love which is not of the mind, which is not of Time, can the mind in its complete stillness feel it, but not be able to recognise, because the moment you recognise it is of time? So, there must be the state of non-recognition, an experience in which there is no experiencer; it is only then in that real stillness of the mind the Unknowable comes into being.

March 8, 1953

BOMBAY 10TH PUBLIC TALK 11TH MARCH 1953

I think it might be worthwhile if we went into the question of how quickly the mind deteriorates and what are the primary factors that make the mind dull, insensitive, quick to respond. I think it would be significant if we could go into this question why the mind deteriorates, because perhaps, in understanding that, we may be able to find out what is really a simple life.

We notice as we grow older that the mind, the instrument of understanding, the instrument with which we probe into any problem, to enquire, to question, to discover - that mind if misused, deteriorates, disintegrates; and it seems to me that one of the major factors of this deterioration of the mind is the process of choice.

All our life is based on choice. We choose at different levels of our existence. We choose between white and blue, between one flower and another flower, between certain psychological impulses of like and dislike, between certain ideas, beliefs; accepting some and discarding others. So our mental structure is based on this process of choice, this continuous effort at choosing, distinguishing, discarding, accepting, rejecting. And, in, that process, there is constant struggle, constant effort. There is never a direct comprehension, but always the tedious process of accumulation, of the capacity to distinguish which is really based on memory, on the accumulation of knowledge; and therefore, there is this constant effort made through choice.

Now, is not choice ambition? Our life is ambition. We want to be somebody, we want to be well-thought-of, want to achieve a

result. If I am not wise, I want to become wise. If I am violent, I want to become non-violent. The becoming is the process of ambition. Whether I want to become the biggest politician or the most perfect saint, the ambition, the drive, the impulse of becoming is the process of choice, is the process of ambition which is essentially based on choice.

So, our life is a series of struggles, a movement from one ideological concept, formula, desire, to another, and in this process of becoming, in this process of struggle the mind deteriorates. The very nature of this deterioration is choice; and we think choice is necessary, choice from which springs ambition.

Now can we find a way of life which is not based on ambition, which is not of choice, which is a flowering in which the result, is not sought? All that we know of life is a series of struggles ending in result; and those results are being discarded for greater results. That is all we know.

In the case of the man who sits alone in a cave, in the very process of making himself perfect, there is choice, and that choice is ambition. The man who is violent tries to become non-violent; that very becoming is ambition. We are not trying to find out whether ambition is right or wrong whether it is essential to life, but whether it is conducive to a life of simplicity. I do not mean the simplicity of a few clothes, that is not a simple life. The putting on of a loin cloth does not indicate a man that is simple; on the contrary, it may be that, by the renunciation of the outer things, the mind becomes more ambitious; for it tries to hold on to its own ideal which it has projected and which it has created. So if we observe our own ways of thinking, should we not enquire into this

question of ambition? What do we mean by it, and is it possible to live without ambition? We see that ambition breeds competition, whether in children, in school, or among the big politicians, all the way up, the trying to beat a record. This ambition produces certain industrial benefits: but in its wake, obviously there is the darkening of the mind, the technological conditioning, so that the mind loses its pliability, its simplicity and therefore is incapable of directly experiencing. Should we not enquire, not as a group but as individuals - you and I - should we not find out what this ambition means, whether we are at all aware of this ambition in our life?

When we offer ourselves to serve the country to do noble work, is there not in it the fundamental element of ambition, which is the way of choice? And is not therefore choice a corruptive influence in our life, because it prevents the flowering? The man who flowers is the man who is, who is not becoming.

Is there not a difference between the flowering mind and the becoming mind? The becoming mind is a mind that is always growing, becoming, enlarging, gathering experience as knowledge. We know that process fully well in our daily life, with all its results, with all its conflicts, its miseries and strife, but we do not know the life of flowering. And is there not a difference between the two which we have to discover - not by trying to demarcate, to separate, but to discover - in the process of our living? When we discover this, we may perhaps be able to set aside this ambition, the way of choice, and discover a flowering which is the way of life, which may be true action.

So if we merely say that we must not be ambitious, without the discovery of the flowering way of life, the mere killing of ambition

destroys the mind also, because it is an action of the will which is the action of choice. So is it not essential for each one of us to find out in our lives the truth of ambition? We are all encouraged to be ambitious, our society is based on it, the strength of the drive towards a result. And in that ambition there are inequalities which legislation tries to level out, to alter. Perhaps that way, that approach to life is essentially wrong; and there might be another approach which is the flowering of life, which could express itself without accumulation. After all, we know when we are conscious of striving after something, of becoming something, that is ambition, the seeking of a result.

But there is an energy, a force in which there is a compulsion without the process of accumulation, without the background of the 'me', of the self, of the ego; that is the way of creativity. Without understanding that, without actually experiencing that, our life becomes very dull, our life becomes a series of endless conflicts in which there is no creativity, no happiness. And perhaps if we can understand - not by discarding ambition but by understanding the ways of ambition - by being open, by comprehending, by listening to the truth of ambition, perhaps we may come upon that creativity in which there is a continuous expression which is not the expression of self-fulfilment but is the expression of energy without the limitation of the 'me'. Question: In the worst of misery, most of us live on hope. Life without hope seems dreadful and inevitable; and yet, very often this hope is nothing but illusion. Can you tell us why hope is so indispensable to life?

Krishnamurti: Is it not the very nature of the mind to create illusion? Is not the very process of thinking the result of memory,

of verbalized thought which creates an idea, a symbol, an image to which the mind clings?

I am in despair; I am in sorrow; I have no way of resolving it; I do not understand how to resolve it. If I understand it, then there is no need for hope. It is only as long as I do not understand how to bring about the dissolution of a particular problem, that I depend on a myth, on an idea of hope. If you observe your own mind, you will see that when you are in discomfort, in conflict, in misery, your mind seeks a way away from it. The process of going away from the problem is the creation of hope.

The mind going away from the problem creates fear; the very movement of going away, the flight from the problem, is fear. I am in despair because I have done something which is not right, or some misery comes upon me, or I have done a terrible wrong, or my son is dead or I have very little to eat. My mind not being able to resolve the problem, created a certainty, something to which it can cling, an image which it carves by the hand or by the mind. Or the mind clings to a guru, to a book, to an idea which sustains me in my difficulties, in my miseries, in my despair; and so I say I shall have a better time next life, and so on and on and on.

As long as I am not capable of resolving my problem, my sorrow, I depend on hope; it is indispensable. Then I fight for that hope. I do not want anyone to disturb that hope, that belief. I make that belief into an organized belief, and I cling to that because, out of that, I derive happiness; because I have not been able to solve the problem which is confronting me, hope becomes the necessity.

Now, can I solve the problem? If I can understand the problem, then hope is not necessary, then depending on an idea or an image

or a person is not necessary because dependence implies hope, implies comfort. So, the problem is whether hope is indispensable, whether I can resolve my problem, whether there is a way to find out how not to be in sorrow - that is my problem. not how to dispense with hope.

Now, what is the factor essential to the understanding of a problem? Obviously, if I wish to understand the problem, there must be no formula, there must be no conclusion, there must be no judgment. But if we observe our minds we will see that we are full of conclusions; we are steeped in formula with which we hope to resolve the problem. And so we judge, we condemn. And so, as long as we have a formula, a conclusion, a judgment, a condemnatory attitude, we shall not understand the problem.

So the problem is not important, but how we approach the problem. So the mind that is wishing to comprehend a problem must not be concerned with the problem, but with the workings of its own machinery of judgment. Do you follow?

I started out with the establishment of a hope, saying that it is essential because without hope I am lost. So my mind is occupied with hope, I occupy it with hope. But that is not my problem, my problem is the problem of sorrow, of pain, of mistakes. Is even that my problem, or is my problem how to approach the problem itself? So what is important is how the mind regards the problem.

I have altogether moved away from hope; because, hope is illusory, it is unreal, it is not factual. I cannot deal with something which is not factual, which has been created by the mind; it is not something real, it is illusory; so, I cannot grapple with it. What is real is my sorrow, my despair, the things that I have done, the

crowded memories, the aches and the sorrows of my life. How I approach the aches and sorrows and miseries in my life is important, not hope; because, if I know how I approach them, then I shall be able to deal with them.

So what is important is not hope but how I regard my problem. I see that I always regard my problem in the light of judgment - either condemning, accepting, or trying to transform it - or looking at it through glasses, through the screen of formulae of what somebody has said in the Bhagavad Gita, what the Buddha or the Christ has said. So my mind being crippled by these formulae, judgments, quotations, can never understand the problem, can never look at it. So can the mind free itself from these accumulated judgments?

Please follow this carefully - not my words, but how you approach your problem. What we are always doing is pursuing the hope and everlastingly being frustrated. If I fail with one hope, I substitute another and so I go on and on. And as I do not know how to approach, how to understand the problem itself, I resort to various escapes. But if I knew how to approach the problem, then there is no necessity for hope. So what is important is to find out how the mind regards the problem.

Your mind looks at a problem. It looks at it obviously with a condemnatory attitude. It condemns it in distinguishing it, in reacting to it; or it wants to change it into something which it is not. If you are violent, you want to change into non-violence. Non-violence is unreal, it is not factual; what is real is violence. Now to see how you approach the problem, with what attitude - whether you condemn it, whether you have the memories of what the so-

called teachers have said about it - that is what is important.

Can the mind eradicate these conditions, free itself from these conditions, and look at the problem? Can it be unconcerned with how to free itself from these conditions? If it is concerned with it, then you create another problem out of it. But if you can see how these conditions prevent you from looking at the problem, then these conditions have no value; because, the problem is important, pain is important, sorrow is important. You cannot call sorrow an idea and brush it aside. It is there.

So, as long as the mind is incapable of looking at the problem, as long as it is not capable of resolving the problem, there must be various escapes from the problem; and the escapes are hopes, they are the defence mechanism.

The mind will always create problems. But what is essential is that, when we make mistakes, when we are in pain, to meet these mistakes, these pains, without judgment, to look at them without condemnation, to live with them and to let them go by. And that can only happen when the mind is in the state of non-condemnation, without any formula; which means, when the mind is essentially quiet, when the mind is fundamentally still; then only is there the comprehension of the problem.

Question: Will you please tell us what you mean by the words "our vocation"? I gather you mean something different from the ordinary connotation of these words.

Krishnamurti: Each one of us pursues some kind of vocation - the lawyer, the soldier, the policeman, the businessman and so on. Obviously, there are certain vocations which are detrimental to society - the lawyer, the soldier, the policeman, and the

industrialist who is not making other men equally rich.

When we want, when we choose a particular vocation, when we train our children to follow a particular vocation, are we not creating a conflict within society? You choose one vocation and I choose another; and does that not bring about conflict between us? Is that not what is happening in the world, because we have never found out what is our true vocation? We are only being conditioned by society, by a particular culture, to accept certain forms of vocations which breed competition and hatred between man and man. We know that, we see it.

Now is there any other way of living in which you and I can function in our true vocations? Now is there not one vocation for man? Please listen, Sirs. Are there different vocations for man? We see that there are: you are a clerk, I polish shoes, you are an engineer and I am a politician. We see innumerable varieties of vocations and we see they are all in conflict with each other. So man through his vocation is in conflict, in hatred, with man. We know that. With that we are familiar every day.

Now let us find out if there is not one vocation for man. If we can all find it, then the expression of different capacities will not bring about conflict between man and man. I say there is only one vocation for man. There is only one vocation, not many. The one vocation for man is to find out what is Real. Sirs, don't settle back, this is not a mystical answer.

If I and you are finding out what is truth, which is our true vocation, then in the search of that we will not be in competition. I shall not be competing with you, I shall not fight you though you may express that truth in a different way; you may be the Prime

Minister, I shall not be ambitious and want to occupy your place, because I am seeking equally with you what is Truth. Therefore, as long as we do not find out that true vocation of man, we must be in competition with each other, we must hate each other; and whatever legislation you may pass, on that level you can only produce further chaos.

So, is it not possible from childhood, through right education, through the right educator, to help the boy - the student - to be free to find out what is the Truth about everything - not just Truth in the abstract - but to find out the truth of all relationships - the boy's relationship to machinery, his relationship to nature, his relationship to money, to society, to government and so on? That requires, does it not?, a different kind of teachers who are concerned with helping or giving the boy, the student, freedom so that he begins to investigate the cultivation of intelligence which can never be conditioned by a society which is always deteriorating.

So, is there not one vocation for man? Man cannot exist in isolation, he exists only in relationship; and when in that relationship, there is no discovery of truth, the discovery of the truth of relationship, then there is conflict.

There is only one vocation for you and me. And in the search of that, we shall find the expression wherein we shall not come into conflict, we shall not destroy each other. But it must begin surely through right education, through the right educator. The educator also needs education. Fundamentally the teacher is not merely the giver of information, but brings about, in the student, the freedom, the revolt to discover what is Truth.

Question: When you answer our questions, what functions - memory or knowledge?

Krishnamurti: It is really quite an interesting question, is it not? Let us find out.

Knowledge and memory are the same, are they not? Without knowledge, without the accumulation of knowledge which is memory, can you reply? The reply is the verbalization of a reaction, is it not? There is this question asked: what is functioning, memory or knowledge? I am only saying memory and knowledge are the same thing essentially, because if you have knowledge but have no memory of it, it will have no value.

You are asking what functions when I answer a question. Is knowledge functioning? Is memory functioning? Now what is it that is functioning with most of us? Please follow this. What is functioning with most of us when you ask a question? Obviously knowledge. When I ask you the way to your house, knowledge is functioning, memory is functioning. And with most of us that is all that functions, because we have accumulated knowledge from the Bhagavad Gita or from the Upanishads or from Marx, or from what Stalin has said, or what your pet guru says or your own experience, your own accumulated reactions; and from that background, you reply. That is all we know. That is the actual fact. In your business that is what is functioning. When you build a bridge that is what is functioning.

When you write a poem, there are two functions going on - the verbalization, the memory and the creative impulse; the creative impulse is not memory but when expressed, it becomes memory.

So without memory, verbalization, the verbalizing process,

there is no possibility of communication. If I do not use certain words, English words, I could not talk to you. The very talking, the verbalization, is the functioning of memory. Now the question is what is functioning when the speaker is answering, memory or something else. Memory obviously, because I am using words. But is that all?

Am I replying from the accumulated memories of innumerable speeches I have made during the last twenty years, which I keep on repeating like a gramophone record machine? That is what most of us are. We have certain actions, certain patterns of thought and we keep on repeating them. But the repetition of words is entirely different to that, because that is the way of communication. In the repetition of experience, the experiences are gathered and stored away; and like a machine, I repeat from that experience, from that storehouse. Here again, there is repetition, which is again the memory functioning.

So you are asking if it is possible, while I am speaking, that I am really experiencing, not answering from experience? Surely there is a difference between the repetition of experience and the freedom of experiencing which is being expressed through memory which is the verbalization. Please listen. This is not difficult to understand.

I want to find out what ambition means, all that it implies. Do I really, now as I am speaking, investigate afresh the whole process of ambition? Or, do I repeat the investigation which I have made yesterday about ambition, which is merely repetition? Is it not possible to investigate, to experience anew all the time, and not merely rely on a record, on memory, on the experience of

yesterday? Is it not possible to flower, to be, all the time, now as I am speaking, without the repetitious experience of yesterday, though I use words to communicate?

Your question is: What is functioning when I am speaking? If I am repeating merely what I have said ten days ago, then it is of very little value. But if I am experiencing as I am talking, not an imaginative feeling but actually, then what is functioning? The flowering is functioning, not through self-expression, not the 'me' functioning which is memory.

So it is very important, not for me alone, but for all of us to find out if we can keep our minds from being this storehouse of the past, and whether the mind can be stable on the waters of life and let the memories float by without clinging to any particular memory, and when necessary to use that memory as we do use it when we communicate. Which means, the mind constantly letting the past float by, never identifying itself with it, never being occupied with it; so that the mind is firm, not in experience, not in memory, not in knowledge, but firm, stable in the process, in the way of experiencing continuously.

So, that is the factor which brings about no deterioration, so that the mind constantly renews. A mind that accumulates is already in decay. But the mind that allows memories to go by and is firm in the way of experiencing - such a mind is always fresh, it is always seeing things anew. That capacity can only come when the mind is very quiet. That quietness, that stillness, is not induced, cannot come about through any discipline, through any action of will, but when the mind understands the whole process of accumulation of knowledge, memory, experience. Then it establishes itself on the

waters of life, which are always moving, living, vibrant.

Question: With what should the mind be occupied? I want to meditate. Would you please tell me on what I should meditate?

Krishnamurti: Now, let us find out what is meditation. You and I are going to find out. I am not going to tell you what is meditation. We are both going to discover it afresh.

The mind that has learnt to meditate, which is to concentrate, the mind that has learnt the technique of shutting out everything and narrowing down to a particular point - such a mind is incapable of meditation. That is what most of us want. We want to learn to concentrate, to be occupied with one thought to the exclusion of every other thought, and we call that meditation. But it is not meditation. Meditation is something entirely different, which we are going to find out.

So our first problem is why does the mind demand that it should be occupied? Do you understand? My mind says, 'I must be occupied with something, with worry, with memory, with a passion, or with how not to be passionate, or how to get rid of something, or to find a technique which will help me to build a bridge.' So the mind, if you observe, demands constant occupation; does it not? That is why you say, 'My mind must be occupied with the word OM', or you repeat Ram Ram; or you are occupied with drinking. The word 'Om; the word 'Ram Ram' or the word 'drink' are all the same, because the mind wants to be occupied, because it says if it is not occupied it will do some mischief, if it is not occupied it will drift away. If the mind is not occupied, then what is the purpose of life? So you invent a purpose of life - noble, ignoble or transcendental - and cling to that; and with that, you are

occupied. It is the same whether the mind is occupied with God or whether it is occupied with business, because the mind says consciously or unconsciously it must be occupied.

So, the next thing is to find out why the mind demands occupation. Please follow this. We are meditating now. This is Meditation. Meditation is not a state at the end. Freedom is not to be got at the end; freedom is at the beginning. If you have no freedom in the beginning, you have no freedom at the end. If you have no love now, you will have no love in ten years. So what we are doing now is to find out what is meditation. And the very enquiry of what is meditation is to meditate.

The mind says, 'I must be occupied with God, with virtue, with my worries, or with my business concern', so, it is incessantly active in its occupation. So the mind can only exist as long as it is active, as long as it is conscious of itself in action, not otherwise. The mind knows itself as being, when it is occupied, when it is acting, when it has results. It knows itself as existing when it is in motion. The motion is occupation towards a result, towards an idea, or denial of that idea negatively.

So, I am conscious of myself only when there is motion, in and out. So consciousness is this motion of action, outward and inward; this breathing out of responses, of reactions, of memories, and then collecting them back again. So my mind, 'I am', is only when I am thinking, when I am in conflict with a thing, when there is suffering, when there is occupation, when there is strain, when there is choice.

So the mind knows itself as in motion when it is ambitious and drags itself there; and seeing that ambition is dull, it says, 'I will

occupy myself with God.' The occupation of the mind with God is the same as the occupation of the mind with money. We think that the man whose mind is occupied with God is more sacred than the man who is thinking of money; but they are factually both the same; both want results, both need to be occupied. So, can the mind be without occupation? That is the problem.

Sirs, can the mind be blank without comparing, because the `more' is the way of the mind knowing that it exists? The mind that knows it exists, is never satisfied with `what is; it is always acquiring, comparing, condemning, demanding more and more. In the demand, in the movement of the `more', it knows itself as existing, which is what we call self-consciousness, the conscious on the surface and the unconscious. This is our life, this is the way of our everyday existence.

I want to know what meditation is; so I say I want to be occupied with meditation. I want to find out what meditation is; so my mind is again occupied with meditation. So, can the occupied mind - please follow this, listen to this - can the occupied mind ever be capable of meditation? Meditation surely is the understanding of the ways of the mind. If I do not know how my mind operates, functions, works, how can I meditate? How can I really find out what is truth? So, the mind must find out how it is occupied; then it begins to see with what it is occupied; and then finds that all occupations are the same; because, the mind then is filling itself with words, with ideas, with constant movement, so that there is never a quietness.

When the mind occupies itself with the discovery of what Love is, it is another form of occupation, is it not? It is like the man who

is occupied with passion. When you say you must find out the Truth, will you find truth? Or, does Truth come into being only when the mind is not occupied, when the mind is empty to receive, not to gather not to accumulate. Because, you can only receive once. But if what you have received you make into memory with which you are occupied, then you will never receive again. Because the receiving is from moment to moment. Therefore it is of timelessness.

So the mind which is of time cannot receive the timeless. So the mind must be completely still, empty, without any movement in any direction. And that can only take place with a mind that is not occupied - not occupied with the `more', with a problem, with worry, with escapes; not conditioned in any belief, in any image, in any experience. It is only when the mind is totally free, then only is there a possibility of immense profound stillness; and in that stillness that which is Eternal comes into being. That is meditation.

March 11, 1953

LONDON 1ST PUBLIC TALK 30TH MARCH 1953

It seems to me that one of our greatest problems in this rather confused world is 'what to do?' There is starvation in Asia; and there is the threatening of war. There is extraordinary progress in science; and though we may want to keep up with this so-called progress morally, we are behind. And the difficulty in this confusion is to find out - intellectually even - how to behave, how to act, and what to think. Because, though we look to leaders, intellectual philosophers, or scientists, it seems to me that the difficulty is that we no longer have confidence in philosophers, in the teachers, in the scientists. The more we observe, the greater we see the confusion to be. Though we may have a welfare State, inwardly, psychologically we are extraordinarily poor. We may have all the outward things - shelter, food, clothing - that go to create comfort; but inwardly we are poor, insufficient, utterly miserable, confused, not knowing what to do, where to find either happiness salvation, or that sense of reality which is not dependent on any particular religion, on any philosophy.

Seeing all this, surely we must begin to find out what we mean by a moral life. Is morality consistent with progress? And, can morality be consciously, deliberately planned out and cultivated, so as to meet this extraordinary progress that man is making in other directions? Is inward progress ever possible? And can man be happy, without this deliberate, conscious effort at morality? Is morality cultivable? And when morality is developed, does it lead to happiness, to creativity, to freedom? Or, is morality something which is not to be cultivated, but a revolution, an unconscious

revolution?

We may cultivate virtue, compassion, love; but, will intellectual cultivation, the deliberate process of becoming something, becoming noble, and so on, will such a deliberate act bring about that unconscious freedom from the restraints that modern society and our own limitations place upon each one of us? Surely, is it not important to find out whether this constant struggle towards greater and greater intellectual development will solve any of our problems, or whether there is a totally different approach? Because, if I consciously follow a particular course of action, plan out my life, intellectually think it out, analyze it, and set a course, naturally I will achieve certain results. But will that bring about a sense of freedom, that creativity which is the reality of actual experience? Or, does that creativity, that freedom, come about entirely differently, through a different process?

Perhaps we can go into this and find out whether, through a deliberate process, through a cultivation of the mind, through various disciplines and compulsions, the mind can go beyond itself. Because, intellectually we are very far advanced, intellectually we know a great many things; but inwardly we are insufficient, there is no richness. We depend on others for our psychological well-being; there is fear, there is frustration, there is anxiety, a sense of being bound. And, is it possible to break through this intellectuality by the cultivation of any particular virtue or virtues? Will intellect free us from our own bondage, will intellect free us from fear, will intellect cultivate that feeling of compassion? And yet, that is what we are trying to do, are we not?

Though we may have a welfare state, where everything is

planned for us, we are aware that there is an insufficiency of affection, love; and there is fear. And we intellectually set about cultivating various forms of resistance to fear - denying anxiety, or analyzing it, going into it very, very carefully, all through the intellect, through the mind. And can the mind resolve the problems which it has created? We cultivate virtue, morality, to keep up with the progress we are making; but will that cultivation of morality by the intellect bring about the well-being of man?

So, that is one of our major problems, is it not? Scientifically we are making extraordinary advances in the world; and so we say to ourselves 'morally also we must progress'. But the more we cultivate virtue, the stronger the resistance, which we call the 'me', the 'I', the ego. Is that not so? When I am consciously, deliberately, cultivating humility, or fearlessness am I being humble, free from fear? When I am deliberately trying to be non-violent, am I so? Or, is virtue something that cannot be cultivated at all? The person who is conscious of his morality surely is not moral, is he? And yet, there must be morality; there must be an unconscious moral well-being which is not the result of the intellectual cultivation of any particular virtue.

I do not know if I am making myself clear? Because, it seems to me that this is one of our greatest problems. Because, to meet this progress, obviously there must be a freedom from the ego consciousness; otherwise, we are going to make more misery for ourselves, more sorrow. And, is the freedom from this ego consciousness the result of the cultivation of any particular virtue? Because, all religions deliberately set about to cultivate particular qualities in the follower. This conscious cultivation is surely the

development of the intellect and not of virtue. The more I am conscious that I am virtuous, the less I am virtuous. And yet, every activity of a religious person, every activity of a person who is trying to meet this world problem, the world crisis, is the deliberate cultivation, conscious effort, towards some particular form of virtue, of morality, of well-being. It is a conscious, deliberate effort. And I wonder if such an effort does bring about morality, the well-being of man, so as to meet the progress that the world is making?

Is not true revolution not of the mind but at quite a different level? Because, planned revolution - economic, social, or of any other kind - is still on the intellectual level; and the intellect cannot possibly bring about a revolution. Intellect can only bring about a continued change; but that change is not a revolution. An economic change, thought out, planned out by the mind, is not a revolution for the total well-being of man, it is only a revolution at a particular narrow level. And if we are concerned with the total revolution of man - not the development of one particular quality at one particular level - must we not be concerned, not only with the revolution at the superficial, conscious level, but at the deeper levels of our being also?

And is the mind, the conscious mind, capable of digging into or analyzing the unconscious, and thereby bringing about a revolution? Because, it is obvious that we need a fundamental, radical transformation in ourselves, which cannot be brought about by the mind. The mind cannot produce that revolution. That revolution can only come about when there is a direct experience of reality, or God, or what you will. But the intellect cannot

experience that; it cannot, through any of its efforts, realize that truth. Any cultivation of morality, any belief, any doctrine, is still on the intellectual level, on the superficial level. And yet with that mind, that intellect, we are trying to grasp, trying to experience, something which is beyond the mind.

Is God, truth, or what you will, to be discovered by the mind, by the intellect? Or, is it to be experienced when the totality of the mind - not only the conscious but also the unconscious - when the whole mind is utterly still, not struggling to achieve a result, not struggling to find something, not trying to go beyond itself? It seems to me this is very important to understand. All our effort so far is at the level of the intellect, because that is all we have that is what we have cultivated for generations. And with that mind we are trying to find a reality, a truth, a God, which will give us happiness, give us virtue, bring about the inward well-being of each one of us. Is that really to be found through the mind? Yet without that reality, do what we will, whatever progress we make will always bring about more confusion, more sorrow, more wars, more divisions; and without finding that reality, progress has no meaning.

So how is one to find that new state? How is one to awaken to that reality, to that creativeness which is not merely a verbal expression, or a myth, or a fantasy? It is to be found. But it cannot be found by the mind. The mind is only the result of time, memory, reactions - a storehouse of knowledge of the past. The mind is the past. In its very nature it is put together, through time, through the ages. And we are trying to find something which is beyond time, which cannot be named, which cannot be put into words, which no

description can ever cover. Without the discovery of that, life has very little significance, life becomes one series of struggles - sorrow, pain, suffering, constant anxiety. So, how is one to find that?

Is it not to be found - or rather, does it not come into being - when the whole of my being is very still? Because in that state I am not asking for anything; I am neither virtuous nor not virtuous; I am not thinking of myself as progressing, advancing, growing, attaining a result; there is no longer the drive of ambition, of wanting to put the world in order. The world can be put in order only when I have found that reality. That reality will bring about order, without my making an effort to do something. So, is it not important for me to understand myself, the ways of my own mind? For that understanding brings about that state of stillness in which there is an unconscious revolution - the revolution in which the 'me' is no longer important. And so when I see all this, the mind becomes very quiet, no longer seeking, no longer demanding, no longer struggling to be something; and in that quietness, in that stillness, reality comes into being. It is not a fancy, it is not some oriental mysticism. Without that reality do what you will, there will be more wars, more destruction; man will be ever against man.

That reality cannot come into being, I feel, without self-knowledge - self-knowledge which is discovered from moment to moment in the mirror of relationship, so that all illusion is stripped away, so that the mind does not build fantasies, escapes. When the mind is no longer caught in beliefs, it begins to understand 'what is' - 'what is' in relationship. So, through the constant awareness in action of the self, of the 'me', one discovers the ways of one's

mind. It is a book that cannot be read all at once. The man who says 'I must read it at once, and understand it totally', will never understand the mind. It is to be read constantly and what one reads is not to be accumulated as knowledge. Because, knowledge prevents reality; knowledge is accumulated memory; knowledge is of time, is of so-called progress. But reality is not of time; it cannot be stored up and used; it comes only when the mind is utterly quiet. And that quietness comes into being, not through any discipline, but through the understanding of the ways of the ego, the 'me', the mind, through awareness of all relationships.

So, no discipline, no cultivation of virtue, will bring reality - into being. The cultivation of virtue merely becomes an impediment to reality without which the various problems that life creates will ever continue. It is only when I begin to understand myself that the mind becomes quiet; only in that quietness, in that stillness of the mind, that creative reality comes into being.

Some questions have been sent in, and I will try to answer them. But before I do so, I think one or two things must be made clear. If you are looking for an answer, I am afraid you will be disappointed. Because, the problem is more important than the answer; how one approaches the problem is more significant than seeking a solution. If one knows how to approach a problem, then the answer is in the problem, not away from it. But we are so eager to find an answer, a remedy, to be told what to do, that we never study the problem itself.

And I think, also, that it is very important to know how to listen. Because, we rarely listen; we are so full of our own ideas, our own objections, our own prejudices; or we have read a great deal, we

know so much. Our own experience, our knowledge, and other people's knowledge, prevent us from listening, not only to the speaker, but to everything in life. The more we listen, the greater the understanding. But it is very difficult to listen. To listen, one must be extraordinarily quiet - not concentrated, because concentration is merely an exclusive process. But when one listens to find out, one discovers, because then one is open, there is no barrier, one's own projections have stopped and psychologically one is not demanding.

So, it is very important, is it not?, to know how to listen, not only to me - that is not so important - but to everything - to your neighbour, to your wife, to your children, to the politicians - so that in the very process of listening there is that confidence which is not of the 'me'. Because, most of us lack confidence; and so we seek to cultivate it, which merely becomes the egocentric certainty of the 'me', the confidence that is self-enclosing. But if I know how to listen, not only to everything about me but also to all my inner compulsions, urges, demands, to listen without interpreting, without translating, then I begin to understand the fact of what is.

And so with that, perhaps I can answer some of these questions.

Question: What need has one who belongs to the Welfare State, to come to meetings like this?

Krishnamurti: Sir, you may have all the physical necessities supplied to you by the State. And then what? Is it not important to find out why man is pursuing physical Utopia? We want salvation on the physical level. We want a well-ordered society. We want the perfect man, the perfect State. And we are getting lost in planning the perfect State. We think we can make progress along that line,

forgetting the total process of man. Man is not just this outward physical entity. There are all the psychological processes, the extraordinary resistances, fears, anxieties, frustrations. Dealing only with one part of man, without understanding the whole total process, surely does not bring about the well-being, the happiness of man. Is it not important also to find out the other parts, the hidden, the different levels, and not merely concentrate on physical well-being?

This does not mean that we must neglect physical well-being, go off into some monastery, into isolation. But, should we not deal with the total process of man? If you are emphasizing only the progress towards a perfect Utopia leaving out the enormous depths, the difficulties, the resistances, fears of man, surely you have not solved the problem! I do not think you will have a Utopia without understanding the total man, Surely religion - not belief, not organized ritual and so on, but true religion - is the discovery of man's total process, and so to go beyond the mind. Because the mind will not solve our problems, we need a different quality. And that quality can only come about with inward revolution.

Perhaps you have come to this meeting to find out for yourself if it is possible, as an individual, to go beyond the limitations of the mind, beyond its conditioning influences: to find out for yourself. Because, I feel without experiencing that reality, mere economic planning, trying to bring about a perfect State, will lead us nowhere. I think we are beginning at the wrong end. If we begin at the right end - that is, the discovery of reality - then the other is possible; then the other, the perfect State, the perfect society, has significance. But to begin with the perfect society and deny the

other will only lead us to further confusion, to concentration camps, to the liquidation of those people with whom we do not agree; and so, we will be everlastingly against each other.

Through understanding this process of conditioning, through understanding how the mind is conditioned - whatever its activities, whatever its projections, the mind will always be conditioned - through realizing that, perhaps it is possible to go beyond. And perhaps that is the reason some of you are here.

Question: I watch my thoughts and feelings, but it does not seem to lead me any further, because I continually slip back into the old routine of casual escape and thought; so, what am I to do?

Krishnamurti: A small mind, a petty mind, watching its own thought and feeling, still remains within its own limitations, does it not? If my mind is petty, shallow, small, I can watch my thought everlastingly, and naturally it will lead me nowhere. Because, my small mind wants certain results, and so, it is observing, watching for the results. My mind being petty, small, whatever I think is also small; my Gods, my beliefs, my activities, my objections, controls, disciplines, are still petty, small, bound by my own limitations. That is the real problem: 'not how to watch the mind, but is it possible for the mind which is small, narrow, petty, to go beyond itself?'

Merely watching your thoughts and feelings will not help a petty mind, will it? After all, I watch my thoughts in order to bring about a change, I watch my feelings in order to transform them. But the entity that is watching, the entity that is trying to change the thought and the feeling, is itself the result of feelings and of thoughts. The entity is not different from the thought and the

feeling. Without that feeling and that thought there is no entity. I am made up of my thoughts, feelings, experiences, conditioning, and so on; I am all that. And one part of me says, 'I will watch the various thoughts, various feelings, and try to change them, try to bring about a transformation'. But the 'I' that is trying to do something about these thoughts is still within the field of thought. So, the mind, separating itself as the superior, and trying to control, to change thought or feeling, is still part of that feeling, is still part of that thought.

Do please think it out with me. I am not different from my thoughts and feelings, am I? I am made up of thoughts and feelings - the fears, the anxieties, the frustrations, the longings, the innumerable desires - I am all that, all of that. And one part of me watching and trying to control thought and feeling will obviously not produce any result. I can change them; but the entity that changes is still petty, small. So what am I to do? Because, I see the necessity of bringing about a fundamental change in my thinking - I want to put aside ambition, various forms of fear, and so on; I see the fundamental necessity of it. Then, what am I to do? The 'I' which is made up of this ambition, made up of fear, frustration, that 'I' which is itself part of frustration, when it tries to go beyond or to fulfil, will only create further frustration.

If I see the truth, that whatever I do with regard to frustration - trying to become happy, trying to fulfil, or trying to put aside any desire for fulfilment - will only lead me to further frustration, if I see the truth of that, is there any necessity to struggle against frustration? Then I do not have to watch my thought and feeling. I only watch my thought and feeling in order to change them, in

order to control them, in order to discipline them to fit into a particular pattern of thought or action. But the `I' is not different from those thoughts and feelings. The `I' cannot change those thoughts. It can modify them, change the pattern; but it cannot bring about a revolution in thinking. Revolution can only come about when the `I' is not conscious of making an effort to change.

Please see this. When you desire to change a particular thought or feeling, you make a deliberate, conscious effort to change; but that consciousness is itself the result of struggle, of pain, of frustration, of wanting a certain result. So it is a planned action of the mind, of the `me', of the `I', of a particular thought process. That is not a revolution. That is only a modified continuity of a particular thought. And so one sees, does one not?, the importance of a fundamental revolution, a revolution in the unconscious, which must come about without one's making a conscious effort. Such a change, such a revolution, is only possible when I understand the total process of my thinking. Therefore, I deliberately do not do a thing. I realize that any conscious action on my part will only hinder that unconscious revolution.

Fundamental revolution in oneself comes about without any act of will. As long as I will to act in a particular direction, I am only cultivating, strengthening the `me' which is always anxious to achieve a result, to bring about a change. Please, think about this; and you will see that so long as you desire to bring about a particular change in habit, in thought, to alter a particular relationship to free yourself from fear, so long as you deliberately set about consciously to change fear, you will never succeed. But, if you can be aware of the total process of fear and leave it alone,

then you will find that there is an unconscious transformation, a fundamental change in which there is no longer any fear.

But the difficulty with most of us is that we want to act, we want to alter, whereas the mind cannot bring about a radical change. The mind can modify; but it cannot bring about fundamental freedom from fear, because the mind itself is made up of fear. So, if you can understand this total process, if as you listen to this you understand it, then you will see that in spite of your conscious efforts there is a transformation going on which will free the conscious mind from fear.

The conscious mind cannot free itself from anything. It can modify, it can alter; but in the background of it there is still fear. To be radically free from fear is to be aware of fear and to leave it alone, without any judgment, without trying to do anything about it. Just to know that there is fear, and to be quiet, brings about, a fundamental revolution in which fear has no longer any place.

March 30, 1953.

LONDON 2ND PUBLIC TALK 31ST MARCH 1953

Is not the conditioned mind - the mind that is held, limited, confined to various forms of beliefs, to many experiences, to a particular mode of conduct, to certain prejudices, attitudes - one of the major causes of confusion? Such a mind obviously does create confusion, because each of us is conditioned - you as a Christian, another as a Hindu, a Buddhist, or a communist, a socialist, and so on. So, whether this conditioning is externally imposed through education, or inwardly imposed through our own fears, our own experiences, through knowledge, through certain capacities, the conditioned mind obviously is incapable of being free. And it seems to me that it is only in freedom that one can discover what is true and that as long as the mind is conditioned it is incapable of that discovery. Only in the discovery of what is true can there be a harmony, a real love between man and man.

Is it possible to be free from this conditioning? And what is the factor that goes to make up the conditioning? If we can understand what it is, without making an effort to uncondition the mind perhaps then we shall find out what it is to be free from the various limitations which the mind has imposed upon itself.

After all, each society, each group of people, the various religions, they all impose certain conditions on us. From childhood, we are all conditioned - climatically geographically, religiously, socially, economically. These influences are constantly impinging on our minds. And we do not seem to be able to free ourselves from these conditionings imposed from our childhood, or the experiences that we have acquired - experience being the

conjunction of the past with the present in the moment of reaction.

Is it ever possible to be free of this conditioning? After all, so long as I am a Hindu, or a Buddhist, or a Christian, I think of reality or God in the framework in which I have been brought up; I believe that there is only one church through which salvation can be found, or only one economic system through which society can be saved; or I have innumerable beliefs imposed or cultivated, through anxiety, through fear. Surely such a mind is incapable of finding any reality! It can only find what it has been conditioned to find. If you are conditioned one way and I another way, there must be confusion, contention in our action, in our attitude, in our relationship. We have each been brought up in a certain framework, and each separate group of people think they alone have found certainty, reality, that their's is the best way. But life is in constant movement; it is not capable of being held in a particular system of thought; and so there is always conflict between the conditioned mind and the vital, living movement of life.

Realizing this, we say, 'Is it not possible to uncondition ourselves?' All that we can do, surely, is to put the mind into a better pattern, a better framework, make it more sociable, more moral. Can a mind which is so conditioned find reality? And, what is the factor that makes the mind conditioned, held in limitation? Perhaps if we understand that, we may be able to step out of conditioning almost immediately. The gradual unconditioning of the mind is really not possible, because in the very process of gradual unconditioning you are conditioning it in another direction.

So, what is the factor that conditions the mind? Is it not the power of the mind to acquire and to hold on to what it has

acquired? The mind is constantly seeking knowledge, security, experience. It has become a storehouse. And through that screen we translate everything. So long as the mind has the power, the urge to acquire, it must obviously be conditioning itself all the time; it is never in a state of freedom; it is limited by its own acquisitions, by its own knowledge, by its own capacity.

So, can the mind be free from this power to acquire and to retain what it has acquired, whether it is knowledge, capacity or experience? Can it not let experience, knowledge pass by, and yet remain without being conditioned? Can I not realize how I am conditioned as a Hindu, a Christian, or what you will, and understand how that conditioning comes into being socially, morally, in my relationships? Can I not see how the mind in that conditioning feels secure, feels that it has acquired certain knowledge, certain experience, that it is certain in itself? Cannot knowledge be used for action, without the action or the knowledge limiting the mind, conditioning the mind?

These things have to be felt out, thought out. It is not a question of being convinced, or being persuaded to a certain attitude. What we have to find out is whether, being conditioned, it is possible to free oneself from that conditioning, inwardly, totally. Because, then there may be a possibility of the mind being so deeply free as to discover what is real. to discover what is God. And it seems to me that if the mind is not capable of freeing itself from this constant acquisition - acquisition in becoming something, in being certain, in safeguarding itself - if the mind continues to hold on to this power to store up what it has learned, to gather experience and retain it, obviously the mind will ever be conditioned. We are

experiencing all the time; but cannot the mind experience, and let it go by without holding, never identified with it, never calling it 'mine'?

Surely, if we can feel that out - not intellectually, abstractly as an idea, but actually see, feel out directly experience this mind that is acquiring, storing, and then acting - then, surely, we shall comprehend that state in which the mind experiences and lets the experience go by, without itself being caught in the experience. Then, it seems to me, there is a real freedom, not the so-called freedom within the framework of a conditioned state.

As a Christian or as a Hindu, one says one is free; but that is not freedom. To be free within a conditioned state is still to be conditioned; and in that state it is obviously not possible to discover what is the real, what is the highest. Any projection of the conditioned mind is still the result of its own experience, the outcome of its past conditioning. So is it possible for me, knowing that I am conditioned, and the factors that condition me, the causes, is it possible so to be aware of it that without any effort, without any action of will, I can let the experience, the knowledge go by, without the mind being caught in it? After all, the mind is memory, is it not. It is the past, it is of time. And most of us are occupied with memories. We cannot deliberately put memory aside; but we can let the memories go by without corrupting the mind without being occupied with any particular memory, pleasant or unpleasant. It is this occupation that conditions the mind, this concern with the particular memory from childhood or from yesterday which I have acquired and to which I cling.

Is it possible to go into this whole process of acquiring, and be

free from it? We seem to think that freedom is not possible as long as economically we are bound. Perhaps we shall always be bound economically. I do not think freedom lies in that direction. But perhaps freedom is to be found, not in the seeking of physical comforts but in the freedom from acquisition, the freedom from being conditioned, so that the mind is always in a state of quiescence, quietude, not being disturbed by any experience, by any shadow. Surely such a state is necessary if one would know what is real, what is true creativeness. Question: I am always hungry. Where can I find the food that will fill me forever?

Krishnamurti: We want to find contentment, do we not? We want to fulfil ourselves in some action, in some person in an idea. And we try one thing after another - join one society, one group after another; attach ourselves to certain ideas, beliefs, and then push them aside when they do not satisfy, when they no longer give us what we want. So we keep on moving, everlastingly hungry. The hunger becomes painful only when it has nothing to feed upon. But the moment it has found something it can feed upon, there is no pain. Pain exists only when I cannot find food when I'm hungry. But if I find food when I'm hungry, there is no pain.

So, being hungry, inwardly insufficient, frustrated, I want to find something that will give me everlasting fulfilment, everlasting happiness. So I seek, I try one thing after another. That is our state, is it not? Being discontented, being hungry, being frustrated, we want to find an outlet somewhere, where one can find contentment, where there is no such thing as frustration. So, I try to quieten my discontent by theories, by explanations, or by identifying myself

with the State, throwing myself into some social activity, or joining a society, a religious group. But always there is hunger, there is anxiety, there is fear, there is discontent.

Now, why shouldn't I be discontented? What is wrong with the discontent? It is only painful, surely, when I want to alter it. Discontent in itself is not painful. It is only when I wish I could find contentment, it is only in relation to contentment, that the main pain of discontent arises. So, being discontented, I am seeking contentment. And when I cannot find it, then there is pain. So I go from door to door, from Master to Master, from saint to saint, from one teacher to another; because my intention is to find contentment, to find satisfaction, perpetual peace. In myself I am in turmoil, confused, frustrated; and as I cannot find the means of alteration of the state in which I am, from that arises pain.

So, can I understand what is discontent, and not ask how to transform it, how to become contented? It is very simple, is it not?, how to be contented. I can take a drug, condition myself to certain beliefs, become active socially, politically, or follow some authority, and so on; thereby it is fairly easy to find contentment; but there is always pain, fear, behind that contentment. But if I can understand discontentment - that flame, that thing that is constantly active, inquiring, searching, that thing that is not satisfied - then that very understanding may be the essential thing, not contentment at all. If I am not capable of constant inquiry, constant watchfulness of the things that are happening, taking shape in me - the thoughts, the feelings, the experiences - if I am not capable of that questioning, inquiring, then only is it that discontent becomes a pain. And from that pain I want to escape. And so I want to find

food that is everlastingly satisfying.

Is it not necessary to be discontented and not to find an easy channel through which the discontent can be pacified? Discontent, this feeling of searching to find out what is true, to be inwardly in revolution, is essential, is it not? Then that flame will give a new life, a new relationship to everything that the mind in) vents, so that the mind's power to create illusion is burnt out. That power to create illusion is not burnt out by experience, because experience creates illusion. It is only the understanding of the accumulative process of experience that gives freedom. So, is it not important, not to seek satisfaction, contentment, the everlasting food, the manna from heaven, not to ask for it? Because, the moment you ask you are given; and what you are given turns to ashes. Is it not important to have this capacity of discontent - perhaps that may not be the right word - to have that feeling of not being easily satisfied, of not seeking satisfaction at all, not being in pursuit of any form of gratification; and so, to be in this permanent state of revolution, not doubting - doubting has no place in it - but inquiring, fathoming, searching out? Such a mind cannot be conditioned, because it has never a resting place, never calls anything `mine'.

Surely we must have such a mind. But the moment you say `How can I have such a mind?' the method becomes the factor of your conditioning. If we can see the truth of that, feel it out inwardly - not merely intellectually or verbally - then an unconscious revolution is taking place; then the mind no longer is satisfied; it can never be satisfied; it is not thinking in terms of satisfaction then at all. And therefore the mind is not caught in frustration, despair, and in hope; it is not held in that terminology

or in that field.

So is it possible for the mind, for you and me - who are just ordinary people, not geniuses, but ordinary mediocre struggling people - is it possible for us to free ourselves from this craving for satisfaction? Because, the moment we are satisfied, we cease to be creative. Creation is not the mere writing of a poem, or the painting of a picture, I'm not talking of that. I am not talking of the projections that the mind creates and calls reality, but of that reality which comes when the mind is capable of receiving it, which alone is creativeness. So, should not the mind be constantly in revolution, never acquiring, never having a place where it feels safe, being ever in that state where no experience can enrich it? Because, the moment you are enriched, revolution has ceased to be, and therefore creativeness is not.

So, is it not possible for the mind which is seeking food for its satisfaction, to be timelessly in a state of non-acquisition so that it is no longer struggling, and is therefore extraordinarily still? Because, in that stillness, perhaps that which is the creative, the timeless, can come into being.

Question: Sleep is necessary for the right function of the physical body. Apart from that, what is the function of sleep?

Krishnamurti: Without making sleep and what happens during sleep into all kinds of mystical nonsense - you know all the things that we invent - can we not find out what actually takes place, the truth of the matter, not the invention of the mind, not what the mind would like to be happening? Because, something does happen during sleep. Problems are solved; new discoveries are made. I may have been thinking over a problem for days, and

suddenly in sleep the answer may be revealed. Sleep is necessary. And perhaps we can, by understanding it, going into it, discover what actually happens - not theoretically, not what we would like to happen, not all the explanations which various societies invent as to what happens during sleep. But cannot we, putting aside all those, really, deeply inquire into it, and find out the truth of the matter?

Obviously sleep is essential, not only for physical well-being but also for psychological well-being. Because, during that period, obviously, the so-called conscious, active mind, the daily mind, the mind that goes to the office, the mind that is tied to the kitchen, the mind that nags, the mind that quarrels, the mind that is perpetually occupied with some silly thing, with what your neighbour says, with the Coronation, and so on, that mind is quiet; actually it is quiet when you sleep. But that is only one part of the mind, the very, very superficial part. The rest of the mind is going on acting. It is never asleep, surely. You can see that when any deep problem, when any deep trouble, anxiety, when a fundamental question in the waking consciousness has been touched upon and no answer found, the deeper mind which does not sleep, is still inquiring; searching out. And because it is searching out without the interference of the superficial mind - the mind that is occupied with the trivial things of daily life - the deeper mind is more free to inquire. That is why suddenly we may wake up in the morning and say, `By Jove, that is the answer!'; or, you have a new idea, a new outlook, a new impression. That new impression comes into being, does it not?, when the so-called superficial mind is quiet. I dig into a problem, look at it all round, talk about it, discuss; and when I

have given up finding a solution, and go to sleep, out comes the right answer. It has happened to all of us. And perhaps it is because the superficial mind is no longer interfering.

And so, sleep becomes very important. But as most of us live and have our being in the superficial mind, we never touch the other. Perhaps, occasionally through dreams the other gives hints; but these hints are translated by the trivial mind; and in the very process of translating, that which has significance is made trivial.

So, sleeping and waking - keeping fully awake during the day - both have significance, have they not? So can I not during the day keep awake - not be a slave to the superficial mind but keep awake to the whole process of the mind, the various levels of consciousness; not just live on a certain level, the level which I choose, the level on which I have said 'This is the perfect state, and in that state I am going to live'? Is it not possible during the day to be aware of the total process of the mind, not just one segment? That process is understood more significantly in sleep; and so again, the waking consciousness becomes much more vital.

So, what is important is not what happens during sleep, and the interpretation of dreams with all its complications, but, to be awake to the whole process of the mind, of consciousness, during the day, so that at night sleep becomes a deeper, a further understanding of what is going on. For, in that sleep, there are a great many hints, suggestions that the conscious mind cannot possibly think of.

But as long as there is an interpreter, the translator, the censor, the one that judges or condemns, the total process of consciousness is not understood. There can be no entity that is looking at the consciousness and translating the hints. The total process cannot be

understood by the part, by the entity that is observing, that is translating. That is why a silent mind is necessary, a mind that no longer condemns, judges. Then the whole process of consciousness reveals itself through every action, through every word. Therefore the waking consciousness and the sleeping are both important; because then the greater depths of consciousness are revealed.

Question: My son is dead. How am I to meet that sorrow?

Krishnamurti: Actually, how do we meet sorrow? Do we ever meet it? We do not know what sorrow, is; we are forever running away from it. That is all we know. If I know how to meet it, how to meet the fact, then the fact will do something to me. I cannot do anything about the fact; but I want to do something about it. So my very desire to translate, to interpret the fact, helps me to run away from it.

Look, and see what actually happens. My son is dead; and I am in sorrow. So my mind, in pain, in anxiety, in fear wants some consolation. The natural response, not the cultivated response, is, 'I want comfort for that pain, for that fear, for that loneliness'. So I turn to something - to a belief, to a seance, to mediums, to reincarnation, or rationalization of the fact of death - hoping to find some assurance. So, the mind is everlastingly active about the fact. The fact is: my son is dead. And I cannot face it. So the mind begins to invent, symbolize, find assurance, hope, in something. So the mind is never meeting sorrow-

When you say 'How am I to meet sorrow?', what you are concerned with is not 'meeting sorrow', but 'how to deal with sorrow', what you should do about sorrow; with what attitude, value, you should look upon it'. So, you are really concerned, not

with meeting sorrow but how to have the self-protective attitude with which to meet it. After all, when I have a belief in reincarnation, that I'm going to meet my son next life, I do not meet sorrow. Or, if I resort to a seance, of course I do not meet my sorrow. Or, if I try to forget it by becoming active socially, in dozens of ways, I still avoid sorrow. And that is what we are actually doing.

If I want to meet sorrow, my mind must not escape from the fact - which does not mean that I accept the fact. The fact is a fact; I don't have to accept it, it is so. If I cultivate the attitude of acceptance, then I again prevent myself from meeting the fact. So, the mind is everlastingly finding ways, devices, not to meet the fact. And yet sorrow can only be understood when I meet it. And it is only possible to meet it when the mind is really still, not interpreting, not accepting, not trying to find the reasons, the explanations, not indulging in theories, speculations.

When the mind is completely still, not because it wants to understand the fact but because it knows its own process then only can I meet the extraordinary experience of death, that unknowingness, that sense of not knowing what death is, despite the innumerable books that have been written about it. Only when the mind is quiet, completely still, can I understand the fact which is: there is sorrow and there is no explanation. Surely, in such a state of mind, when it is completely silent before the fact of death, something extraordinary happens. This is not a promise. So do not cultivate quietness of the mind. But when the mind is not seeking any solution, has no beliefs, has no hope, is completely silent, then only can it meet sorrow. And in that state, sorrow ceases to be.

March 31, 1953.

LONDON 3RD PUBLIC TALK 1ST APRIL 1953

If we can find out what are the factors of deterioration, then perhaps we shall be able to set aside mediocrity, and come to a realization or to a feeling of what it is to be creative. Is not one of our problems, perhaps the major one, that we are constantly living in the shadow of death, in the shadow of deterioration, decay? The circumstances, the various compulsions of life about us, make us mediocre, closed in, ineffective, and there is soon deterioration, not only physical but the much more important, psychological deterioration. Perhaps if we can find out what it is that we are seeking, what it is that we are searching after, that we want, then we may be able to solve this problem of mediocrity and decay. Why is it that most of us are so utterly, inwardly empty, miserable, always seeking, running after things, trying to find out, longing for something which we never seem able to get? Is that not one of our problems? If we can really try to find out what it is that we are seeking, perhaps we shall be able to answer or to go beyond this psychological decay, the mediocrity of the mind.

We can see, most of us, that at one level we are seeking comfort, physical well-being - to be comfortable, to have money, to have love, to have things, to enjoy things, to travel, to be able to do certain things. All these we want, at the superficial level. And if we go a little bit deeper, at another level, we want happiness, we want freedom, we want to have the capacity to do things grandly, greatly, magnificently. And if we go still deeper, we want to find out what there is beyond death, and what is love, to work for an ideal, for a perfect State. And if we go deeper still, there is the

desire to find out what is reality, what is God, what is this thing that is so creative, that is always new. And we are caught between these many layers, are we not? We would like to have all of them. We want to live in perfect relationship, we want to work collectively, to have the right vocation, and so on. We are constantly seeking something, even though we may not be fully aware of it. Perhaps we have never inquired into the matter. We just drift along, pushed by circumstances, till death comes, and there is the end of things, or, perhaps the beginning of a new torture.

So, we have never really sat down and looked into ourselves to find out what it is that we are searching after. I think if we can find that out, not merely at the superficial level, but fundamentally deeply what it is we want, then I think we shall be able to solve this question of mediocrity and decay. Because, most of us are mediocre. We have nothing alive, nothing new, nothing creative in us. Anything that we create is so empty, so tawdry, with such little significance. So, should we not find out what it is that we want?

If we really examine it, go into it, we find we want something permanent, don't we?, permanent love, a state of permanent peace, a joy that can never vanish, that can never fade the realization of some beauty, a perfection. We want, do we not?, a state in which there is joy and permanency. That is what most of us are searching for, to find a permanent state, something that cannot be destroyed by the mind, by any circumstances, by any physical disease, something that is beyond the mind, a joy that does not depend on the body, a creativeness that is independent of the withering effect of the mind. Surely that is what most of us want, do we not?

Perhaps not when we are young; but as we grow old, more thoughtful, more mature, we want something permanent. That is what most of us are seeking, are we not? Put it in any other words you like, but that is the direction of our striving.

Now, is there anything permanent? Though I want it, though in my longing, in my search, in my struggle I am constantly seeking that state which can never be destroyed, a state which is beyond the mind, is there really anything permanent, which the mind can have? Most of us want a permanent relationship of love, a permanent experience which is timeless, a thing that can never be destroyed. That is what most of us want, if we go beyond the superficial, immediate demands. But is not this demand for the permanency of experience, of knowledge, for the continuity of a certain state, is that not one of the main factors of deterioration? Because, is there anything permanent? Yet the mind is forever pursuing and seeking out a state which will be forever the same. If I have an experience which gives me joy, I want that state to continue for ever; I do not want to be disturbed from it. So the mind clings to that experience.

So, if I want to find out, must I not inquire if there is anything permanent at all? Surely, to find out if there is something which is beyond the mind, must I not put aside in myself any demand for the continued state? Because, after all, to find creativity - not the mere writing of a poem or the painting of a picture, but creativity which is of no time, which is not the invention of the mind, not a mere capacity or gift, but that creativity which is ever renewing itself - must not the mind be capable of being enthusiastic and persistent in its inquiry? Most of us, as we grow older, lose our

enthusiasm which is not the superficial enthusiasm of certain actions; which is not the enthusiasm that one has when one is searching with an end in view, when one is going to be rewarded; but which is that enthusiasm which is not dependent on the body, that enthusiasm which is constantly probing, inquiring, searching out, never satisfied.

Now, to be free to inquire, must there not be virtue? Because, the virtue that gives freedom is not the virtue that is pursued, caught, and cultivated, for that only creates respectability, which is the sign of mediocrity. But without the cultivation of virtue, to be virtuous is essential, is it not?, if one would find out what is true, without any illusion. So I want to find out if there is something beyond the mind, something which is permanent. And to find out, there must be freedom to inquire, that extraordinary vitality of the mind which is not dependent on the physical state. To inquire, there must be freedom; and virtue gives freedom, but not the virtue that one cultivates, which is merely a bondage.

So to inquire, to find out, must there not be that innocence which is not contaminated by experience? Because if experience is used as a guide to inquiry, then experience conditions thought, does it not? Whatever experience I have conditions all further experience. All knowledge conditions further knowledge, does it not?, because my experience interprets every reaction. All experiences are translated by past experience. So, experience is never liberating; it is always conditioning. So can the mind be innocent, free of knowledge, free of memory, free of experience? Because, after all, that is innocence, is it not? The mind that is burdened with knowledge, with experience, with memory, such a

mind is not an innocent mind.

So, in order to find out if there is a permanent state must there not be that virtue, that enthusiasm, that innocence? Then only, it seems to me, can we go beyond the demands of the mind. Because, the mind, when it inquires, can never find that which is true. The mind can only project from its past experiences; and what it finds will be the effects of its own conditioning, its own knowledge, its own experience.

So, can one find out what is creativity, or God, or whatever name you like to give to it? Because that is the one factor that makes all things new. Though I may be living with death, when there is that creativity death has quite a different significance.

That creativity frees the mind from all mediocrity, from all deterioration. And if that is the thing which I am seeking, I have to be very clear, have I not?, so as not to create any illusion, so as to free the mind to really discover - which means, surely, that the mind must be utterly still to find out. Because, creativity cannot be invited; it has to come to you, to the mind. God cannot be invited; it has to come. And it cannot come when the mind is not free. And freedom is not the outcome of a discipline.

So, our problem is really very complex. Unconsciously we are pursuing, we are demanding, we are longing for some permanent quality permanent state. And this desire for permanency, for security, brings about mediocrity, deterioration. Because that is what we want, do we not?, psychological security. And by devious means and ways we try to capture it. But if once we really understand that there is no such thing as psychological security, then there is no decay, is there?, because then there is no resting

place. There is decay only when there is something permanent, something continuous. But when there is a constant ending, constant dying, then there is a constant renewal which is not continuous.

Please, this is not something mystical. If you really listen to what I am saying, then you will experience something directly, which frees the mind from all this horror of trying to be secure in some corner. It is only when the mind is really free, that it is able to receive that which is creative.

Question: What, precisely, do you want to do, and are you really doing it? Do you just want to talk?

Krishnamurti: I am not turning the tables on you. But precisely, why are you here? Why do you listen? Why do you attend these meetings? I may perhaps answer why I talk; but it is much more important for you to find out, is it not?, why you are here. Because, if you are here merely to listen to another talk, to another lecture, to capture some mysterious something or other, surely that would be utterly a waste of time, would it not? But if you are here to find out, to actually discover for yourself, to actually experience, then it is very important to find out the relationship between you and me. If our relationship is of one who instructs you, and you who listen and follow, then you will never discover: you are merely followers. Then there is no creativity; in yourself there is no renewal. And if you are merely listening to find out a state, a feeling, which you can take home and keep, then obviously our relationship is not mutual.

But if in listening you are discovering yourself how your mind thinks, operates, functions - which is the whole problem of

existence - then as you discover it, understand it, your being here has value, has it not? If in listening there is an awakening, a revolution in the right sense of the word if there is a deep, inward, psychological revolution which brings about a wider, more significant understanding, then your being here has significance, has value.

And what is it that I am trying to do? Talking is only a means of communication, is it not? I want to tell you something, perhaps the way to find out what is reality - not the way as a system, but how to set about it. And if you can find this for yourself there will not be one speaker, there will be all of us talking, all of us expressing that reality in our lives wherever we are. That is what is important is it not? Because, one solitary voice has very little significance in a world of confusion, in a world of so much noise. But if each one of us is discovering reality, then there will be the more of us. Then perhaps we may be able to bring about a totally different world. That is why I am talking, and I hope that is why you are listening, so that each one of us is alive to himself, so that each one of us is creative, free to discover what truth is, what reality, what God is, not ultimately, but from moment to moment, without any sense of accumulation.

Truth cannot be accumulated. What is accumulated is always being destroyed; it withers away. Truth can never wither, because it can only be found from moment to moment, in every thought, in every relationship, in every word, in every gesture, in a smile, in tears. And if you and I can find that, and live it - the very living is the finding of it - then we shall not become propagandists, we shall be creative human beings - not perfect human beings, but creative

human beings, which is vastly different. And that I think is why I am talking; and perhaps that is why you are here listening.

Question: How can I free myself from my conditioning?

Krishnamurti: As this is rather an important and complex question, let us patiently go into it. Because, perhaps by very careful delving into the problem we shall be able to free the mind from its conditioning, immediately.

Most of us are conditioned, are we not? We may be unaware of it, but we are conditioned: as Christians, as the English, as the French, as the Germans, as the Communists, as the Hindus, and so on; we are all conditioned. That is, I have certain beliefs, certain experiences, knowledge which is imposed upon me from childhood through education, through various forms of compulsion; and also my own experiences have conditioned me. Religiously you and I are conditioned; and also - politically, economically, in various ways, consciously or unconsciously, we are conditioned. Perhaps we are not aware of it. And when we do become aware of it, then what happens? I am aware that I have been conditioned as a Hindu, with certain beliefs. And being dissatisfied with those beliefs I turn to other forms of belief: I become a Christian, or a Buddhist, or a communist. So, my movement is always from what I am to something which I think is better. That is what is happening constantly, is it not? I am moving from what I am, hoping to break what I am, the conditioned state in which I live, by moving away from it to something better, to another conditioning. That is always so, is it not?

Please, this is not a question of argument, to be discussed and torn to pieces; but this is actually what is happening in our daily

life. We are moving from one conditioned state to another conditioned state which we think is better, wider, more significant, of greater value, more helpful, and so on. And when the questioner says 'Can I be free from conditioning?', does he mean entirely, totally free, or, is he inquiring for a better conditioning? Do I, as a Hindu, want to completely break down my conditioning totally, or, do I want to go to a better conditioning?

Please ask yourself this question. Because, on that depends the answer, the right answer, the truth of the matter. If I am aware of the conditioning, do I want to break down totally my conditioning, or, do I merely want to go to another, better, superior conditioning? If I merely want to go towards a better conditioning, then the problem is entirely different. There may be a better conditioning, or there may not be. It may be merely another illusion in which the mind is caught. But if I want to find out, break down the total conditioning, then my problem is entirely different. Because then, I am not concerned with moving towards something else. Then I am concerned with being aware of the total process of conditioning.

Now, if I am so aware, what is the thing that is conditioning me? What is it that conditions the mind? I am a Hindu. What is a Hindu? Certain traditions, beliefs, customs, and so on, which are all ideas, thoughts, are they not? You as a Christian are conditioned by certain other ideas, by certain other beliefs. So, one is conditioned by idea. As long as there is idea, there must be conditioning. As long as I believe as a Hindu, that belief conditions me. As long as you believe in certain forms of salvation, that idea conditions you. So conditioning takes place when there is idea.

And when you say 'I want to be free from conditioning', what is

your immediate response? Do you understand? That is, I say 'I must be free from conditioning'. The immediate response to that question is, 'How am I going to be free?', is it not? The 'how' becomes very important; the 'how' is the immediate reaction, is it not? If I am aware of my conditioning, and I see the importance of breaking it down, the immediate reaction after that is to ask myself 'How am I going to break it down?' So, the 'how' is again the idea. is it not? I am again caught in the idea of how to break it down. So the 'how' becomes the pattern of action, which conditions my mind. So as long as I am looking at my conditioning with the idea of how to break it down, the 'how' creates another pattern in which the mind is caught.

So, how do I look at my conditioning? With an idea? Or, am I breaking it down? I do not know if I am making it clear. Because, I think it is really important to find out whether we are dealing with idea or with actuality. Because after all, when I call myself a communist I have certain ideas; and if I want to break down those ideas, I do so by introducing another series of ideas, do I not? So I am always dealing with ideas. And ideas obviously are the conditioning factor.

So, as long as I am dealing with ideas, conditioning will go on. Because, my conditioned state is merely a set of ideas. And I can only break down that conditioning, not through further ideas, but by being free from the idea altogether. I believe, as a Christian, in a Saviour, that is an idea. And to be free from that conditioning, I cannot introduce another idea. Yet that is what the mind is always doing. I can only be free when the idea is not. So, the conditioned mind can never be free through ideas; because the ideas

themselves, thought and belief, condition the mind. It is only when the mind is free from the creation of ideas, that there is immediate freedom from conditioning.

Question: In the past I have done harm. How can I now achieve peace of mind.

Krishnamurti: We all make mistakes, do we not? We all hurt people; we make grave mistakes. And it has left a mark, regret, repentance. And, how is one to be free from the mistake that one has made? Will repentance dissolve the mistake? It is done. My repenting over it, will repentance dissolve the mistake? It is done. My repenting over it, will that wipe it away? My calling it a sin, will that wipe it away? Or, confessing it to you, will that wipe it away? What will free my mind, my being, my consciousness, from the error, from a grave mistake that I have made?

Surely this is our problem, is it not? Because, the moment we say 'we must never make a mistake', then we are working for an ideal - the perfect man - which is again an idea which will condition the mind. We do make mistakes; that is a fact. So, how are we to deal with a mistake that we have made, a grave error?

Now, what does the mind do with regard to that error? How does the mind respond? I know I have made a mistake; I have hurt somebody. What am I to do? I can go and apologize, but the fact remains: I have done harm. Now, how does the mind respond to that? What is its next action? It wants to put it right, does it not? It has already put it right in the sense that it goes to the person and apologizes for whatever it has done, and so on; that is the ordinary thing to do. But the mistake, the hurt, is still there. So, is it not important for me to find out how my mind reacts to that mistake

which I have made? Is it not occupied with that mistake, building it up, enlarging it, being concerned with it everlastingly, dreaming about it, condemning itself? That is what most of us do, do we not? So, the very occupation of the mind with a mistake that has already been made, becomes another mistake. From that there arises the idea of forgiveness, repentance, and so on - the continual occupation of the mind with an error. It is done; you have tried to correct it; but the occupation of the mind with the mistake is another form of the mind trying to correct it, without any effect. So, as long as I am concerned with the mistake, with the error, with the hurt, and my mind is occupied with it, it becomes a fixation, does it not?, it becomes another barrier. The fact is: I have made a mistake; all that I am now concerned with is to see why the mind not only occupies itself with the mistake, with the error, but why the mind is frightened of ever making a mistake. Because, as long as I live and you live, we are hurting each other in some way or other. Though I don't want to hurt you and you don't want to hurt me, we are hurting each other in most subtle ways. And, what am I to do? Am I to withdraw completely into isolation? The very existence of me, the very breath of me, destroys; I am exploiting somebody and somebody else is exploiting me. So, realizing that, shall I withdraw into isolation, and never move?

Whereas, if I know how to meet the errors, the mistakes, that I have made, then there is a freedom, is there not? Then I will know what to do. So I do not say to myself that the perfect entity will never make a mistake. But, after making the mistake, can I not acknowledge it and then let it go by, and not be occupied with it? Because, that gives a freedom to the mind, to be conscious that one

has made a mistake and to acknowledge it, to do what has to be done about it, and then to let it go by, and not be occupied with it.

That requires a great deal of understanding, a great deal of subtle freedom. To know that one is capable of making a mistake, and not have a standard according to which one is living, that way the mind is set free, to make perhaps more mistakes. But, to know how to deal with the mistake is what is so very important. The important thing is to acknowledge it and leave it alone, not to worry, not to be occupied with it.

Question: Is there any possibility of the individual becoming perfect and so creating a perfect world?

Krishnamurti: Can the individual, you and I, become perfect, and so create a perfect world? Again, we are dealing with ideas, are we not? The perfect man is the ideal man, the man which the mind has conceived as being perfect. Mind has conceived and projected that pattern, and I live according to that. The mind projects the idea of the perfect state, and tries to bring this perfect state about. That is, we are concerned only with the mind when we say 'Can man be perfect?' And when you say 'We want to create a perfect State', it is still again within the field of the mind.

So, when perfection, reform, is within the field of the mind, then, to produce the perfect State, there is cruelty; then there is liquidation, concentration camps, tyranny; you know the whole business of it. So long as we consider that man can be made perfect, then brutality is endless. The mind then is only dealing with ideas; and idea has no relationship with reality.

But, can the mind discover what is real, not the idea of what is real? Can the mind allow reality to come into being? If it does, then

the relationship of man to man, of man to society, is entirely different. After all, if I want to create a perfect State, then I not only compel myself to live according to a certain pattern of thought, but I also compel others to live according to that ideal pattern. The perfect man is never a free man. It is the most materialistic form of achievement, it is not spiritual at all - the idea that man should become perfect.

But, man can find what is true, what is the real, what is God. And then, reality can operate. Then that reality will produce quite a different state from the perfect state which the mind can think of. So, we must first seek reality, not how to make ourselves perfect or to make society perfect.

So, can the mind which is conditioned, which is perpetually seeking perfection as a security, can such a mind free itself from the idea of perfection, and seek reality? Because, we do not know what reality is. Mind can only deal with ideas; it cannot deal with a fact. It can translate the fact, it can interpret the fact, but the mind is not the fact. So, as long as I am seeking perfection I am not seeking God, truth. And if I am seeking a perfect State, then I inevitably create a society in which compulsion, every form of coercion, discipline, tyranny, becomes essential. But if I am seeking reality, seeking the unknown, the unknowable, then there is a possibility of creating a different world.

But to find the unknown, mind must be extraordinarily quiet; it cannot be projecting ideas. Because, the very idea controls the mind, conditions the mind. A conditioned mind is free from idea that there is a possibility for it to receive that which is creative.

April 1, 1953

LONDON 4TH PUBLIC TALK 7TH APRIL 1953

I think if one can understand the power that creates superstition, then there is a possibility of understanding what is true religion. But without understanding or going deeply into the matter of this problem of illusion, what it is that breeds illusion, without deeply and fully comprehending that, it is almost impossible to find what reality is. Most of us have got so many illusions, so many superstitions. We have not only the economic superstition of the perfect State, the illusion of creating a perfect man, but also the superstition of what reality is, or what God is. And is it possible to free the mind from creating, from breeding, throwing up, any kind of illusion, so that we can find out what truth is without any barrier, without any interpretation, see it simply and directly with a clear mind, a mind that does not have premeditated ideas, theories, speculations?

It seems to me it is very important, if we are at all earnest, to find out how this sense of illusion arises, this feeling that one is caught in a trap of one's own making. So perhaps we can really go into it and dissolve it, not bit by bit, slowly, gradually, but completely, because I do not think there is such a thing as the gradual dissolution of any particular idea, superstition, or desire; either one dissolves it completely, or not at all.

Is it possible to dissolve the power that creates illusion? Most of our religions throughout the world are ritualistic, dogmatic; they condition our thinking. We have been brought up in a particular pattern of thought or action, and our mind clings to it. And it seems almost impossible, being born in a particular pattern of philosophy,

organized thought, to free the mind from its symbols, from the words which we have learned since childhood.

To find out what is reality, surely mind must be extraordinarily free, without any symbol, without any re- action to a particular word, without projecting ideas or experiences that it has had, so that the mind is very clear, very simple and direct, without any illusion or the power to create illusion.

Now, what is it that makes for illusion? Is it not the desire, the wish, to seek comfort, to seek gratification, salvation, this desire for fundamental security, this deep demand for some kind of hope, for some escape from deep frustration? Does not the power to create illusion arise when the mind puts out a hand in supplication, in petition, wanting to know? Because, behind that desire there is the whole unconscious background of our conditioning, of the innumerable impulses, fears, anxieties, the conditionings of a particular race, of a particular philosophy. And with that background we demand a salvation, comfort, a hope. Because we cannot find in this world happiness, a sense of freedom, a complete fulfilment without any fear or frustration, so we turn to the other world. We know we cannot be perfect in this world; man cannot make himself perfect; because he, can only make himself perfect through his own mind, and mind can never make itself perfect. Mind can never be free from thought: and thought conditions the mind. So we look to various forms of salvation, trying to find out what is reality, what God, what is happiness what is immortality, something beyond and above the transient. So the mind already, in its demands, through its desire, is creating further illusion. Can such a mind, which is wanting desiring to find, discover what is the

real? I think it is very important to enter into this matter. Because as long as we are seeking, without understanding the background we shall find what we seek, but it will be an illusion.

So, can I free myself from my background without going through the process of analysis? Because I can see that by analyzing the background I have not resolved it. I can strip, I can explain, I can see the various implications involved in it; but I am not free of it, the mind is still unconsciously held by it. Because, there is still the analyzer observing, and therefore the analyzer always translating what he observes, according to his conditioning.

So, can I be entirely free from the background, not in some distant future but now, so as to be able to stop creating any form of desire for truth, for happiness, for some unknown thing? Because, desire is the root cause, is it not?, of this creating of illusions to which the mind clings. And can I be free from psychological desire, not through any compulsion, not through any discipline, resistance, but by seeing the significance of this feeling, of this demand for more and more and more? I want more knowledge, more virtue, more freedom, more happiness; I want to understand more. Surely it is the demand for the 'more' that creates the illusion - which does not mean I must be content with what I have. If I am content with what I have, that is also another form of illusion, because I can never be content with what I am, with what I have accumulated.

So, can the mind free itself from this demand for the 'more'? This means really: can the mind recognize 'what is', without trying to alter, without trying to transform 'what is' into 'something that should be'? Can one psychologically, deeply, inwardly, understand

this thing, that the demand for the `more' creates the illusion? Because, mind then invents the process of time: `ultimately, through perfection, through perfecting the mind, by cultivating virtue, I will attain that happiness'. So the mind is everlastingly struggling, experiencing gathering, in order to be free, in order to recognize what is true.

So, can I completely strip myself of this desire for more, completely put it away from myself? I think one can, if one understands the whole implication, if one really listens to the inward nature of it, the unconscious urges of the moment. I think then there is a possibility of breaking down the power that creates illusion. After all, that is what we all want. We want more and more comfort, more and more happiness, more and more assurance, certainty. And being caught in that, the mind creates the pattern of action which will give the `more'.

Surely we have had enough explanations, descriptions. And if we are at all serious, if we really, earnestly are intending to find out what is true, surely we have put aside all explanations, words, and we are concerned directly with trying to find out. But our mind is incapable of finding out so long as we want more.

So it seems to me that the important thing is for the mind to be in a state when it can allow itself not to ask, not to demand - which does not mean acquiescence, acceptance, but that the mind is really silent. The mind being thought - thought as the verbalization of certain experiences, thought as memory, thought that is seeking, investigating - cannot such thinking come to an end, so that the mind is no longer projecting, is really still? For then only is it possible for the mind to be free from all illusion. Then only shall

we find out what is reality - not the description of reality, not the explanations, not the speculations, not the reality of someone else who has experienced it; those things are utterly valueless, they have no meaning. But when the mind is really in that state when thought as we know it has come to an end - thought which is always strengthening the background of the conditioned mind - then we shall find out what that nameless thing is.

But it is very difficult for the mind to be quiet, for it not to project, seek, try to find out. That stillness can only come, not through any form of well-thought-out pattern of action, but when we understand this whole problem of the power of the mind to create anything it desires - the Master, the Saviour, the various forms of innumerable superstitions in which we are caught. So, can the mind, my mind and your mind, not through any sense of compulsion, come to that extraordinary stillness, that peace of mind, which is not of its own creation? It is only possible when I understand the necessity of it, when having wandered through all this labyrinth of illusions I have finished with it. Then only is there a possibility of reality coming into being.

Question: Looking at my fellow creatures in bus or tube I find everyone, myself included, mediocre and commonplace. How can I tolerate this ugliness of everyday life?

Krishnamurti: We ourselves are mediocre; we ourselves are ugly. We do not have to look at our neighbours, we do not have to look at the woman or the man sitting across in the other seat in the tube or the bus. We have lost all vitality, all zest, all true appreciation of beauty. Our life is a routine, a boredom, a thing really that has no great significance. So being ourselves ugly,

mediocre, what is our reaction? When I recognize that I am ugly, mediocre, that my whole life has very little significance, being merely the routine that I have to carry on with, on recognizing that, what is my immediate reaction? I condemn it, do I not? I condemn mediocrity; I want to be more beautiful, I want to have a different quality, I want to have joy, a sense of freedom. So I cling to beauty, do I not? I want to have beauty. So I cultivate beauty and condemn the mediocre, the ugly. That is our normal reaction, is it not?

And when I condemn, have I understood, have I changed in any way, has there been some new thing taking place? All that I am concerned with is the cultivation of beauty.. I want that; I want to be sensitive to beauty, and I want to put away the ugly. But the putting away of the ugly, and holding on to beauty, makes me insensitive, does it not? Please see this. When I deny the ugly, condemn it, try to put it away from me, am I not becoming less sensitive to beauty? It is like cutting away my own arm which is ugly, and trying to cultivate beauty in other directions.

Is it not important to be totally sensitive, not merely sensitive to one thing? And does sensitivity arise through condemnation of that which I think is ugly? If I condemn envy, saying it is ugly, am I sensitive to that state in which there is envy? Have I not to be totally sensitive both to envy and to that state which is not envious? So, the important thing is sensitivity, is it not?, not how to be more beautiful or more virtuous, not how to avoid the ugly, the everyday hideousness of life, but to be sensitive to both. I cannot be sensitive if I condemn and hold on to one particular thought, idea or picture which I think is beautiful. If I see all that, then I do not, condemn, I

do not say 'It is ugly, mediocre'. Then I see that the very word has a neurological significance; it acts upon me, as the word 'beauty' acts upon me.

So it is important, is it not?, to be sensitive both to the ugly and to the beautiful. Then there is a possibility of observation, of looking across at the ugly without condemning it. And out of that sensitivity, something new may arise, a quality of love. But love is not something to be cultivated; it comes only if we can understand this whole background of our condemnation. Every society, every religion, every culture, condemns: we are brought up to condemn, to judge, to weigh, to say 'this is right, this is wrong' - not that there is not right and wrong. Our instinctual response is to condemn, which is a form of resistance; and through resistance there can be no sensitivity either to beauty or to ugliness.

But if we do not condemn, perhaps there may be a new breath, a new vitality, a feeling of love which will transform, which will give a different outlook to our ugly daily life.

Question: I feel very lonely, and long for some intimate human relationship. Since I can find no such companion, what am I to do?

Krishnamurti: One of our difficulties is, surely, that we want to be happy through something, through a person, through a symbol, through an idea, through virtue, through action, through companionship. We think happiness, or reality, or what you like to call it, can be found through something. Therefore we feel that through action, through companionship, through certain ideas, we will find happiness.

So being lonely, I want to find someone or some idea, through which I can be happy. But loneliness always remains; it is ever

there, under cover. But as it frightens me, and as I do not know what the inward nature of this loneliness is, therefore I want to find something to which to cling. So I think that through something, through a person, I will be happy. So, our mind is always concerned with finding something. Through furniture, through a house, through books, through people, through ideas, through rituals, through symbols, we hope to get something, to find happiness. And so the things, the people, the ideas, become extraordinarily important; because through them we hope we shall find. So we begin to be dependent on them.

But with it all there is still this thing, not understood, not resolved; the anxiety, the fear, is still there. And even when I see that it is still there, then I want to use it, to go through, to find what is beyond. So my mind uses everything as a means to go beyond, and so makes everything trivial. If I use you for my fulfillment for my happiness, you become very unimportant, because it is my happiness I am concerned with. So, when the mind is concerned with the idea that it can have happiness through somebody, through a thing or through an idea, do I not make all these means transitory? Because, my concern is then something else, to go further, to catch something beyond.

So, is it not very important that I should understand this loneliness, this ache, this pain of extraordinary emptiness? Because if I understand that, perhaps I shall not use anything to find happiness, I shall not use God as a means to acquire peace, or a ritual in order to have more sensations, exaltations, inspirations. The thing which is eating my heart out is this sense of fear, my loneliness, my emptiness. Can I understand that? Can I resolve

that? Most of us are lonely, are we not? Do what we will, radio, books, politics, religion, none of these can really cover that loneliness. I may be socially active, I may identify myself with certain organized philosophies; but whatever I do it is still there, deep down in my unconscious, or in the deeper depths of my being.

So, how am I to deal with it? How am I to bring it out and completely resolve it? Again, my whole tendency is to condemn, is it not? The thing which I do not know, I am afraid of; and the fear is the outcome of condemnation. After all, I do not know the quality of loneliness, what it actually is. But my mind has judged it by saying it is fearful. It has opinions about the fact; it has ideas about loneliness. And it is these ideas, opinions, that create the fear and prevent me from really looking at that loneliness.

I hope I am making myself clear? I am lonely; and I am afraid of it. What causes the fear? Is it not because I do not know the implications involved in loneliness? If I knew the content of loneliness, then I would not be afraid of it. But because I have an idea of what it might be, I run away from it. The very running away creates the fear, not the looking at it. To look at it, to be with it, I cannot condemn. And when I am capable of facing it, then I am capable of loving it, of looking into it.

Then, is that loneliness of which I am afraid merely a word? Is it not actually a state which is essential, the door may be through which I shall find out? Because, that door may lead me further, so that the mind comprehends that state in which it must be alone, uncontaminated. Because all other processes away from that loneliness are deviations, escapes, distractions. If the mind can live with it, without condemning it, then perhaps through that the mind

will find that state which is alone, a mind that is not lonely but completely alone, not dependent, not seeking through something to find.

It is not necessary to be alone, to know that aloneness which is not induced by circumstances, that aloneness which is not isolation, that aloneness which is creativeness, when the mind is no longer seeking either happiness, virtue, or creating resistance. It is the mind which is alone that can find - not the mind which has been contaminated, made corrupt, by its own experiences. So perhaps loneliness, of which we are all aware, if we know how to look at it, may open the door to reality.

Question: I am dependent, primarily psychologically, on others. I want to be free from this dependence. Please show me the way to be free.

Krishnamurti: Psychologically, inwardly, we are dependent, are we not?, on rituals, on ideas, people, things, property. We are dependent. And, we want to be free from that dependence, because it gives us pain. As long as that dependence is satisfactory, as long as I find happiness in it, I do not want to be free. But when the dependence hurts me, when it gives pain, when the thing on which I have depended runs away from me dies, withers away, looks at somebody else, then I want to be free.

But do I want to be free totally from all psychological dependence, or only from those dependences which give me pain? Obviously, from those dependences and memories which give me pain. I do not want to be free totally from all dependences; I only want to be free from the particular dependence. So, I seek ways and means to free myself; and I ask others, someone else, to help

me to free myself from a particular dependence which causes pain. I do not want to be free from the total process of dependence.

And, can another help me to be free from dependence, the partial dependence or the total dependence? Can I show you the way - the way being the explanation, the word, the technique? By showing you the way, the technique, giving you an explanation, will you be free? You have still the problem, have you not; you have still the pain of it. No amount of my showing you how to deal with it, your discussing it with me, will free you from that dependence. So, what is one to do?

Please see the importance of this. You are asking for a method which will free you from a particular dependence or from total dependence. The method is an explanation, is it not?, which you are going to practice and live, in order to free yourself. So, the method becomes another dependence. In trying to free yourself from a particular dependence, you have introduced another form of dependence.

But if you are concerned with the total freedom from all psychological dependences, if you are really concerned with that, then you will not ask for a method, the way. Then you ask quite a different question, do you not? You ask if you can have the capacity to deal with it, the possibility of dealing with that dependence. So the question is: not how to free myself from a dependence, but can I have the capacity to deal with the whole problem? If I have the capacity, then I do not depend on anybody. It is only when I say I have not the capacity, that I ask 'please help me, show me a way.' But if I have the capacity to deal with a problem of dependence, then, I do not ask anyone to help me to

dissolve it.

I hope I am making myself clear. Because I think it is very important not to ask 'how?', but 'can I have the capacity to deal with the problem?' Because, if I know how to deal with it, then I am free of the problem. So, I am no longer asking for a method, the way. But, can I have the capacity to deal with the problem of dependence?

Now, psychologically, when you put that question to yourself, what happens? When you consciously put the question 'Can I have the capacity to free myself from that dependence?', what has psychologically happened? Are you not already free from that dependence? Psychologically you have depended; and now you say: 'Have I the capacity to free myself?' Obviously, the moment you put that question earnestly to yourself, there is already freedom from that dependence.

Please, I hope you are following not merely verbally, but actually experiencing what we are discussing. Because, that is the art of listening, is it not? Not to merely listen to my words, but to listen to what is actually taking place in your own mind.

When I know that I can have that capacity, then the problem ceases to be. But because I have not the capacity, I want to be shown. So I create the Master, the guru, the Saviour, someone who is going to save me, who is going to help me. So I become dependent on them. Whereas if I can have that capacity of resolving, understanding, the question, then it is very simple, then I am no longer dependent. This does not mean I am full of self-confidence. The confidence which comes into being through the self, the 'me', does not lead anywhere; because that confidence is

self-enclosing. But the very question 'Can I have the capacity to discover reality?' gives one an extraordinary insight and strength. The question is: not that I have capacity - I have not the capacity - but 'can I have it'? Then I shall know how to open the door which the mind is everlastingly closing, by its own doubts, by its own anxieties, fears, by its experiences, knowledge.

So when the whole process is seen, the capacity is there. But that capacity is not to be found through any particular pattern of action. I cannot comprehend the whole through the particular. Through a particular analysis of a special problem I shall not comprehend the whole. So, can I have the capacity to see the whole, not to understand one particular incident, one particular happening, but to see the whole total process of my life, with its sorrows, pains, joys, the everlasting search for comfort? If I can put that question in earnestness, then the capacity is there.

And with that capacity I can deal with all the problems that arise. There will always be problems, always incidents, reactions; that is life. Because I do not know how to deal with them, I go to others to find out, to ask for the way to deal with it. But when I put the question 'Can I have the capacity?', it is already the beginning of that confidence which is not the confidence of the 'me', of the self, not the confidence which comes into being through accumulation, but that confidence which is renewing itself constantly, not through any particular experience or any incident, but which comes through understanding, through freedom, so that the mind can find that which is real.

April 7, 1953.

LONDON 5TH PUBLIC TALK 8TH APRIL 1953

I would like this evening for us to consider a problem that may be rather difficult to go into; I want to talk over with you the problem of consciousness. Because, without understanding the function of the mind, what the mind is, however much one may earnestly seek to transform oneself, to bring about a deep fundamental revolution in oneself, it seems to me that it will not be possible. It is obviously a very difficult subject. Because, each one of us has very definite opinions, unfortunately, on what the mind is or should be. We have, after reading a great many books, come to definite conclusions about what consciousness is. But perhaps if we can put aside our particular knowledge, the things that we have learned, the things that we have experienced, if that is possible, and examine it anew, then we may find out how to bring about this fundamental transformation and not merely a superficial change.

So, what is the function of the mind? Can the mind bring about an entire change, transform itself? And, the 'I' the 'me', the ego, is that different from the mind? At whatever level one may place the 'I', the ego, the 'me', and however much it may struggle to bring about a transformation within itself, is that not still within the field of the mind, of consciousness? And can there be a transformation - not permanent in the sense of continuity, but a complete revolution within itself - without any cause, without any motive, without any desire to seek a result?

I think if one can go rather hesitantly into this question of what is consciousness, and what the function of the mind is, then we may be able to discover what is wisdom.

So, what is consciousness? What is the thing that is functioning all the time that chooses that struggles that creates ideals images symbols that allows itself to be conditioned, and demands to uncondition itself, that feels pain, and avoids any pursuit that might entail fear? What is this thing that is constantly seeking permanency, comfort, security, and what it calls God? What is this total thing - not just the superficial part, that shrinks through fear, or enlarges through pleasure? What is this 'me' - the 'me' that is constantly endeavouring to become better, the 'me' that allows itself to be disciplined in order to achieve a result, the thing that is driven by ambition, that is always seeking to overcome any barrier and so always being afraid of frustration - and where is its centre? Is not all this what we call consciousness - not only the consciousness that is functioning daily, but also the consciousness that is hidden, the consciousness of the race, in which all the traditions of the past are embedded? The things that one has learned, the things that one has acquired, the experiences, the prejudices, and so on, and also, the 'me' that tries to go beyond the limitations, the conditionings, is not all that our consciousness?

And is not the unconscious a part of the whole of mankind? Is not my unconscious the totality of the thought of India, as yours is of another race, another clime?

Is not all this, the total process, what we call consciousness? Is not that the mind - the mind being the result of time, of cultivation, the 'me' that is always being put together through contact, sensation, desire, and the accumulation of experience through that desire? And, when we talk of experience, is it not memory, the word, the symbol, the idea? So, as we - plain people, not very

highly theological or erudite people - know it, that is our mind, is it not? That is our consciousness - desire, experience, memory, and knowledge - and within that sphere we function.

Will the consciousness of the 'me' bring about wisdom? Will knowledge bring about wisdom - not the wisdom of books, not the wisdom that one learns through going to a school of wisdom?

So, what I want to find out is, can the mind which is the product of time, which has been put together through experience, through memory, through symbols, which is constantly aspiring, despairing, hoping, feeling itself frustrated, in bondage, in pain, in misery, which is ever choosing, and in its very choice being caught by the bigger choice, the better choice, can that mind discover what is wisdom, what is truth, what is God? And if the mind experiences reality, is not that mind of the nature of reality, at the time when it experiences reality?

You follow what I mean? I see that my mind is the result of time. That is fairly obvious, we need not go into that in too great detail. It has been put together through generations of experience. I am the result of all the thought, the struggles, the pain, the superstitions of the world; my mind is that. And yet, this mind is seeking some reality which obviously must be out of time, which cannot be gathered, accumulated, stored up to be used. And, yet, the mind being the only instrument with which we can feel, experience, surely in the moment of experiencing reality, the mind is of the quality of truth, the quality of timelessness?

So, how does this transformation take place? And can the 'I', the 'me', which is the result of time bring about the change within itself, a transformation within itself? Because, that is our problem,

is it not? I want to change; I want to bring about in myself a transformation. Because, my life is very dull; I am unhappy, I am conditioned; it is a constant struggle, with the pleasures and joys and depressions that make up the 'me'. And in that consciousness, at the centre, there must be a revolution. I do not want to change just on the outward periphery, because that has no meaning. If I am at all serious and in earnest, I want a transformation at the centre, a transformation which is not merely of time, of convenience, of varying moods, or even of necessity. And I have no other means than the mind. I cannot put aside my mind, because I am the mind. The things which I think, the things which I feel, the aspirations, the longings, the fears, the loves and the hates, the inevitable death and the unknown, all that is me. And at the centre of that self, consciousness there must be a revolution.

And how is that possible? Will the unconscious, which is the result also of time, will that bring about any revolution? Will the unconscious aid, help the conscious mind to stop accumulating, so that at the centre there is complete abnegation? I think this is very important. Even though I may put it clumsily, use words that have a different meaning to each one of us, that is the fundamental question, is it not? Because, every attempt leads to dreariness, leads to routine, to degeneration, to slow withering away. There are moments of supreme happiness, ecstasy; and then, a few days later, everything has faded away.

So, seeing all this extraordinary complexity, is it not necessary to inquire whether it is possible to come to that revolution, to that inner transformation, without the interference of the mind? Can the mind change itself? Can the mind transform itself? I know there

are moments when it perceives reality, unbidden, unasked. At that moment the mind is the real. When the `I' is no longer struggling, consciously or unconsciously, no longer trying to become something, when the `I' is totally unaware of itself, at that moment, that state of worship, that state of reality is there. And so, the mind at that moment is the real, is God.

So, the problem is, can the mind, which is the result of time, the mind which is the self, the `me', however much it may like to divide itself into the higher self and the lower self, as the observer and the observed, can that `me' whose whole consciousness is the result of accumulation of experience, of memory, of knowledge, can that `me' come to an end, without desiring, without hoping for the `me' to be dissolved? Because, I have only one instrument, which is the mind, the mind which evaluates, judges, condemns. And can such a mind which is of time, which is not of truth - the mind knows knowledge, but knowledge is not truth - suddenly cease, so that the other mind, the other state of being, the mind which experiences reality can be and therefore the mind itself is the real.

By asking, by inquiring seriously, I think, one finds the answer. Can the mind, which is the only instrument we have, can the self cease to be, cease to accumulate? Can the mind which has accumulated knowledge, experience, memory, completely free itself? Can it allow itself to watch the memories, the experiences, knowledge, go by, and itself remain on the bank of the stream, as it were, without attaching itself to any particular memory, to any particular experience, and so, be free and remain anchored in its freedom?

Because we cannot put aside our knowledge, or experiences, or the memories, they are there. But we can watch them go by, without clinging to any one of them, either the pleasurable or the painful. This is not a thing to be practiced. Because, the moment you practice, you are accumulating; and where there is accumulation there is the strengthening of the `me'. The `me' of time, the `me' that pursues virtue and cultivates virtue, is accumulating. Reality has nothing to do with acquired virtue. But yet, there must be the virtue of the non-accumulative state. The man who is observing his experiences, his memories, his knowledge, watching them go by, he does not require virtue; he is not gathering. And when the mind is no longer accumulating when the mind is awakened to the whole process of consciousness with all its memories, the unconscious motives, the impulses of generations, of centuries, and can let it pass by, then is not the mind out of time? Then is not the mind, though aware of the experiences, not holding on to them at all, no longer caught in the net of time?

Because, what makes for time is the occupation with memory, the capacity to distinguish different forms of memory. And is it possible for the mind to remain out of time, out of knowledge which is memory, which is experience, which is the word, the symbol? Can it be free from that, and so be out of time? Then is there not a fundamental revolution or transformation at the centre? Because, then the mind is no longer struggling to achieve, to accumulate, to arrive. Then there is no fear. Then the mind in itself is the unknown; the mind in itself is the new, the uncontaminated. Therefore it is the real, the incorruptible, which is not of time.

Question: I find I am deeply afraid to give up certain habits which give me pleasure; and yet I feel I must give them up, as their hold on me is too great. What can I do?

Krishnamurti: Can habits be broken, without creating another habit? My problem is, surely, not that I want to give up one particular habit which is painful or cling to a habit which is pleasurable, but, can I be free from all the habit-forming mechanism? Can I be free from the whole pattern of action, not only from the particular but from the whole pattern-making thought? That is, can I break down, be free from the thought, the pattern, which has been made, created for centuries, without creating another pattern? That is what most of us indulge in: we break one pattern, and go and join, create, or make on another pattern. If I am a Hindu, I break it and become a Communist; but it is still a pattern of thought, an organized philosophy. Or, if I am a Communist, I break that and become a Catholic. So, I go from one pattern to another; that is my life. I am always seeking better patterns of action, better patterns of thought, a better framework of reference. I revolt against one pattern and take on another.

So, the problem is: can I, can the mind, break from all patterns? Can it be in revolt, not merely against any one particular pattern, but be essentially in revolt? When we are in revolt, we are against something, are we not? As a traditional Christian, I may be in revolt against communism; or the Communist may be in revolt against capitalism. We are always in revolt against something, are we not? The very revolt against something creates the pattern. When I, as a Hindu, am against Christianity or communism, does it not create yet another pattern of action? So, can I be in revolt, not

against something, but be in essence in a state of revolution?

That is the problem, is it not?, how to be in oneself in revolt, and not how to break down one pleasurable habit, one particular pattern of action, or how to find a better framework, another reference of ideas - because, we go through that process everlastingly, there is no end to it. But if I am concerned with breaking down the whole pattern-forming mind, must I not be in revolt, not against something, but be in myself in revolt? The pattern comes to an end, surely, only when I am not in opposition to something.

What is happening when I am in opposition, when I am against something, when one idea is opposed by another idea? If I, as a Hindu, am against Christianity, my idea opposes your idea. And it is this idea that creates the pattern, even though it may be a so-called new idea. So, if I would be free from all patterns, there must be revolt without a motive, a revolt without the new idea. Such a revolt is surely creative, that state is creativeness; it is the pure thing, unadulterated, uncorrupted; because there is no hope even; it is not against anything; it is not caught in any particular pattern.

But that transformation is only possible when the mind understands the whole structure of the pattern, the whole process of idea opposing idea, belief opposing belief, one experience contradicting another experience. So long as the mind is caught in its own experience, in its own knowledge, it can never free itself; there must ever be the pattern. The mind can see, surely, how the patterns are made. The formation of idea to which the mind clings, the adherence to a belief, to a habit, to a pleasure, all these create the form, the framework, in which the mind is held. So, can the

mind be free from idea?

Thought is the creator of the pattern; thought is always conditioned; there is no freedom in thought; because what I think is the result of my background, and all thinking is the reaction to the background. So, the question is: not 'how to be free of a particular pattern or habit of thought', but 'whether the mind can be free from creating ideas, from clinging to belief, from holding on to experience, to knowledge, to memory.' Then only is there a possibility of breaking the pattern, of being completely free of all pattern.

Question: Christians, including Roman Catholics, promise heaven. What do you offer?

Krishnamurti: Why are you seeking heaven? Why are you wanting something? Why do you say, 'others give me something; what have you to offer?' If you are promised something because you are stretching out your hand, begging, is what you get the truth?

What is heaven, and what is hell? What is the heaven that religions offer? Security, in some form or another, is it not? A hope, a reward, a better life, a greater happiness on the other side, salvation beyond death, and a secure place for each one of us hereafter. That is what we all want. And each religion promises the ultimate reward; so each religion has its own monopoly on heaven. This is what we want; and we create all these heavens and hells for ourselves. It is not merely that religions offer them; they are what we want. We want security, we want a permanent happiness, never to be in a state of unknowingness.

But, the unknown is reality. Heaven is a state of

unknowingness; and hell is the state of knowing. And we are caught between the knowing and the unknowing. And as all our life is a state of knowing, we are always afraid of that which is not known. God, the real, the Heaven, is the unknown. And we want a place in the unknown. So any religion, any State, any political party that promises us a place of security, we accept; and we become either Catholics, Communists, or join some other organized philosophy. So long as we are seeking a permanent place, a happiness that knows no variety, no change, a peace that shall never be disturbed, that is everlasting, we shall find, we shall organize philosophies, religions that will satisfy us.

So, as long as I am seeking permanency, I shall create dogmas, beliefs. And in those dogmas, beliefs, theories, I shall be caught. And that is all we want. Fundamentally, deeply, we never want to be in a state in which there is no 'knowing'. Even though the thing that I have known becomes the routine, the chore, the tiresome, the unknown is something of which I am afraid. And as I feel there is the unknown, I want a place in that. So I am in constant battle between the thing that I know, and the thing that I do not know. That is my hell. So, is it possible for the mind to put aside all its knowledge, all its experiences, memories, and be in that state of unknowing? That is the mystery, is it not?, not the mystery of superstition, dogmas, Saviours and Masters, but the mystery of the unknown. Cannot the mind itself become the unknown, be the unknown? That requires, does it not?, extraordinary freedom from the known. So the mind, with the burden of the known, tries to capture the unknown. And there is this constant battle between the past and something not knowable by the mind which is caught in

the past.

But when the mind is free from the past, the past of experience, of memory, of knowledge, then the mind is the unknown. To such a mind there is no death.

These are merely words, unless you experience it. Unless it is a direct revolution which the unknown brings, mere repetition of words will have little meaning. And, is it possible for plain people like us to come to this thing? The simpler and plainer we are, the nearer. The man of erudition, the man of vast experience, the man who is burdened with innumerable memories, can never come to it. But unfortunately the plain man, the ordinary man, is grasping to become 'the more', to become wiser, to acquire more knowledge. But if he remains simple, plain, not acquiring, then there is a possibility, is there not?, for the mind itself to become the unknown. Therefore the mind itself becomes the heaven, the unfathomable.

Question: The words "the thinker and the thought are one" seem incomprehensible to me, and arouse my resistance. Can you tell me why I find the idea so extremely difficult to understand?

Krishnamurti: Probably the idea is difficult because you are meeting idea with idea, because we have been conditioned from childhood to think that there are two different states, the thinker and the thought, the higher self and the lower self, the God and the non-God - the one trying to dominate, control, shape the other. That is what we are always taught, are we not? We are conditioned in that way, prejudiced, biased. We think these two states are separate. And so there is a constant battle between the thinker and the thought.

Please notice your own minds, your own thoughts, and you will see this is an ordinary, everyday fact: there is the thinker controlling, disciplining his thought, shaping it, making it more noble, more virtuous, more respectable, inhibited. That is what we are doing, is it not?

And, if you are at all awake, why do you ask the question whether the thinker is separate? Is there a thinker as an entity, a spiritual essence, or call it what you like, a higher self, apart from thought? Is there a thinker apart from the very quality of thinking? Obviously not. If I do not think, there is no thinker. So, thinking creates the thinker.

Please, you do not have to accept anything I say; just observe your own ways of thought.

And so, we are everlastingly in conflict, the conflict between the thinker and his thought. I want to concentrate, and my thoughts go off; I am jealous, and I must not be jealous; at one end of the scale I am very noble, at the other end I am ugly. So, there is this battle going on. And if one wants to transcend, to go beyond this battle, to be free from this everlasting struggle, must one not find out if the thinker is a reality, if there is a thinker apart from the thoughts? Thoughts are transient, aren't they; they change. And the mind, seeing this vast transient chain going on, naturally desires to establish a thinker which is not destructible. So, I, thought, have given myself a quality of imperishability. So there I have established, by thought, a thinker - the thinker that knows, the thinker that accumulates, the thinker that can choose, the thinker that can overcome all difficulties. But the thinker is part of the thought. There is only thinking.

Can the thinking process free itself from the struggle, from the constant battle of achievement, the constant desire for permanency? After all, thought is the result of the known; thought is the reaction of the known, of memory, of experience, of knowledge. You cannot think without words, without symbols, or without memory. And thought, in its struggle to become something greater, creates the ideal. And then there is the ideal and the actual; the `what should be' and the `what is'. And so there is a battle ever going on, a constant effort, constant struggle, to achieve, to become, to be better.

And yet one really wants to understand and be free from the struggle. Because, struggle, conflict, is uncreative; like all war, it is destructive. And if there is to be creativeness in the highest sense of that word, there cannot be conflict. And if I am serious in my desire to find out how to put an end to conflict, I must be clear about this question of the observer and the observed. As long as there is the observer, the thinker, the experiencer, apart from the experience, the observed, the thought, there must be conflict.

Seeing this whole process, how the mind invents the thinker, the separate entity, the ego, the higher self, the atman, is it not possible for the mind not to divide itself but only be concerned with thinking? Is it not possible for the mind to be free of ideation, of thought - thought being the memory, the background, from which there is the reaction through words, through expression, through symbols?

Surely, when the mind is free from struggle, from conflict, when the mind is still, when there is that stillness which is not induced by the background, by thought, then only is there the

cessation of all conflict. That stillness is not an idea, it is a fact. It is the unfathomable, the unknown. And then the mind is the real.

April 8, 1953.

LONDON 6TH PUBLIC TALK 9TH APRIL 1953

Again this evening I would like to talk over with you the question of renewal, of being reborn - not in an afterlife, a next life, but whether it is possible to bring about the complete regeneration of consciousness, a rebirth, not a continuity but a complete revolution. It seems to me that is one of the most important questions to go into and to consider: if it is possible for the mind which is the only instrument we have of perception, of understanding, of investigation of discovery, to be made completely new. And if we can discover it, if we do not merely listen to words but actually experience that state of renewal, of complete regeneration, something new, then it may be possible to live the ordinary life of everyday routine, of trials, fears, mistakes, and yet bring to these mistakes and fears a quite different significance, a different meaning. So it may be worthwhile this evening to talk over this question: whether there can be a complete transformation of the unconscious. In understanding that, we may be able to find out what is the true function of the mind.

Now as I talk, perhaps it would be worthwhile if you would not merely listen to the words, but actually experience the significance of the words by observing your own minds, not only following what I am saying but watching the operation of your own mind as it is functioning when you listen. Because, I think, if we can go into this question we may find the key to this creativeness, to this complete state in which the unknown, the unknowable, can come into being.

What we now know of life is a series of struggles, of

adjustments, of limitations, of continual compulsions; that is our life. And in that process there is no renewal, there is nothing new taking place. Occasionally there is a hint from the unconscious; but that hint is translated by the conscious mind and made to conform to the pattern of our everyday convenience. What we do know is struggle, a constant effort to achieve a result. And will strife, struggle, the conflict between the thesis and the antithesis, hoping to find a synthesis, will that struggle bring about this quality of something new original, clear, uncorrupt?

Our life is a routine, a wasting away, a death - the death of continuity, not the death that brings a new state. We know this; this is our life; conscious or unconscious. And it is possible for this mechanical mind, the mind that is the result of time, that is made up of experience, memory, and knowledge - which are all a form of continuity, the mechanism of the known - is it possible for such a mind completely to renew itself and become innocent, uncorrupted? Can the mind, my mind and your mind, which is caught in various habits, passions demands, urges, which is forever following a series of convenient pleasant habits, or struggling to break down habits that are not pleasant, can such a mind put aside its activities and be the unknown?

Because, it seems to me, that is one of the major problems of our existence: 'how to be able to die to everything of the past?' Can that take place? Can the mind die to all the past, the memory, the longings, the various conditionings, the fears, the respectabilities? If not, there is no hope, is there? Because then, all that we know is the continuity of the things that have been, which we are continually establishing in the mind, in consciousness. The mind is

constantly giving birth, through memory, through experience, through knowledge, to a state of continuity. That is all I know. I want to continue, either through property, through family, or through ideas; I want this continuity to go on. And can the mind which is seeking security, seeking permanency either in pleasure or in strife, or trying to go beyond its own fears and so establish a state of permanency, which is the reaction of its own desire for continuity, can such a mind come to an end?

Because, what continues can never renew, can never give birth to something new. And yet, deep down in all of us there is the desire to live, to continue, to be as we are, only modified, better, more noble having greater significance in life through our actions, our relationships. So, the function of the mind, as we know it, is to give birth to continuity, to bring about a state in which time plays a very extraordinarily important part as a means of becoming. And so we are constantly making an endeavour, struggling, striving to maintain this continuity. And that continuity is the `me', the `I', the ego. That is the function of our mind up to now; that is all we know.

Now, can such a mind which is so embedded in time, put an end to itself, and be in that state in which the unknown is? The mind is mechanical, because memory is mechanical, experience is mechanical, and knowledge, though it may be stimulating, is still mechanical, and the background of the mind is of time; can such a mind cease to think in terms of time, in terms of becoming in terms of the `me'? The `me' is the idea, the idea being memory, the experience, the struggle, the fears. Can that mind come to an end, without desiring to come to an end?

When the mind desires to arrive at an end, it can intellectually come to that state, it can hypnotize itself to that state. The mind is capable of any form of illusion; but in that illusion there is no renewal.

So, the problem is: 'knowing the function of the mind as it is, can such a mind renew itself?' Or, is such a mind incapable of seeing the new, or receiving the new, the unknown, and therefore all that it can do is to lie completely silent? And it seems to me that is all that it can do. Can the mind, which is so restless, discursive, wandering all over the place, gathering, rejecting - please follow your own mind - can such a mind immediately come to an end and be silent?

Because, in that silence there is the renewal, the renewal that is not comprehensible by the mind of time. But when the mind is silent, freed from time, it is altogether a different mind in which there is no continuity of experience, because there is no entity that is accumulating. In that silence, in that state, there is creativity, the creativity of God, or truth. That creativity is not continuous, as we know it. But our mind, the mind that is mechanical, can only think in terms of continuity and therefore it asks of truth, of God, that it should be continuous, constant, permanent. But the mechanical mind, the ordinary mind, the mind that we use every day, cannot experience the other; such a mind can never renew itself; such a mind can never know the unknowable.

But if the mind that is the continuous mind, the mind of time, the mind that functions in memory, in knowledge, in experience, if such a mind can come to that silence, that extraordinary stillness, then in that there is the creativity of truth. That truth is not for all

time; it is only from moment to moment, for in it there is no sense of accumulation.

And so creativeness is something which is never, in terms of the ordinary mind, continuous. It is always there; but even to say 'it is always there' is, not true. Because the idea that it is always there gives it a permanency. But a mind that can be silent will know that state which is eternally creative. And that is the function of the mind, is it not? The function of the mind is not merely the mechanical side of it, not merely how to put things together, how to struggle, how to break down and again be put together. All that is the everyday mind; the plain mind, where there are hints from the unconscious but where the whole process of consciousness is in the net of time; the mind that is constantly reacting - which it should, otherwise we are dead entities. We cannot dispense with such a mind. Such a mind is born of technique; and the more you pursue technique - the 'how', the method, the system - the less there is of the other, the creative. Yet we have to have technique; we must know how to do things. But when that mechanical mind, the mind of memory, experience, knowledge, exists by itself, and functions by itself, irrespective of the other, it obviously must lead to destruction. For, intellectuality, without that creativeness of reality has no meaning; it only leads to war, to further misery, to further suffering. And so, is it possible for that creative state - to be while, at the same time, the mechanical, technical mind is yet going on? Does the one exclude the other?

There is only exclusion of the real, surely, when the intellect which is the mechanical becomes all-important; when ideas, beliefs, dogmas, theories, the inventions of the intellect become all-

important. But, when the mind is silent, and that creative reality comes into being, then the ordinary mind has quite a different meaning; then the ordinary mind also is in continuous revolt against technique, the `how', then such a mind will never ask for the `how', then it is not concerned with virtue, because truth is beyond virtue. The silent mind, the mind that is utterly still, knowing, being the unknown, that creativity of the real, does not need virtue. For, in that, there is no struggle. It is only the mind that is struggling to become, which needs virtue.

So, as long as we give emphasis to the intellect, to the mind of knowledge, of information, of experience and memory, the other is not. One may occasionally catch glimpses of the other; but that glimpse is immediately translated in terms of time, of demanding further experience, and so strengthening memory. But if, seeing all this, this whole process of consciousness, the mind naturally is no longer caught in the net of beliefs, ideas, then there is a stillness, a silence, an unpremeditated silence; not a silence that is put together by will, by resistance. Then in that silence there is that creative reality which cannot be measured, which cannot be made as an end to be got hold of by the mechanical mind. In that state there is happiness of a kind the mechanical mind can never understand.

This is not mysticism, a thing from the East. But on the contrary, this is a human thing, wherever one is and whatever the clime. If one can really observe this whole process of consciousness, the function of the mind as we know it, then, without any struggle, that extraordinary stillness of the mind comes into being. And in that there is creative reality.

Many questions have been sent in. And I hope those who have

sent them will forgive if all are not answered; there are too many of them. But each evening we have tried to answer the representative ones. And if your particular question is not answered, perhaps in listening to the other questions which have been answered you may solve or understand your own problem.

As I said, it is very important to know how to listen, to listen to everything - not only to me, which is not very greatly important. But if one knows how to listen, then there is no authority, then there is no imitation. For in that listening there is great freedom. The moment I am incapable of listening, then I create resistance; and to break down that resistance I need further authorities, further compulsions. But if one knows how to listen without interpretation, without judgment, without twisting, without always bringing to it one's reactions, the reactions of one's conditioning, if one can put aside all that and listen to everything, listen to one's wife, one's children, one's neighbour, to the ugly newspapers, to all the things that are taking place about us, then everything has an extraordinary significance, everything is a revelation.

We are so caught up in our own judgments, in our own prejudices, in what we want to know; but if one can listen, it reveals a great deal. If we can really quietly listen to everything that is happening in our consciousness, to our own impulses, the various passions, the envies, the fears, then that silence of which I spoke earlier comes into being.

Question: How is collective action possible when there are so many divergent individual interests?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by collective action? Let us take that up first, and then see if we have fundamentally divergent

interests which come into conflict with the collective action.

What do we mean by collective action? All of us doing something together, creatively doing things together, building a bridge together, painting together, writing a poem together, or cultivating the farm together? Collective action, surely, is only possible when there is collective thinking. We do not mean collective action; we mean collective thinking, which will naturally produce an action in which we all conform. Now is collective thinking possible? That is what we all want. All the governments, all the religions, organized philosophies, beliefs, all of them want collective thought. We must all be Christians, or Communists, or Hindus; then the world will be perfect. Now, is collective thinking possible? I know it is made possible now through education, through social order, through economic compulsion, through various forms of disciplines, nationalism, and so on; collective thinking is made possible, in which you are all English or Germans or Russians or what you will. Through propaganda, through education, through religion, there are various elastic frames in which we all think alike. And because we are individuals with our peculiar idiosyncrasies, with our peculiar drives and urges and ambitions, the framework is made more and more solid, so that we do not wander away from it; and if we do, we are liquidated, we are excommunicated, we are thrown out of the party - which means losing the job.

So we are all held together, whether we like it or not, by the framework of an ideology. And the more that work becomes solid, firm, the more we are happy, relieved, because responsibility is taken away from us. So every government, every society, wants to

make us all think alike. And we also want to think alike, because we feel secure in thinking alike, don't we?, we feel safe. We are always afraid lest we do not create the right impression, afraid of what people will say about us, because we all want to be respectable.

And so, collective thinking becomes possible. And out of it, when there is a crisis, we all come together, as in wars, or when we all are threatened religiously, politically, or in any other way.

Now, is such a conditioning of the individual creative? Though we may yield to this conditioning, we are inwardly never happy, there is always a resistance; because, in that yielding to the collective, there is no freedom, the freedom of the individual becomes merely verbal. And the individual, because he is so held by conventions, by tradition is always expressing himself, wanting to fulfil himself through ambition. So society again curbs him, and there is a conflict between the individual and society, an everlasting war.

And is it not possible to have one vocation for all of us, not divergent aptitudes, divergent interests, but one true interest for all of us, which is: 'the understanding of what is true, what is real'? That is the true vocation, surely, of all us, not that you become an engineer or a sailor, or a soldier, or a lawyer; the true vocation, surely, of each one of us, is to find that reality. Because, we are human beings, suffering, inquiring; and if we can have that true vocation, by right education from the very beginning, through freedom and so on, if we can find that reality, then we shall in freedom co-operate together, and not have collective thought everlastingly conditioning us and making us act together. If we as

human beings can find that reality, then only is true creative action possible.

Question: How can our poor faulty human love become incorruptible?

Krishnamurti: Can that which is corruptible become non-corruptible? Can that which is ugly become beautiful? Can the stupid become very intelligent? Can I, who become aware that I am stupid, struggle to become intelligent? Is not the very struggle to become intelligent, stupid? Because, fundamentally I am stupid, though I may learn all the clever tricks, still, in essence, I am stupid. Similarly if my love is corruptible, I want to make it pure, incorruptible. I do not think it is possible. The very becoming is a form of corruption. All that I can do is to be aware of the whole implication of this love, with its envies, jealousies, anxieties, fears, its bondage, its dependence. We know that; we know what we mean when we say we love, the enormous background that lies behind that word. And we want the whole of that background to become incorruptible which means, again, the mind making something out of love, trying to give the timeless a quality of time. Is that possible?

Please, see this. Because the mind knows the pain of love, the anxiety, the uncertainty, the separation, the fear, the death, it says it must change it, it wants to make love into something that cannot be corrupted. Does not the very desire to change it make love into something which is of the mind, which is sensation? The mind cannot make something which is already corrupt into something noble; and that is what we are always trying to do, are we not? I am envious, and I want to be non-envious; and so I struggle, because

the mind feels the suffering of envy, and wants to transform it. I am violent, and it is painful; so the mind wants to transform violence into non-violence which is still within the field of time. And so there is never a freedom from violence, from envy, from the decay of love. As long as the mind makes of love something which is of time, there must always be corruption.

Then is human love not possible? One will find that out if one really understands the significance of how the mind corrupts love. It is the mind that destroys. Love is not corrupt. But the mind that feels that it is not being loved, that feels isolated, that is conditioned, it is that mind which destroys love. We love with our minds, not with our hearts. One has to find out what this means. One has to inquire, to go into it, not just repeat the words.

But one cannot comprehend it without understanding the whole significance of the function of the mind. One must come to understand the whole consciousness of the 'me' that is so afraid of not being loved, or, having love, is so anxious to hold the love that depends on another for its sustenance; that is all part of that mind. The 'me' that says 'I must love God, truth', and so creates the symbol, and goes to church every day, or once a week, or whenever you will, is still a part of the mind. Whatever the mind touches, with its mechanical memory, experience and knowledge, it corrupts.

So it is very important, when we are faced with a problem of such a kind, to find out how to deal with it. One can only deal with it and bring about that quality which is incorruptible, when the mind, knowing its function, comes to an end. Then only, surely, is love incorruptible.

Question: Are there not as many ways to reality or God as there are individuals? And is not yoga or discipline one of the ways?

Krishnamurti: Is there a path to the unknowable? There is always a path to the known, but not to the unknown. If we really saw that once, felt it in our hearts and minds, really saw the truth of it, then all the heavens that religions promise, and our own desire to find a path through which reality can be found, would be broken down.

If reality is the known as you know your way home to your house then it is very simple; you can make a path to it. Then you can have a discipline, then you can bind yourself to it with various forms of yogas, disciplines, beliefs, so as not to wander away. But is reality something known? And if it is known, is it the real? Surely, reality is something from moment to moment, which can only be found in the silence of the mind. So there is no path to truth, in spite of all the philosophies; because reality is the unknowable, unnameable, unthinkable. What you can think about truth is the outcome of your background, of your tradition of your knowledge. But truth is not knowledge, is not of memory, is not of experience. If the mind can create a God, as it does, surely it is not God, is it?, it is merely a word. The mind can only think in words, in symbols, in images. And what the mind creates is not the real.

The word is all we know. And to have faith in that God which the mind has created, obviously gives us certain strength. That is all we know. We have read, we have been conditioned as Christians, or Buddhists, as Communists, or what you will and that conditioning is all we know. There is a path always to the known; but not to the unknown. And can any discipline lead us to that

discipline being resistance, suppression, sublimation, substitution? We want to find a substitute for the real. Because we do not know how to allow the real to come into being, we think it will come through control, through virtue. So we cultivate virtue, which is again the mechanical habit of the mind, and thus make of virtue something which gives, not freedom by respectability, a safeguarding from fear.

When we use discipline there is no understanding. Surely a mind that is disciplined, controlled, shaped, can never be a free mind free to inquire, to find out, to be silent. Because, all that it has learned is to strengthen the process of thought, which is the reaction of memory, reaction according to a conditioned demand, hoping thereby it will achieve some happiness, which it calls truth.

So can we not see all this, how consciousness, the mind, operates, how the "me" is everlastingly seeking, gathering, accumulating, in order to be secure, and projecting Heaven, or God, which is its own creation, which is the urge to be safe, to be singularistic? Such a mind obviously cannot come upon truth. A mind that is suppressed, that has never looked within itself. that is always fearful of what it may find within itself, and so always escaping, running away from "what is", such a mind obviously can never find the unknown.

For the unknown comes into being only when the mind is no longer searching, no longer asking, petitioning. Then the mind, fully comprehending the whole process of itself, naturally comes to that silence in which there is creative reality.

April 9, 1953

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 5TH DECEMBER 1953

I think you must all be concerned with how to bring about a different world, a world in which we have a totally different set of values, a world in which man is not against man and in which wars have come to an end. We must have thought about these things, at least those who are serious and well intentioned. Is there an answer to all these innumerable problems? The problems at different levels of which we are conscious, our activities and the various crises that occur, offer an opportunity to discover, for ourselves, the ways of our thinking. If we are earnest, perhaps we follow a particular leader, a particular system of philosophy or action, forming groups which are in conjunction with other groups. Seeing all this wide confusion, not only in this unfortunate country but also throughout the world, what is our own individual response? Do we say someone else will solve these problems? We turn to the politicians, communists or others; and if we are not at all inclined socially, we turn to religious gurus, masters, or to the various systems of philosophy, and hope that by following them studiously and earnestly we might be able to resolve or at least give a helping hand in this utter confusion and sadness of the world. Surely, we must have thought about all these. How are we to rebuild, if we are at all thoughtful? Will this mad confusion bring about a transformation, a revolution, not merely at one particular level but a total revolution? I think that is really the problem.

If I may add, it is very important to listen rightly. Because most of us are confronted with problems, we want an answer; the answer

is always applicable, and must be applicable, to the immediate issue; so we are answer-conscious. Please listen to what I am talking as I feel very strongly that if you can listen rightly, transformation will take place without the conscious effort of our conscious everyday mind. But we do not know how to listen. We hear, but the hearing is only superficial. We have to listen without seeking an answer; we have merely to be confronted with the problem. There is no answer, there is only the problem. Please listen to what I am saying. Because, all of us have been trained from childhood to seek an answer; we put a question, wait and sit back hoping that some one else is going to answer our question. If you will examine in your mind, you will see how conscious we are of this constant demand to find an answer. So we are never confronted with the problem itself. We do not know how to look at the problem even.

If you can establish relationship between you and me, you are not expecting an answer from me with such infantile immature demand; but you and I together are going to look at the problem which is enormously complex. The problem must be understood. The man who is seeking an answer to any problem is shallow minded like a school boy who finds an answer at the end of the book - which indicates a great laziness and the fear of going wrong. We are all concerned that we do not make a mistake in the discovery of what is truth. So we go from continent to continent, leader to leader; we hear persons talking or giving lectures how to do things or what to do in this mad, chaotic confusion? One should be very alert of such people. They are really misleading because they have pet schemes - whether they are communists, socialists,

capitalists, or any of the recent organizations with their leaders, with their masters, with their gurus because they have all answers. A man who is seeking an answer will find an answer according to his demand; therefore, his answer will always be limited.

So let us, from the beginning of these talks, establish a right relationship between you and myself. If you are seeking an answer, you should not be here because you will be utterly disappointed. But if you are willing to confront, to face, the problem, then together we can examine, because the problem itself contains the answer. It requires an astonishing insight, a great deal of understanding, patience, to understand this complex problem of living.

What is the problem? Is the problem merely economic? That is what most of the world is pursuing at the present time. All the economic conditions give immediate effect to certain problems. That is the way of the politician and that is what most of us are satisfied with. The immediate remedy is reform. Is the problem intellectual, verbal or is the problem a total revolution of one's own being at all levels of our existence - socially, morally, educationally and religiously? Because, it is only when there is a total revolution that we can find out what is the truth, and it is the truth that will build and not those who labour in vain to build something which is traditional, which is of the immediate. Please listen to all this. There is a village next door. Those who are socially minded reform it and do something about it, which further increases the problems. So whatever reforms we bring about only increase and give more problems to man. We must be aware of this always. We want to stop war and yet we are doing every thing to

produce wars. So looking at all this vast confusion, we see the false leadership that exists. Later on, we shall go into whether there should be any leadership at all.

Surely considering all this, is not a total revolution in man necessary? Not only a change of thought, change of ideas, change of morals and so on, but a complete unconscious revolution, because a conscious revolution is still conditioned and limited. Because our training from childhood is limited and conditioned, we are either communists, or Hindus, Buddhists, Christians and so on. Any conscious change by the upper levels of the mind - however desirous, however urgent, however cunning, inviting - will not solve the problem; because, our mind is conditioned, and a conditional mind concerned with this enormous problem can only have a conditional response. If you see that, you will never be caught up by any of the leaders. Politics is not going to solve our problems. No religious leaders, no hidden masters, no secret societies - none of them are going to solve the problem. Because, they are all conscious effort by the limited mind seeking to answer the enormous problem, and such a mind can only give an answer either traditional, reactionary, or something opposed to that tradition. So, if the conscious mind cannot give a total answer, a total comprehension to the problem, then what is one to do? Do you understand the problem? We will discuss this in the coming weeks.

Let us begin at the very beginning to see how to look at, how to grapple with, a problem. If I, as a Hindu or a Catholic or a communist, am confronted with this problem of existence, not only at the level of the bread but also at all the levels of my

consciousness, my response will be according to my conditioning; and my conditioning will dictate my action with regard to that problem. Being a Hindu or a communist or what not, I will gather those people who will accept my particular response; because I am a strong personality or because of some kind of trick, or dress or some woman or some kind of charm, I call, I gather people and I build. My action as an Indian or as a Christian or as a communist must be conditioned, and that will create further confusion, further misery. So neither the capitalist, nor the communist who is a reactionary essentially against something, nor a religious person who believes, nor the man who does not believe - none of these people will solve the problem, because their approach is a conscious, deliberate approach which is conditioned. So at least some of us, even two or three, have to see, and not accept, what I am saying, namely that a man who is conditioned can never approach this problem and resolve it and go beyond it, or transform it. All the politicians, all the builders, all the do-gooders who are collecting money for various schemes from the Government and are putting up new buildings, they are all reformers with a conditioned mind, and their reforms only produce more sorrow, more misery.

So then, my problem is entirely different, is it not? There is only the problem. I am not responding because my response, my conscious response, will always be limited - such as, becoming anti-brahmin or some other stupid nonsense. So it behoves us, as human beings trying to understand this vast complex existence, to look at it without any conditioned response, to comprehend it. It is a most difficult thing to do. Is it not? Because, I must look at all

this with out a background. You understand? Can I look at this problem without a background, without the back ground of Krishnamurti, or of a Catholic or communist, of the `me' who has a vested interest in some property or in a society or in a system which offers a solution? Because we are not capable of looking at the problem without all this background, we jump into action which is a conditioned response; so we pile misery upon misery. So until we understand the ways of conditioning, how the mind is caught in it and how to bring about liberation from this conditioning, whatever we do will create more misery. So is it not essential for those who are really serious - we must be really serious because the problems are appalling, complex and serious - to consider the answer in a way of action, not what to do or whom to follow or what philosophy to accept or reject, but to understand this consciousness which is so conditioned and in understanding to try and find out if there is a state of consciousness or a state of being in which there is no conditioning at all? That requires a great deal of investigation but not acceptance, a great deal of enquiry, talking it over.

To build many are needed, many to understand the problem; and the understanding is not given by a leader, by a guru or by a master. These are all childish enquiries. Understanding comes when we know how to still the conscious mind, how a conscious mind, by facing the problem, becomes still. It is only when the mind is conscious. when the mind is utterly quiet without a back ground, without striving for its own vested interests, that there is a possibility of total revolution: and it is only in that state of total revolution it is possible to build, and the builder will not be in vain.

So if we know how to listen not only to what I am saying but to the problem itself - we can only listen rightly, deeply if we understand the conditioning of our own mind - the very understanding of our conditioning frees the mind. Be aware that you are a Hindu; you can never solve the problem as a Hindu with all your systems of philosophy, because they are all man-made and therefore conditioned. So one can only listen and look at the problem truly and in a revolutionary manner only when the mind is capable of not being anchored in any background. Memory is the anchoring of the mind to a condition. All knowledge becomes the vested interest of the mind in its use for its own importance, either for its own or identified with a particular group. So, the mind must be astonishingly free, free of the vested interest of the self and the anchorages of knowledge, free so as to look at the problem and thereby bring about a total revolution. It is this total revolution, in its activity, that will create a new world. Without that total revolution all labour to build a new state, a new society, a new religion is in vain. Therefore it is very important for you and me to understand this revolution and bring it about in ourselves. We must begin small, unobtrusively, quietly because everything we begin is small. There must be no search for success, for membership, for show; such a search is the response of a conditioned mind eager to achieve a result, which is again seeking the answer to the problem. So, if we can during the coming weeks discuss patiently, not throwing ideas at each other but going to the problem meticulously, wisely, intelligently, then you will see that, without your making a concerted effort, the revolution takes place. That revolution comes about because the truth is perceived, and it

is that truth that liberates and not the conscious mind seeking an answer.

I have some questions and before I answer them or discuss them, perhaps it might be better if you can try to naturally ask what you think and not discuss it with me. Any problem you have, we will discuss on Monday morning at 7:30. But here, this evening, if something arises out of this talk, perhaps you would be good enough to ask, not to discuss and not to make long perorations; perhaps that would be worthwhile. If not, I have got questions.

You know asking questions is very easy. The question arises, you put it down and ask, and there you are. Your response to the answer, if there is an answer, depends, on whether you like it or not, whether it tallies with your knowledge, with your experience or with your conditioning. You ask not to find out but, whether you agree or disagree, to confirm. So, merely asking questions has very little value. But what has value is to enquire, which requires an astonishing freedom on your side as well as on the other. If I rely on any authority or on my knowledge or my experience and so on to convince you, then it is mere propaganda; it is not an enquiry which will open the mind to truth.

So it is very important in asking your question how you regard the answer if there is an answer. Because our minds are small, we look through particular gaps, avenues of thought - such as communist, socialist, religious, economist or spiritualist. Through that avenue we want an answer. We think that, by piling up answers, we come to the whole. The whole is not perceived or understood through the part. The whole can be understood only when the mind is capable of being the whole itself.

Question: Living as I do in the United States, appeals are made for financial help to various activities. Should one refuse to give any such help because they imply, according to what the lady says, conscious effort?

Krishnamurti: I will discuss that question. But, watch your own mind in operation. Here is a problem: must help, because there is starvation, there is war and there are so many things demanding my charity, my generosity should I withhold all these because they imply not only superficial reformation but more intrinsically a conscious effort on my part to do something? What is your response? How is your mind operating? Because, it is your problem and not that lady's only. Should you support the division of a country, of a State, of immediate action in a village, such as giving medical aid and doing innumerable other things; as human beings living in daily contact with misery? What is your response? Do not answer me but watch the functioning of your mind. We have made this world consciously, deliberately, by our acquisitive discontent. We have separated peoples - India and Pakistan, America and Russia. We have broken up the world - you and I, and not some idiotic politicians - because that is what we want. We want to be separate and meet a world in which all these things exist and where charity is necessary, where you have to act in order to stop some kind of misery. There is thus a conscious world produced by us consciously. Should we withhold all conscious action in order to understand the unconscious? Is it that till I understand and till there is a total revolution in me, I will not act? Is that possible? You do have your desire or ambitions and various forms of envious discontent. Is it not more important to stop those

than not to give?

To understand this problem of conscious action, you are not going to do it in one talk. It requires a great deal of meditation to uncover, to go deep into the problem; and in the discovery and in the unfolding of that problem, you will solve the problem. I do not know if I am making myself clear. In uncovering a conscious problem, looking at it, investigating it, I shall come upon the unconscious revolution; and that is going to act, that is going to create. But in the meantime I cannot just sit and wait; I must use my intelligence what to support and what not to support which are totally and traditionally destructive. All that enquiry requires patience, intelligence, understanding, insight. Does it not? That very insight, understanding, unfolding is the problem of the unconscious.

You know listening is very difficult because I have put to you a lot of ideas and you cannot absorb all of them; you remember at least one idea; so you have consciously excluded the comprehension of the whole. You are merely capturing one idea, living with it and examining it, hoping to understand the whole. The tree is not just the leaf. You cannot take home a leaf and understand the whole beauty of the tree. You have to look at the whole tree, and you cannot look at the whole tree if you are paying attention only to one part. That is why it is so enormously difficult to listen.

Question: Why is it that, in spite of your talks, no one has been transformed? If no one is transformed, what is the use of your talking to us?

Krishnamurti: Do you think that by listening to a talk or to a

number of talks you are going to be transformed. Do you know what it means to be transformed? If you knew, then you can judge. If you knew, would you be transformed? Please follow all this. A man who says 'I know,' is the most destructive human being because he really does not know. What does he know? So, when you are conscious you are transformed, when you are aware that you are transformed, you are not. You must begin from the very beginning. To think that, by listening to talks by some one, this extraordinary revolution is going to take place is purely infantile. Is it not? Because, this revolution requires not just a day's, half an hour's and one hour's casual listening; but a great deal of attention must be paid to the whole process of self-knowledge. Some of you are lawyers, some of you are doctors, or businessmen or engineers. Could you tell me how to become an engineer in half an hour? Do not laugh at it. That is what we all want, a quick remedy.

Transformation is something that cannot be caught by mere listening, by mere hearing of a few talks. If you know really how to listen - that is the beauty of listening - then you will see how your mind becomes astonishingly still and, in that stillness, a revolution takes place, a total revolution. But we do not know how to listen. You may hear me year after year, unfortunately as most of you do, without any deviation from your daily habitual and stupid way of life. Then you say "Why am I not changed and why is there no transformation in me?" We do not know how to look at the stars or the sun or the beauty of the sky. We have never listened except when we are told to listen. We look at things professionally as experts tell us. We never see a smile or tear. But to have that something which is not habitual and which is a constant revolution

requires an enormous awareness, an awareness in which there is no choice, no judgment, but mere awareness without translation. If you can look, you can listen. In such a way, I assure you, there is transformation. Transformation implies complete revolution, total revolution. How can there be total revolution if you are anchored to any belief? If your mind is working in a system, if it is caught up in a particular philosophy whether it is of Marx or of Sankara, or if your mind is caught in acquisitive discontent, how can it be transformed? But if you be aware of this acquisitive discontent without condemning it, without judging it, be merely aware of it, listen to it totally, then you will see an extraordinary thing happens. That is the truth of the transformation. The truth is not caught by the conscious mind. It must come to you darkly, unknowingly. Then such a mind is in a state of total revolution.

Question: Will it be correct to say, Sir, that an unconditioned mind will have no problem?

Krishnamurti: Sir, why speculate? That is one of our most extraordinary habits. After all, all our religious books are speculation. Are they not? They may be experience for some people. But the moment you read them, they become speculations to you. Please listen to what I am saying. The gentleman wants to know if an unconditioned mind has no problem or can have no problems. Is that so? If I were to say `yes' or `no', then where are you, of what value is it to you? Sir, all such questions indicate that you are not hungry. You look from the outside on the food inside and speculate about the food. But if you are hungry, you would be inside and you would not be asking questions about what it is. It would be like that if an unconditioned mind has no problem.

We think that by asking such a question our minds are active. We think we are intelligent, we are aware. Please I am not personally answering that gentleman. Please do not think I am criticizing. I am talking about the problem of speculation. Is it not one of the characteristics of a lazy mind to speculate and think that it is active? Either you experience or you do not. Why speculate? Is not speculation itself a hindrance to direct understanding? You see that opens up a vast problem of what it is to experience. I do not want to go into it now, but we can see how the mind prevents itself from discovering for itself. Speculation can never be true. Hypothesis is always a hypothesis. The mind has gone beyond it. As long as the mind is caught in a hypothesis, in a speculation, it is creating a barrier for itself. Such a state of mind is not an active mind. An active mind is a mind that is free from thought. For, all thinking is merely a verbalization of memory. A mind merely memorizing is not an active mind. An active mind is a mind that is free from all the process of thought. Please think it over, look into it, do not reject it; and you will see that when the mind is free from thought, how extraordinarily active it is. It is the mind that is always thinking that is a dull mind because thought is always springing from its own conditioning.

So what is important is how to listen to everything about one; then the mind becomes astonishingly sensitive. The mind is not sensitive if it is constantly judging comparing, balancing. A sensitive mind is necessary to enquire and find out what truth is.

Question: What about the various systems of thought in India, which lead a man to liberation or Moksha?

Krishnamurti: Do you think that any system can liberate you?

The very idea that a system can liberate you is conditioning. Is it not? Sir, surely this is an obvious question. Is it not? Do you mean to say a man who has no system cannot free himself except through systems? Will any system, thought out consciously and laid out, bring liberation?

What is implied in a system? Conformity. Why do you conform? Because, you want to gain liberation. As a man wants money, you want liberation. He must conform to certain rules in order to gain money; similarly, you say that, in order to attain liberation, you must follow a system; then, that system has engaged you or captured you. How can that system give you liberation? For centuries we have imitated, we have followed. Systems compete with each other, butcher each other and liquidate each other. You say that one system is better than another. Can such immature thinking lead you to liberation? No revolution which is based on a system has produced happiness for man - the communist, the French or any other revolution merely following a particular system of thought. Sir, to find reality, God, the mind must be free and not anchored to a system. If you are led through a system to discover it, then what you discover is not true. How can you be led to discover? It is a contradiction if I lead you to discover something; you have to discover for yourself. Because I have discovered, how can you be led to it? That is not liberation. That is conformity born of fear.

That is why I say that total revolution is necessary, not the superseding of one system by another, by the very latest system. That requires enormous freedom, freedom from fear, freedom from desire to be successful. If you search your heart and mind, you will

see that we all want success; every leader - communist or religious - wants a great many followers. To discover what truth is, the mind must be fearless, the mind must be free from all imitation; and that requires a great deal of understanding. December 5, 1953.

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 6TH DECEMBER 1953

As I was saying yesterday, what is important is the understanding of the problem and not the search for the solution of the problem. I think it is very important to understand this fundamentally, not superficially but to see the whole implications involved in such an idea when our whole mind is geared or trained or conditioned to think in terms of seeking a solution. Because, the revolution is not so much in trying to find out a new answer, a new solution, but rather in the capacity to look at the problem without a particular background to which we are accustomed. If we are communists, we look at the problem with the particular conditioning, with the particular training, with the particular system or ideas of Marxism; and all our vested interests or the backgrounds of our approach are from that point. Similarly, if you are a capitalist or a religious person, our background dictates the solution to the problem. Problems always occur. There is no solution at all for the problem which is manifest in the world in the present time. If you observe the various activities, the various ideologies that are in conflict with each other, this is the process which is going on.

The revolution of which I have been talking does not lie in a new solution or in a new system of philosophy but rather in a complete freedom to approach the problem anew. Our problems are not only the materialistic welfare of each individual, the welfare state and so on but also the psychological well-being of man because that ultimately shapes the physical well-being of man, which again is fairly obvious to those who have given thought at

all to this whole problem. So how is one to liberate oneself from the background? What is this background? You understand that there is this problem, the problem of material welfare for every human being - whether they are communists, capitalists or people with vested interests - for the well-being of every people in the world whether in the East or in the West. In our approach to the material problem, the problem of material welfare, the emphasis of our whole attention on material things will produce various new problems which are involved in it. Until we fundamentally alter our approach to the material problem, we will use the material as a psychological means to self-aggrandizement.

I hesitate here because most of us think that the psychological problem is irrelevant to the material problem. We are anxious to bring about material welfare, and so say 'Let us organize, let us act, let us do something immediately, or plan to bring about material welfare,' totally forgetting the whole psychological structure of the human being. So if we emphasize one at the expense of the other, we distort man's conduct towards life. What we are dealing with is a difficult problem, a very complex problem, which needs attention; and most of us do not give attention. We hear very casually certain ideas and respond to those ideas depending upon our prejudices, our bias and our conditioning. It is very difficult in a group like this to discuss problems deeply, with attention because, if you do not follow carefully and if you miss certain points, the whole thing becomes a distortion.

As I said yesterday, it is important to know how to listen. Though I repeat it often, listening is the problem. If I can listen to this whole problem of man's existence, material welfare,

psychological well-being, creativeness, creative reality, ultimate reality, and so on, if I can listen to this whole structure of man's endeavour or of man's struggle without interpreting it, without translating it in terms to suit me or my desires, if I can see this vast picture without immediately taking a particular route and travelling on that - which means not having an immediate urge for a result - then it is possible to look at this whole picture and comprehend it totally. It is this totality of understanding that is important and not a particular part of the picture. Do please see that. What is important is to see the whole structure and not the part, not one particular culture or one particular aspect of our whole existence. Because, if we take one part, discuss it, act upon it, it will produce problems which will be in constant conflict with all the other structure of the human being.

So what is important is not education, not peace, not the immediate social action, not the problem of war or peace or starvation, but the approach to these problems, totally, as a whole. That requires enormous insight. As most of us are politicians in one form or another, we want an immediate action, immediate response, immediate results. So our whole outlook, our whole approach to this problem, is perverted. There is starvation of which we know very well. We need not discuss it. There are various organizations dealing with it; and in the very solution of that particular problem, we are introducing various other problems, such as the liquidation of man. Because certain leaders, certain dominant, urgent, strong personalities say that this should be done, they organize and liquidate others who do not fit in; or they create confusion in order to bring about a certain state when a group of

people can control it and so on. There is the multiplication of problems one after another because we never approach this whole human existence as a totality. If we can, during these talks, merely approach the problem totally without seeking an answer, we shall have done a great deal, because then we shall act totally and not partially.

We know we have many problems of sex, of love, of reality, of God; what is after death; the whole implication of action and ideation; the problem of deterioration; the problem of not being able to create; the problem of not knowing what is creation, which is God, which is truth. Seeing all these problems, how is it that we approach it? In understanding how we approach it the problem will be dissolved. Please listen to this. There is this whole complex problem of existence; and each leader, each specialist, each person who has had any thought or any experience translates these problems and gives a system and says "Do these things and you will resolve them". The religious specialist, the economist, the psychologist and so on - each is giving us a system to be followed, to be practiced, to be lived out; and we, in our ignorance, in our stupidity, follow them because we want a result. Whereas, if we can look at the problem totally, then the problem will have an entirely different meaning.

So how is one to look at the problem totally? That is the problem - not the problem of life or death or God or starvation but how can you and I look at this vast problem totally and not partially? That is the problem. Because, after all, a great artist is one who sees the whole and not the part. He paints or writes poems, or creates a marvel because he sees the whole and then

works out the details. What is it that is preventing deeply, fundamentally, the perception of the whole, of the total problem? Why is it that you cannot and I cannot see the whole picture? If we can answer that, not merely verbally but see the truth of it, then our approach to the problem will be entirely different. So our enquiry then is not how to answer this vast problem of existence, with all its cruelties, with its joys, with its ups and downs, with its loneliness, imitation, shades and brightness, but how to approach that problem totally and to see what is preventing us from approaching it entirely, completely and wholly. So that is our enquiry and that is the only enquiry; because, small men, narrow men, men seeking answer, will translate; the problem according to their limitations.

So our enquiry then is not the solution of the problem but what it is that prevents each one of us from looking at the problem totally. Is it not fundamentally the `self', the `me', the `I' which is the background? After all, what is preventing me and you from looking at the problem totally and therefore approaching it from a wholly different point of view? Is it not the `me', the mind which is the state of `me'? So without understanding the process of the mind - the total process of the mind, the psychological process, the conscious as well as the unconscious, merely to approach this vast complex problem by a mind which does not understand itself, creates more problems, more miseries, more destruction. So what is important is not the problem but the understanding of the mind which is creating the problem. The mind, conscious as well as unconscious, is always creating a background, is always creating tradition from which it is acting. The background of tradition is the

habit, the practice, the memory, the conclusion, the idea, and from that idea conclusion, memory, tradition, practice. This is how the mind is acting. Realizing this, people say, 'Let us control the mind, let us shape the mind to a particular action; and if it does not yield, we will wash the brain in order to conform.' I hope you are following all this.

The mind acts from an anchorage, from a fixed point which is elastic; but always there is a centre from which it acts. It is always tethered to a point, the point being the 'me'. The 'me' is the idea. The idea translated is the State, or identified with the State or God. So the mind, which is tethered, which is anchored, which has a background, which has a tradition, which is the memory, such a mind can never approach the problem totally. How can I, anchored in my aggressive discontent or acquisitive discontent - for all discontent with us is acquisitive - how can such a mind look at this whole problem of life? When it does, it looks at it from the point of view of acquisitive discontent and translates this vast problem of existence in terms of 'what I want' consciously or unconsciously. So the enquiry then is how to free the mind from the 'me', from the background; and until we do that completely and totally, we shall have misery after misery vast destruction, savage brutality and every form of coercion and compulsion. This is what is happening in the world at present.

How is the 'I' which is the 'me', which is the whole process of our thinking, to come to an end? You see the problem? We think the 'I', the 'me', comes to an end when we identify ourselves with the State; the State then becomes all important. Does the 'I' disappear because I put the State in front of me as the most

important? No; only I have substituted another ideation, another tradition. So until each one of us, through the understanding of the whole process of relationship as from a mirror, discovers oneself or one's activities and one's thought, and is aware of this whole process of the `me' - which is self-knowledge - our struggle to merely reform, which reaches only the surface, has very little meaning. On the contrary, it only creates more mischief.

So the enquiry then is the understanding of the `me' the `self', the mind. To understand something requires no judgment. To understand the working of the mind conscious as well as unconscious, demands no comparison. You must take it as it is and begin as it is. But it is very difficult to begin as it is because we are always comparing with something else. We have been fed on ideology, on ideals which are merely a substitution of `what should be' for the reality of `what is'. So to understand the mind, the workings of the mind have to be watched in relationship. Is it not? Going into the meaning and dwelling with it in the mind has very little significance. Then you can deceive yourself, most extraordinarily. To watch constantly from day to day, from moment to moment, without drawing the conclusion or living in that conclusion, to watch in relationship without judgment, without comparison, but with constant awareness requires a great deal of persistency. Without doing that, all study of sacred books, all systems, have very little meaning; on the contrary, they are harmful to the mind which is stuffing itself with other people's ideas.

So only a man who has understood the way of the mind can know what is reality, what is God. whatever the name by which you call it. The mere repetition of the word `God' or `love', the

practicing of rituals have very little meaning; they only deviate the mind. But if you and I study this whole problem of the mind, enquire into the seat of the 'I', then you will see that in that enquiry comes the stillness of the mind, which is not induced, which is not disciplined, but which comes into being spontaneously, naturally, freely; and in that stillness, the totality is seen, and that totality, will resolve the problem. It is that totality that will build, and not those who labour in vain not knowing the totality.

Perhaps, as I suggested yesterday, out of this talk there are questions you might ask me, if you are willing, but not discuss them because we shall have a discussion tomorrow. But if you are inclined after hearing this talk, there might be questions. If not, I have some questions written down.

Question: What is the function of a true educator?

Krishnamurti: Now, you have asked a question and you are waiting for an answer; because, you can then dispute with the answer like a clever lawyer, the pros and cons. That is what I am not going to do. That is infantile, immature. But you and I are going to find out, to discover, the functions of a true educator. You are not going to be told 'It is this', for you just to agree or to disagree. But you and I will investigate, will discover together that which will be truth; and it is the truth that matters. Please listen to this because these problems are very important nowadays, because the world is going to greater sorrows, greater misery, and those who are listening have the responsibility. You have taken the trouble to come here. Therefore, you should listen to find out the truth of the matter and not indulge in mere speculative opinion or answer or judgment of another. What is important is that you

should find out what the truth of the matter is. Then you are the liberator of man and not an imitator.

What is the true function of an educator? What is education? Why are we educated? Are we educated at all? Because you pass a few examinations, have a job, competing, struggling, brutalizing ambition, is that education? What is an educator? Is he one who prepares the student for a job, merely for a job, for technical achievement in order to earn a livelihood? That is all we know at present. There are vast schools, universities where you prepare the youth, boy or girl, to have a job, to have technical knowledge so that he or she can have a livelihood. Is that alone the function of a true educator? There must be something more than that, because it is too mechanical. So you say that the educator must be an example. You agree with that? You will have to follow the truth of the matter, to go into it. When you go into it you will see the truth of it, namely, no example is necessary. Put aside your conclusions or conditioning, and enquire. You say a teacher should be an example. What do you mean by that? An example, a hero, so that the boy or the girl imitates him? After all, there are many examples - Christ, Buddha, Gandhiji; and if you go to the other extreme, Lenin, Stalin, and God knows what not, and the various saints, heroes.

What is the implication of an example? If the functioning of a teacher is that he is to be an example, then is he not consciously or unconsciously imposing a pattern on the boy, on the student? Does conformity to a pattern however noble, however well thought out, planned out, free the individual from fear? Because, after all, you are educating a student to face life, to understand life, not to meet it

as a communist or capitalist or some other stupid conditioned individual. You are helping him to meet life. To meet life, there must be no fear; and that is a very rare thing. To be without fear implies no example, no hero. If there is no hero, no example, will the student go astray? That is the fear of the older people, is it not? So they say, 'Because he will go astray, there must be an example. He must be compelled consciously or unconsciously'. So we create a mediocre human being who has no initiative but who is a conforming entity, a machine, who is afraid to think out, to live, to find out. Does not an example imply the engendering of fear in the understanding by the student through himself of his own problems, and also in the attempt of the educator to help him to understand them. If the educator himself becomes the guide, the example, the hero, then is he not instilling fear in the boy, in the student? So surely the educator of the right kind is not an example, nor does he inspire a student because inspiration implies dependence.

Please listen. You may virtually be bored with it because you think you are past the age for education. What has age got to do with education? Education is a whole process of life and not just at the college age only. So if we are to create a different world - which your sons or your daughters may create but not you, because you have made a mess of it - to bring about a new world we must create a different kind of intelligence which is not fearful. A student who is afraid because he has the example of saints, heroes, innumerable patterns of established thought, of tradition, cannot create a new world; he will create the same ugly world, mischievous and misery-creating world. So the true function of a teacher is not to be an inspirer, is not to be an example, but to

awaken the intelligence in the child - which does not mean he becomes the awakener. If the teacher becomes the awakener, the student will immediately make him into a guru because he will depend upon the awakener; thus, the student allows himself to become dull because he has some one on whom to rely and who is going to awaken him.

So the teacher is not an awakener, the teacher is not an inspirer, not a guide not a hero, not an example. The true function of a teacher is entirely different, namely, to help, to educate the student to see all these problems. The student cannot see these problems if there is fear - economic, social or religious fear. He is not a true teacher who is always comparing the student with somebody else, with his elder brother or with the brightest boy in the class, because that very comparison destroys the person with whom the comparison is made. Please follow all this. Such a teacher does not exist in any of the schools at present. So we have to educate the educator, and that is your responsibility because the State is not going to do that. The State is only concerned with conformity, with producing mass results.

Is not the true educator, the parent, the mother and the society about him - not a specialized entity who had a particular way? So it is your responsibility, is it not?, to counteract it at home if there is no proper teacher, to see that there is the awakening of the intelligence in the child without fear, without comparison to look at life, to understand all the conditioning influences so that he, as an intelligent human being without fear, with out competition, without comparing, can create a new world in which there will be no wars no appalling social miseries; or he can create a world of his own

worse than ours; it is up to him. So the true function of a teacher is to create an atmosphere, an environment in which the student will grow to fruition without fear.

Sirs, Ladies, you have heard this. It would be very interesting to find out your response. You will say `This is not practical, this is utopian and only Rishis can do it. We need to have jobs to earn our livelihood. What is to happen to me in my old age if my sons do not support me?' If this is your response, you have not understood the truth of the matter. If you have understood the truth of this question, it will act in spite of your cunning mind. It is very important to see the truth of it.

Question: Do you work on the conscious of your listeners or on their unconscious?

Krishnamurti: What is a conscious mind and what is an unconscious mind? Again, please find out, do not depend upon my answer or my definition. For that you can look in a dictionary. So let us find out, let us discover the truth of the matter.

What is the conscious mind? It is the every day mind, is it not?, every day mind of the lawyer, every day mind of the General, the Policeman, the specialist; every day mind of the acquisitive intent; the mind that is discontented and wants to find contentment; the mind that is escaping from the problems; the mind that practices rituals, stupidly pursuing something other than facing what is; the mind that is gregarious; the mind that is committed to a certain conclusion; the mind that is traditional, copying; the mind that is following a particular pattern of action. It is the conscious mind that judges, evaluates, compares, seeking its own ambitious results. That is the conscious mind of every day activity, is it not? That

mind, seeking security, may place that security on an extraordinary level; but still, it is the conscious mind, whether in the bank, or in Nirvana, or in Moksha, where you will. That is the conscious mind.

What is the unconscious? Do we know that there is the unconscious except that you might have read about it. If you are a psychologist, you might be slightly interested in it. Are we aware that there is a whole process of the unconscious deep down, hidden, very difficult to get at? Are we aware of it? I am afraid we are not because all our conscious effort is directed to the upper levels, and there we remain. Our ambitions, our social activities, our discontents, our jealousies, envies, comparing and judging, there we are. Do we know anything of the unconscious, do we really know any thing about it except perhaps in a dream on a still night? The battles, the conflicts, are they between the unconscious and the conscious, or only between the various conscious desires? Do you understand all this, please? When you ask a question of that kind, you must know what is the conscious as well as what is the unconscious. Is the revolution, the total revolution, to take place at the conscious level or at a level which is not controllable by the conscious? The mind can control the conscious. If it can also control the unconscious with a view to bring about a revolution, then it is no revolution; that is merely a conditioning of the unconscious.

Can a conscious mind delve into the unconscious? Can it see what the unconscious is? Let us consider collective tradition; you call your selves Hindus, Mussalmans, Christians, or what you will - which is the conditioning of the unconscious, of which you are not conscious. You are calling yourself a Hindu; and to call

yourself a Hindu, centuries of conditioning of the deeper layers of consciousness have been going on. Is it not so? To call yourself a Christian, it has taken centuries of social, economic and religious influences. For centuries, till now, you say consciously `I am a Christian or a Hindu or a Mussalman. Now you hear that statement and you say that it is so. But you, as a conscious mind, have not discovered it, have not penetrated the processes and the causes of that conditioning. Are you getting tired of this? This requires thought, and probably you are not used to this attentive talk for an hour and therefore you are not listening any more; you are just hearing words which have very little meaning now. It is very important to understand this question because great many things are involved in it. I wish you could follow it, follow it not as I describe it, not my description, but follow the workings of your own mind; otherwise, it is merely my description which you are trying to follow. If you are interested, if you are attentive, if you are truly listening, then you will follow the things operating in your own mind; you will discover for yourself the whole process of consciousness.

We know what the conscious is; we know we live, move, function from day to day, keep going on without knowing like a machine which is running down the hill or up the hill. When this is pointed out to you, the conscious mind then begins to watch itself. But there are hidden layers of the unconscious, which control the conscious, because the deeper layers are much more vital and much more active than the so called superficial mind. Is not the so called unconscious mind the residue of all the struggles, pursuits of all humanity, which expresses itself outward, as in the Hindu, with

its big tradition of custom and culture? You understand? Let us take, for instance, 'culture'. Everybody is talking about it nowadays - the Eastern culture, the Indian culture, the Western culture. Some say, that we must have a pure Indian culture and that we must build buildings for that work. What does culture mean? Please follow this. Do not say 'yes' or 'no' but enquire. Is there such a thing as Indian Culture or European Culture? There may be an expression of that culture, which is Indian or European. That feeling, that ecstasy, that appreciation of beauty may translate itself in a particular manner in India, in the East; the West may translate and express it in an entirely different way. But the content, the depth of feeling, is common, is it not? It is not Indian or English - which is simply stupid - though the expression may be Indian or So if one wants to understand the whole process of culture, one must go into the unconscious and not into the conscious. Culture may be something, not traditional at all; it must be something totally creative and not imitative. Because culture, the so called culture, has now become traditional, we are not creative.

So in the enquiry after what is culture, you have to go deeper and deeper, have you not? It is important to find out what is the unconscious. Do not read books. They will only describe what is the unconscious. But their description will prevent you from discovering it. But if you begin to enquire into it intelligently not judging not saying 'This is it' or 'That is not it' but watching the whole process of the mind - which is meditation - , then you will see that there is very little difference between the unconscious and the conscious. The conscious is merely an expression, the outward action of the unconscious. There is no gap. It is one process, the

deeper process controlling the outer, shaping, guiding it. The conflict is between the various desires in that consciousness.

The questioner wants to know if I am speaking to the conscious or the unconscious. Obviously in talking, in using words you may remember the words and your acknowledging these words is a conscious process. Sirs, are you following all this? I find that some of you seem to be a little bit sleepy. I am not awakening you. I am not interested. If you want, you can have your sleep. That is for you. I am not your awakener. But together we can find the truth of this matter. It is the truth that will liberate. If you are awake, you can let it come to you. So what is happening is not that I am talking to the conscious or to the unconscious, but the truth is being uncovered which lies beyond the conscious and the unconscious, which means bringing about an extraordinary stillness of the mind. Do not make your minds still. Do not close your eyes and become silent. Truth cannot be found by the conscious or the unconscious. Only when the mind is conscious, we know of both the conscious and the unconscious with all its workings, noises, striving. When all that comes to an end, there is stillness. This stillness is not the product of the consciousness at all. It is only the stillness that is creative, that is eternal. In that stillness, that which is everlasting can be found, that comes into being. But for that silence to be, the whole process of consciousness must be understood - the workings of it and not the explanations of it. That is why these meetings will be worthwhile if you can pay attention and if you can listen rightly so that we can both be in that state of stillness in which truth can be. But that is not easy because you have the job, your wife, your husband, all the traditions, all the nauseating smells of life. They

must be understood and quietened. That requires awareness of all things, of the trees, of the books, of the women, of the smiles, of your daily mischievous actions, pujas, appetites, passions. Of all these one must be aware; and to be aware is not to condemn, but to look at and to observe them without judgment. Then only it is possible to have self-knowledge which is not taught in books, which you cannot learn by attending one or two talks. It comes into being when you watch and understand all your feelings and thoughts, from moment to moment, every day. The totality of that understanding will resolve the problems of your life. December, 6, 1953.

MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 12TH DECEMBER 1953

You may remember what we were discussing last week. We were considering how to approach the problem. As long as we are looking for an answer to the problem, a solution, the problem is of no importance in itself. If we are merely searching a way out of the problem, which most of us do, then the problem becomes insignificant. If we can approach the problem without a desire to find an answer then, as we stated, we will find that the problem itself becomes all important; and then it is a matter of how one approaches the problem, and not the search for an answer.

Now I would like to discuss this evening the same thing, what we were saying last week, only differently, to approach it differently. But before I go into that, is not communication difficult? I have something to say, and you listen with your conclusions or your own biases or your own particular experiences. You listen from a conclusion and so you are not listening to it at all. Please pay, if you don't mind, a little attention to what I am saying. What I want to say is not so complicated. If you can listen, not with a conclusion but trying to find out what I am trying to convey, then perhaps communication may be made easier. Most of us are told what to think; but we do not know how to think. Our minds are so conditioned and so full of what to think, that any statement of another - contradictory, silly or wise - is translated through the screen of our conclusion. So we are not listening or understanding what the other fellow is saying at all. Is it possible to listen without a conclusion, purely to listen as you would listen to

music?

What I want to discuss this evening is the problem of a mind approaching this vast complex problem of existence. The existence is not only the acquiring of a job or maintaining a job but the whole field of the psychological existence with which most of us are almost unfamiliar. We have been told by some that there is continuity and by others that there is no continuity; but we have never found out for ourselves. The problem of existence is this vast complex of wars, class, caste, division - the perpetual battle of man against man in competition. We have the desire to find out what is truth, what is God, what is mortality, if there is continuity after death. We have not found the reality of any of these things. But we believe what we are told from our childhood; or, from out of our fear, or for our security, we invent or grasp at some hope.

Now there is this enormous, psychological, unconscious or semi-conscious complexity which we call life. How does the mind approach the problem? Can a mind which is constantly thinking in terms of 'becoming', acquiring, understand this complex state when the mind is only thinking in terms of acquiring or is being driven with acquisitive discontent? Do you understand? There is this problem. How do you approach the problem? Do you approach it in thinking of the problem in terms of the more, in terms of 'becoming', or in terms of 'being'? This is not a philosophical question. Do not translate immediately into terms of becoming, being, as a philosophical thesis.

Our minds are accustomed to think in terms of becoming - becoming more rich, having a better job, having greater virtue, becoming more beautiful, in terms of the more, more time to

develop, to become greater, wiser, more in knowledge - which we call discontent. That is our state of mind. 'The more' implies the whole process of time, 'I must have tomorrow to learn more, to become wise; I must have more time to understand.' So is our approach, is it not? When we are confronted with this problem, we are thinking of the more, in terms of time. We never begin to understand it as 'being'.

The fact is that there is this complexity, and we think of changing the fact in terms of time and not in terms of being. This is what is mediocrity. I am not using that word comparatively, that is, in terms of one who is cleverer, more brilliant, greater genius, greater capacity to create. I am not using that word comparatively, in terms of greater and lesser. But if you are going to translate that word in terms of the more and the less, more clever, more genius or less, you are going to be misled by your own conclusions, which is not in my mind. I want to discuss this with you, for I feel this is one of the problems we are confronted with. A mediocre mind is middling, ordinary, average. I am not now talking of the mind which wants to be the more, which wants to be more clever, which wants to come out of level, which is not creative and therefore struggling to be creative writing poems, writing sentences. I am talking of a mind which is mediocre. Now immediately, the mind - if you observe your own minds in operation - wants a definition of 'What is mediocre?' Having a definition, you will think out according to that definition; either you are accepting it, or rejecting it. Is not the mind mediocre when it seeks a definition according to which it shall think? Please follow this.

As I have said last week, it is important to bring about a

revolution - not an economic or particular revolution or a revolution at a particular level of our being or existence - a total revolution, a complete, whole, integrated revolution; and that is only possible if our whole thinking process undergoes a real revolution - not a mere substitution of one thought, of one belief, of one idea, by another. So if you are concerned, you will see the importance of a total revolution. The communist or the socialist revolutions are really no revolutions at all. Merely following a particular action or system of thought laid down according to Marx or according to Sankara, is not revolution. A total revolution is necessary because the problems are enormous; and to understand problems we have to understand the mind, because the mind will translate the problems according to its mediocrity, according to its wisdom, according to its knowledge. So, there must be a total revolution in the contents of the mind, which is thought.

So we have to enquire what is mediocrity - not the definition, not how to make the mind which is mediocre, whatever it is, into some thing else. We have actually to discover for ourselves what is mediocrity, not how to become less or more mediocre; because, in the problem of mediocrity you will find this issue of discontent, and the pacification of discontent arises. In that, you will find a constant endeavour to become, to be something. Is a mind which is not trying to become something, mediocre, stagnant? All these problems arise when you enter into this question of what is mediocre. That seems to me to be one of our major difficulties in life.

Out of the enquiry into mediocrity, arises the question 'What is creativeness?' A man who paints a picture, writes poems, gives a

lecture or uses his power as a means to compel others, in order to become self-important - is that creativeness? Or is creativeness something totally different, not comparable but totally different? If we can go into that question of mediocrity, all these problems will be dealt with. But before we can go into it, we must clear our minds, must we not?, of all comparative thinking. I mean by comparative thinking a mind which is constantly comparing itself with somebody, with an idea, with becoming. For instance, specially in this country where caste or class is terrible, our mind is so shaped and so deliberately cultivated as to maintain these strata. We think always in terms of becoming less or more, or, despising them all, destroying what we consider to be the more intelligent in order to bring about equality. I hope you are following all this.

Your mind will say 'What is the practicality of all these? What is the use of all these in our daily life?' I will tell you. There is no use at all because your daily life is now not revolutionary, not creative, but dull, heavy, routine; and you cannot solve the problems with your minds as they are now. The moment your mind in thinking process changes, you will be able to deal with the problem. So when you ask about the practicality of what I am saying, then that very question will show that you are not thinking in terms of revolution but only how to bring about superficial adjustment.

Let us look into this question of what is mediocrity. Please follow this. Do not ask for a definition because you are having it in a dictionary, you can go home and look into it. But how can you and I be aware of what mediocrity is? What do we mean by mediocrity? Please do not hold to anything I may say verbally in

order to explain what is mediocrity, because then you will use it as a conclusion, as a definition, and you will compare what I have said with what some one else has said, and choose the definition you prefer. Now that process of mind which chooses a definition and compares it with another and in that comparison says 'This is applicable to me, this appeals to me' - is not that process a mediocre process? Do you understand what I am talking about?

If I am to enquire into what is mediocrity, I must be aware how my mind is operating, not how to becomes mediocre. The demand of the mind, in wanting to change the mediocre mind into something intelligent, wise, clever, sets about enquiring and trying to find out the definition; and having found a suitable definition which appeals to the mind, it begins to carry that out. Is it not a mediocre mind that is doing this? I hope you are observing your own minds in operation, not merely listening to my words. My words are merely indicating the operation of the mind, the mind which is yours. So you are watching your own mind in operation and not following what I am saying.

When a mind compares because, either for reasons of fear or for security or for greater economic certainty, it wants 'to become', is not such a mind mediocre, which means a mind that is afraid? As long as there is fear, there must be comparison, there must be the process of 'becoming,' imitation, conformity. So is not mediocrity a state of mind which, being discontented, finds easy pacification of that discontent? We think discontent is wrong. Don't we? At least we are told not to be discontented. Are we not? Is not the pacification of discontent an indication of mediocrity? I am not defining mediocrity, but watching how the mediocre mind works.

Does not the mediocre mind seek comfort when there is a burning flame of discontent? That is what most of us want, to find contentment. Because I am discontented, I want to find some resting place somewhere I can be at peace. So what is happening? My mind soon finds a way to be pacified, to be quiet, to be undisturbed - which we call tranquillity of the mind. My mind becomes slowly dull, and I am exhausted because I have not really understood the whole process of discontent. A mind being discontented sometimes becomes very clever, drives, is aggressive; such a mind also is a mediocre mind, because it is trying to transform what is into something else. So is not a mediocre mind a mind that is constantly trying to 'become', not only in this world of acquisitiveness but also in the so-called spiritual world, the whole hierarchical principle. 'You know, and I do not know; you are the guru, you lead me to safety' - this total process of the mind indicates a mediocre mind. The 'becoming', away from what is - 'I am little, small; I am ignorant; I am this; and I want to become that, the most supreme one, the God or the Commissar or the Cabinet Minister' - is not this everlasting 'becoming', wanting more, not only physiologically or psychologically but also spiritually, the cause of all discontent? Is not this whole process an indication of mediocrity? Now, do you realize that it is so, not merely verbally but actually,? Do you see it as a fact, a defenceless fact? The mind that clings to God, Buddha, Sankara, Aristotle, Gandhiji, or X, Y or Z - is not that also a mediocre mind because it is incapable of discovering what is truth for itself? Therefore it must realize the fact. Now, when you are confronted with that fact, what is the operation of your mind? How does your mind work when you are

confronted with this fact? If you are aware of the fact, you will also see that your mind immediately asks 'How am I to transform the fact'? Does it not? 'I realize my mind is mediocre from what all you have stated now; what am I to do?' - that very question shows that you have not understood the problem. When you are confronted with this fact of mediocrity and you say 'What am I to do?', you are again caught in mediocrity, because you are concerned with changing it. You are not aware of the fact and the truth of it. The very desire to change your mediocre mind into something bigger is preventing you from being creative - not the creativeness of writing poems, however clever, however marvellous. That creativeness which is timeless, which is of no class, no group, no religion, which is truth, which is God, whatever name you give it - that creativeness is not caught by a mediocre mind, a mind which says 'I must be creative, I must get at it, I must know more.' But the creativeness comes into being when the mind is face to face with the fact and is still.

The fact of mediocrity and the mind confronted with that fact and having no desire to alter the fact from the state of being in which mediocrity melts away. But this requires a great alertness of mind. You cannot be alert when there is fear. No. Fear makes us dull, unintelligent. A person who is afraid may be very clever, may occupy the highest position in the land, may know all the scriptures, may climb the social ladder or the hierarchical ladder of what is called spirituality which is only illusory; but his is only a dark mind capable of inventing mischief and illusion. Until we resolve that centre of fear - not how are we to resolve it?, we cannot be creative. Being aware of fear without any desire to

resolve it, to overcome it, to run away from it, that very discovery of the fact and remaining with the fact is the dissolution of fear.

The gentleman asks `living in a country like this, with a neighbour who is aggressive, who wants to destroy, what is to be my action? Now, Sirs, let us go into the matter, not what to do but how to think of the problem, how to approach the problem. What to do, what action should take place - you will find it out if your minds are clear. India has been unfortunately divided into Pakistan and India. It has been divided through many causes - by the politicians' greed to have immediate power, and by the politicians of other countries to bring about a disunited India and to divide and rule, which has been going on for centuries. It is not just an event happening out of context. It has been a growth. How are you to meet it? How do you meet it? You meet it by armament and so you prolong the problem. Don't you? You are armed and I am armed; and by mutual terror, we hope to have peace; that is what the world is doing, and that is the result of centuries of wrong thinking. Is it not? See how the world is divided. You think India is a separate sovereign country; so is England a separate sovereign country; and so on; different sovereign countries with different flags, different ministers, different laws, different economic barriers. We have been maintaining all this out of our greed, out of our fear; and you say `How am I to act and what am I to do as an individual'? Is that not the problem? Now can you stop this division? The politicians want to divide because then only they can have more power. Are you not having the same, next door, the Andhras and the Tamils? Not so brutally, not so very antagonistically, but the same issue is at stake. Is it not? You will have out of this division other

problems; and when these problems arise, you say 'What am I to do'? So all that one can do is to think entirely and totally differently, as a human being - not as a Tamilian, Telegu, Indian, Christian or a Communist but as an integrated human being concerned with the problem.

There is only the problem and not the answer to the problem. The moment you put the question 'What am I to do', have you not already entered into a system of thought which is going to divide you? Then you have one system and I have another system. Please see the importance of this. There is only the man, not the Englishman, the Russian, the German or the Hindu. As long as there are even a few of us who are thinking in those terms and creating a new process of thinking about these matters, others will come in and rather bring about greater misery and destruction. This answer does not satisfy you because you want an immediate answer to a problem created through centuries by our deliberate desire to have a better position than the neighbour, to be more clever to cultivate a brain, to exploit others - which the Brahmin has unfortunately become now. After creating the mischief, you say 'How am I to deal with it?'. You cannot deal with it because it is going on from moment to moment. All that you can do is to have a total perception of that problem, and that perception will bring about a revolution; but you do not like to have this. Before I answer any of these questions written to me, perhaps you will like to ask questions from the talk which I have just now given.

Question: Can a mediocre mind, as it is, realize self-realization?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, it all depends. This is a question and answer meeting and not a discussion. If you want to discuss, please come

on Monday morning, Tuesday morning or Wednesday morning when we can discuss this problem. So let me explain what the question means. Because, if you understand the question, you will find the answer in the question itself; you do not have to ask me.

Can a mediocre mind realize God? Is that not, Sir? You may use the word 'self-realization,' whatever that may mean. Can the mind be liberated, can it find truth, God, can it? Sir, please do listen. Can a mediocre mind, a small mind, a disturbed mind, a mind that is petty, broken up, that is average, find reality? Reality is something totally unknown. It is something to be from moment to moment. It is not a thing fixed there for me to get. If it is fixed there for me to get, it is an invention of the mind. We create God in our image, don't we? All the books, all the temples are filled with the works of our hands - the word, the image, or the symbol which the mind considers very important because it is afraid to discover for itself. Can such a mind find truth or self-realization whatever that word "self-realization" may mean? Can a small mind which is only thinking in terms of getting more, thinking in terms of time - that is, 'I will do something to morrow.' 'I will get something next life' - can such a mind understand that which is timeless, which is beyond chronological and psychological demand of desire. Obviously not.

Sirs, God is not something that you acquire, as you acquire a suit or get a virtue. It is something incomparable, timeless, unimaginable, not nameable, you cannot come to it. It must come to you. It can only come to you when your mind is no longer seeking. Because you are seeking now in order to acquire in order to become comfortable, in order to become something because you

are thinking in terms of time, in terms of growth, in terms of achieving results, you can never know what reality is. Such a mind is a mediocre mind. It can invent phrases, it can talk about God, it can talk about truth. But such a mind has no experience of reality. It cannot. It is only when the mind is no longer comparing, no longer acquiring, to such a mind that is still, reality comes into being; and that reality is not continuous, it is from moment to moment. That which was, is not; and that which is, shall not be. Sirs, these are not just words. When you really go into the problem of all that I have been saying, you yourself will find out what it is to be creative. You yourself will have the mind that is no longer comparing, acquiring, a mind that has come into a state of 'being,' and into that being reality comes. That reality is never the same. Therefore the mind cannot write, talk, describe about the reality. That reality has no appeal. You cannot say it appeals to me. Therefore it is really a vain foolish talk.

Only when the mind no longer is seeking, no longer demanding, no longer searching, wanting, becoming, only then the mind is still; and that stillness is not constant, that stillness varies from moment to moment. A mind that only knows continuity is not a still mind. All this requires a great deal of patience, awareness and self-knowledge. That self-knowledge is not of some self you have heard of in books, in which you have been conditioned, brought up; but it is of the self of every day, the self that is finding, seeking, wanting, being acquisitive, discontented corrupting, greedy in vain, inventing the hierarchy in order to assert itself in more power. That is the mind that has to be understood. That can be understood from moment to moment, as you walk, as you talk. You will find when

you talk to your servant, watching the language you use, how your mind is conditioned, crippled by tradition; such a mind can never find reality. There must be a total revolution in our thinking for that which is timeless to be.

December 12, 1953

MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 13TH DECEMBER 1953

Almost all of us are concerned with the problem of change. We see things in confusion. Every problem, every change, seems to produce more problems, more complex suffering, every kind of disturbance. As we think about the problem and in the process of changing from `what is' to `what should be,' we create other problems, do we not? I do not know if you have thought about it. Every one must have noticed that in the process of changing oneself, one creates problems not only in one's daily life but also politically, socially, in every direction. The very revolution brings other problems and yet we want to change to a state or into a stage in which no other problems will be created. That is what we all want, don't we? Please let us think this out together because it requires a little bit of attention, insight into what we are discussing.

I am not out to show you, or to twist your thinking to a particular pattern. But we are concerned with the problem of change and we see the necessity of it. For instance, most of us when we are young are very dissatisfied, we are discontented, we search, we grope after, we seek various avenues of knowledge, information, guidance, go to some guru, some master to help us out of our discontent, out of our enquiry, to give us knowledge, information and insight into things. The moment we have found someone who can give us knowledge, a way to act, a way to live, our dissatisfaction comes to an end, and we pursue that particular pattern of thought for years and years. That is the case with most of us, is it not? When you look back to your youth, that is what

happens to most of us. I see the inequality in this world of the rich and the poor, the man who knows so much and the man who knows so little; there is the appalling misery, war, strife; and I am discontented with all that in my youth and I begin to enquire; then I join the socialist party, the communist party, or become a very devout religious person. The moment I have joined hoping that joining will bring about change, the discontent is gone. I want change according to a certain pattern of thought, according to a certain course of action. Then the discontent is only in following that course. That is the case with most of us, is it not? When we have become crystallized, heavy in that which we have accepted, we have destroyed our discontent. Then we need sanction, then we need authority to ply us from our set course of action. So we go to an authority as a final means of producing a change in ourselves.

This is really a very important question which I am not twisting to my particular way of thinking or looking or enquiring; but this is what is happening. There is a tremendous revolution in thousands and millions. Certain people have an idea what a change should be, how a change should be brought about, how a society should be built. So they assume powers of Providence and they mould, shape and control the people, because they say that people must change and, for that, they must be held in a certain pattern of action, and otherwise there will be no corporate action. So everybody including the dull, heavy, insensitive person is concerned with this problem of change. You may not change; you may have your corners of seclusion, safe gardens where nothing can penetrate; your whole mind may be enclosed by ideas, systems. But even in those minds, there must be the germ of anxiety, the worry of

change, because everything is changing. To what? We do not know to what, but we should like to change to what is the real which will not create more problems, more anxieties, more sorrow. After all, we are human beings. We have a certain sense of responsibility, and there is such a thing called love which may be smothered, destroyed; but there it is. We see misery, poverty, wars, the powerful and the weak; and that love must act and somehow find a way.

Are we not all greatly concerned with this problem of change? How easily we are satisfied when there is discontent which we think is so wrong! Give a man or a boy who is a Communist, who is a Socialist, who feels violently, strongly about this problem, a good job, a safe position; let him marry and have children; there he is finished, he becomes a capitalist like ourselves because he wants his change to be continued in a particular direction. When we do change, it is the change in a particular cast, in a particular direction, towards a certain direction. So is it not a problem with each one of us, this question of change? Change to what? We want a change; and in the process of changing we have problems, and the very changing produces such catastrophes! So the mind hesitates. So what has one to do? Please let us think over this together, not that you are listening and I am giving a talk - which is quite stupid. But let us, you and I together, find out the truth of this, not my truth or your truth - because truth is not personal - how to think about this problem but not what to change into. Every religion, every group, every society, every philosophy says `You are this, change to that; and in the process of changing, there is conflict within and without. The conflict is not an indication of

intelligence, it dulls the mind. One becomes insensitive, dull, weary, as most of us are - especially the older people, who have struggled, battled, disciplined, controlled in order to change, to achieve the result.

So just listen to this problem of change, not to my approach to the problem because I have shown I have no approach; not in terms of conclusion or how to bring about a change or in terms of what to change to. Just listen to the problem of complete revolution which will not produce other problems. Look at what is happening in the world. There are India and Pakistan, essentially one country but now two countries; therefore more trouble, more wars, more destruction, more competition to fight with each other. Similarly, in Europe everywhere there is a breaking up, there is a disintegration. Every leader, every political dogmatist, every religious tyrannist says his way is the way you must change. So if we can, even for this evening, put away all such thoughts and enquire into what to change into, then perhaps we shall have an understanding which is not merely the product of effort of striving. First of all, the enquiry must be, must it not?, 'From what intention do you want to change; and what authority do you need to change; what compulsion, what motive do you need in order to bring about a change?' That is a very important question, is it not? Because on that depends whether you will change or not change. If my whole structure, if my thought is built on acquisitiveness, which is the case with most of us, on a sense of discontent which demands the more - 'you have, I have not, and I must have' indicates our discontent is acquisitive - then that discontent carries the mind.

Is change possible without any form of compulsion? Please

follow all this. I am thinking aloud, I am not giving a talk to you. It is a problem of how to change the people who are in power, position, authority, who believe in such absurd nonsense. How to change them, how to change you and myself? Must I not enquire why I want a change? What is the drive? What is the motive and towards what? Most of us change, do we not?, when we are assured that which we are going to change into is satisfactory, is comfortable, is worth, while. You follow? I will change if I am assured by an authority, by a man who knows, by a guru, by a system, by somebody who has written a book, that doing these things will produce that. Do you understand? You listen to me, why? Is it not primarily that somehow I will tell you something which will help you to change, to acquire, to be more happy, to be something else? Is that change? If I were able to guarantee, or if I were stupid enough to guarantee, that if you change you will have happiness, Moksha, and whatever it is, then you will struggle violently to acquire that. But is that change? That is, when you know, when you are conscious, when you deliberately move towards the known, is that change? You understand? Is there a change in me when I move from a known to another known. The other known is always to be guaranteed, to be made satisfactory, it must be certain almost in getting through to be successful. Is that the motive for most of us to change?

A change is possible only from the known to the unknown, not from the known to the known. Do please think this over with me. In the change from the known to the known, there is authority, there is hierarchical outlook of life - `You know, I do not know. Therefore, I worship you, I create a system, I go after a guru, I

follow you because you are giving me what I want to know, you are giving me a certainty of conduct which will produce the result, the success and the result'. Success is the known. I know what is to be successful. That is what I want. So we proceed from the known to the known in which authority must exist, the authority of sanction, the authority of the leader, the guru, the hierarchy, the one who knows and the other who does not know; and the one who knows must guarantee me the success, the success in my endeavour, in change, so that I will be happy, I will have what I want. Is that not the motive for most of us to change? Do please observe your own thinking, and you will see the ways of your own life and conduct. So we set up a society, build a structure, in which there is this whole principle of authority, the authority of the one who knows, who is going to help me to that state in which I shall also know, I shall have the supreme satisfaction of achieving, arriving; and this is called change. I am not twisting it to my particular thinking; this is just what is happening in our daily life. When you look at it, is that change? Change, revolution, is something from the known to the unknown in which there is no authority, in which there may be total failure. But if you are assured that you will achieve, you will succeed, you will be happy, you will have everlasting life, then there is no problem. Then you pursue the well-known course of action, which is, yourself being always at the centre of things.

So is it not a problem, in thinking this out, whether time brings about a process of change? Do you understand? I am greedy, envious; I look to time, tomorrow, day after tomorrow, next month, next year, as a means of destroying my greed, overcoming my

violence, my passion. Does time produce change, revolution? Is not the psychological demand for time a process of being certain? After all, time, the psychological process of achieving the end through time - is that not the invention of the mind for its own convenience in order not to change but to continue in the same pattern of action only calling it by a different name? Look! `I am violent. I have the ideal of non-violence, which is so much talked of in India - they have other ideals in other countries unfortunately. I am violent and non-violence is over there; to arrive there, I must have a gap of time; I am going to arrive there. That is the state, the ideal state. I think that is the state in which I will be happy, a perfect state in which there is no violence; and to achieve that, that distance, to travel from here to there, I need time'. This process of travelling from here to there is called progress towards a state of non-violence. Is that state of non-violence, non-violence at all? You follow? Or is it merely an idea away from what is. You understand, Sirs?

I am violent. How is that violence to be changed? That is the problem, not into what, but the complete transformation in what is. If I am only concerned with the complete transformation in `what is', then `what should be' is not. Therefore time is no concern. This is not a philosophical problem of time. If I am concerned with revolution, a complete total transformation, I must not think in terms of time, time being merely the invention of the mind. Therefore, a mind wishing to change can never change, can only modify what is as in a continuity. Is all this too difficult. I wonder if you are understanding what I am talking about. First of all, it is a very difficult problem. You only know change in terms of time, in

terms of the known, in terms of compulsion, in terms of social environment, squeeze. That is all we know. In these terms we think and are compelled to change fast. But we do not know the spontaneous change in which the consciousness of the effort to change is not; because, when a conscious mind says 'I am going to change', that requires effort; and when the mind makes a conscious effort to change, that implies time. Please follow all this; and if you follow it, listen to it carefully and you will find how astonishing is the change that takes place without your making an effort.

So when a conscious mind makes up its mind to change, it must have time, and time implies the continuity of the same in a modified form. It is never a revolution. It is not what has been, but it is a continuity of what has been. When there is a conscious, deliberate act to acquire virtue, through meditation, through practice, it implies time, does it not? Time is the very nature of the self, the 'me' that is going to acquire, to be. The man who says 'I must forget myself in virtue and therefore I am going to practice virtue', takes the cloak of virtue as the 'self', it is only the self, the 'me', which is clothed in virtue. Therefore, the 'me' is the cause of disturbance, is the cause of destruction, is the cause of misery.

When the conscious mind uses authority, sanction, as the means to bring about a change, it must establish a whole hierarchical outlook of life in which there is no love. When you follow your guru who knows, you have no love; you have only fear which is covered over by the words 'devotion', 'service', 'sacrifice', because, at the bottom of it, you want to be sure, you want to arrive; you do not want to suffer, you do not want to discover, to find out - which means uncertainty, enquiry. So, a man who is concerned with this

problem of change is confronted with all this. It is only the most stupid or the cleverest politicians who say that they know and who take the role of Providence.

So our problem is the change to the unknown, not to the known; and that is the only revolution, the change which comes about when the unknown comes into being in my mind. Please follow this. When the unknown comes into being, the unknown cannot be with the 'me' when the 'me' is pursuing consciously some end. Until that unknown, that truth, comes into being - which only can build - all labour is vain. So, for that unknown to come into being, the mind must cast away all knowledge of the thing, which it has learnt in its self protection; the mind must be completely, totally empty to receive the unknown; the mind itself must be in a state of the unknown. Then from that unknown we shall build, and then that which we build is everlasting. But without that, they who labour to build labour in vain, which only creates more misery and more chaos in the world.

There are many questions sent in. I shall try to answer them. I will not give the answers, but we shall investigate the problems together and find the truth of the problem. The truth is not yours or mine; it is not what appeals to you or what appeals to me. Truth is not appealing, it does not depend upon your temperament. It can only be when you have no temperament. I have no temperament, when I have no opinion, judgment, comparison. Truth is only when I am not and you are not. Therefore, it has not anything to do with your satisfaction or with mine; it has nothing to do with whether it appeals to you or not. It is there. Only the wise, experienced man who suffers, the man who loves, will know it.

Question: Sir, what kick exactly do you get out of these talks and discussions? Obviously you would not go on for more than 20 years, if you do not enjoy them. Or, is it only by force of habit?

Krishnamurti: This is a natural question to put, is it not? Because, the questioner only knows or is aware that generally a speaker gets a kick out of it, some kind of personal benefit. Or is it merely old age? Or, whether one is young or old, is it the habit? That is all he is accustomed to; so he puts the question.

What is the truth of this? Am I speaking out of habit? What do you mean by habit, force of habit? Because I have talked for 20 years, am I going to talk for 20 more years till I die? Is the understanding of anything habitual? The use of the words is habitual; but the contents of the words vary according to the perception of truth from moment to moment. If a speaker gets a kick out of it, then he is exploiting you. That is what most of us are used to. The speaker is then using you as a means of fulfilment, and surely it would destroy that which is real. As we are concerned to find the truth and what is from moment to moment, in it there can be no continuity; all habit, all certainty, all desire for fulfilment, all personal aggrandizement must have come to an end, must it not? Other wise, it is another way of exploiting, another way of deluding people; and with that surely we are not concerned.

There are many questions or several questions about gurus - 'Should I follow my own mind or my guru?' 'You awaken in us the desire to discover the truth and so you are indispensable to us.' So, similarly, 'True realization is essentially an individual matter. Are not philosophies, systems, gurus, masters, helpful in lighting the spark within us and therefore necessary.'

This is really a very persistent question with most of us. We want an awakener, we want an inspirer, we want a guide, we want somebody to tell us how to behave, we want some one to tell us what love is, what to love. In ourselves we are empty; in ourselves, we are confused, uncertain, miserable. So we go round begging to be helped, to be inspired, to be guided, to be awakened. Please follow this. It is your problem and not mine and because it is your problem you should face it, understand it, not repeat it, year after year till you die confused, utterly lost. You say an inspirer is indispensable, or a guru is a necessity. For what? Is a guru necessary for you to be led to what you call truth, what you call the real, to God, to self-realization? Do you understand? You want to be led. Several things are implied in this. First, that which is truth is never an abode or a fixed thing to understand; it has not a fixed spot in time so that you can carefully be guided, led, shown. If you are guided or helped, and if it be shown to you, then it is not truth; it is only an invention of the mind, which you want because that will give you satisfaction, certainty, and that will make you happy. So do follow this.

Truth is not a fixed point in time. Only if it is a fixed point, the mind can understand it. What the mind can understand is the creation of the mind; and so it has nothing whatever to do with reality, with God or what you will. You cannot be led to reality, because it is a living thing, because it is never the same from day to day, from moment to moment. Because you want permanency, a state of continuity, you seek a guru who will lead you to what you want. But what you want is not what is truth, and you can not be led to discover truth. Do you understand? The process of leading

you to discover truth is not discovery. You cannot be led to discover it; it must be discovered by you. No one can lead you to discover it. It is a contradiction. So I must be allowed to discover truth. Do please see this.

In India, it is one of our curses that you must have an awakener, a guru, a master, someone who will help us, who will guide us to find the truth; and in that desire to find truth, you build up an hierarchy of authority. The building of authority and the hierarchy destroys love because then you discard everybody, you trample on everybody in your desire to get there. You talk of brotherhood, you found societies of brotherhood; and yet, you maintain the hierarchy, the caste system. So you are not seeking reality. If you are really seeking reality, you will not stretch your hand out for it, because reality must come to you. You cannot invite it, you can not go after it, because it is there every second, if you know how to look at it. What you want is not truth, you want comfort, you want safety, you want success, you want self-fulfilment which is 'me' fulfilment in God, in Truth, which is 'me' ever continuous, everlasting. That is all you are interested in. You want safety, spiritual safety as well as economic safety; and as you know very well there is no economic safety, you are after the permanency in spirituality; that permanent state you call truth. That is why you have leaders, religious organizations, philosophies, gurus, always guaranteeing safety, permanency for your comfort.

One who guarantees and one who seeks guarantee are, both of them, caught in illusion. They are not seeking reality. Once for all, if you really understand this, you will put away your gurus; for light is not in a guru or through a guru; it is in yourself. But no one

can lead you to find it because you will have to find it for yourself. When you say you are seeking truth, it is superstition and vanity; and those people exploit you through your superstition, through your vanity. Surely, to find truth you must be stripped, you must be completely naked, of all desire, alone, not depending, unsheltered. Then only truth comes. Only then, it is possible to create a new world, a world in which there will be no problems. Because, there is action then not from fear, not from the desire to be certain, but from reality which is the unknown.

The questioner asks 'Should I follow my mind or my guru?' Your guru is made or born or chosen from your mind, from your temperament, from your like or dislike, from what appeals to you; your mind creates the guru. So you are following your own mind and there is no guru. You are following your desires, and your desire is to be safe, comfortable, to have certainty for great success. You are not successful in this world, fortunately for you; therefore, you want, unfortunately, success in the next world. A man who is seeking success will never find reality. Sirs, the mind must be understood, the ways of your thoughts must be fathomed, delved into. Then you will know the operations, the workings of your mind, how the mind in its desire to be safe, projects everything - every illusion, every master, every guru. So the mind is the only guru which you have; but that guru is not going to help you; that guru is not going to lead you; that guru is only going to deceive you, to bring more confusion and more misery. You have to understand that mind which creates illusion. Just listen, do not say I have heard what Sankara says or what others say. Comparative thinking is not thinking. So when you know the ways of your mind,

the mind becomes still, voluntarily and easily, without discipline, without compulsion; then only that reality will come into being. Then that reality will build a new world, not the mind, not your gurus; because, that reality is love.

December 13, 1953

MADRAS 5TH PUBLIC TALK 19TH DECEMBER 1953

You may remember last week we were trying to discuss the problem of change. It seems to me that is one of the most fundamental issues that is confronting the present world at the present moment, because we do not know what to change to. Because we do not know, all the professional religious people turn to the Vedas, or quote authorities or follow a particular philosophical system of thought hoping actually, if you observe, to divert in a particular direct action. The leaders themselves, like the followers, are very confused. They may profess that they are following a philosophy, that they know what they are talking about. But if you closely observe, you will see that fundamentally they are very confused. Is it not right that those of us who are really earnest, should enquire into this problem of what is change and towards what? I discussed that last week. But I think, if we can go into it from a different point of view, then perhaps we shall be able to understand the deeper significance of the idea, of the word, 'to change'. Perhaps if we are able to enquire into what is religion, then we shall be able perhaps to understand what it is to change. But without understanding the whole significance of religion, mere outward reformation is most unrealistic, as it has been shown to us by all recent revolutions and reforms. Let us, if we can, seriously enquire into what is religion; and perhaps in understanding it, not at the verbal level but as we go into it, as we actually experience the significance of that word, then perhaps we shall be able to understand the meaning of the word 'to change' and to bring about

a revolution which, as we are discussing for the last two or three weeks, is essential.

Things go on as they are; and those people who are well-established in position in the religious or in the social order, or who have the means of power in their hands obviously do not want a revolution; they want the things as they are to continue in a modified form. But if we are really serious in our intention to enquire into what is religion, obviously we must approach it without any vested interest. You know what is meant by vested interest, the vested interest in an organization. It means all the profits which accrue from it in the name of something, the personal benefits which soon become the personal racket of the leader though he uses it in the name of peace, master, philosophy, or any particular political ideology. So really to enquire into the significance of what is religion, is it not necessary to begin not with what God is but with what the mind is that thinks of God? You understand? A mind that thinks of God or believes in God and practices various forms of discipline and rituals, will never know God or truth, because the mind that believes projects that which is most satisfactory to itself. That is a psychological fact. So a mind that believes in God or in truth or in something, is obviously incapable of real enquiry because such a mind has vested interest in that belief. From that belief it acquires security, hope, satisfaction, a sense of moral and physical well-being. So such a mind can never find it, it will deceive itself and others. It can never find what is real, because psychologically it has committed itself to a certain pattern of action. Yet, most people who are religious - so-called religious - are steeped in beliefs, in rituals, in dogmas; and

this is because they find this world to be very troublesome, to be very, very painful. All relationship leads to conflict. In the ordinary daily life there is no mystery. So the mind must have a mystery, something supernatural - either the worship of the State according to Marx or somebody, or the worship of an image made by the hand or by the mind in some dogma. The dogma then becomes mysterious, as it is placed by the mind and treated by the mind as mystery; and it cannot be touched because it is too mysterious for the mind to understand; but still, it is an invention of the mind, of the psychological urgency. I hope you are following all this. I am not describing anything but the mind of each one of us, the mind that is caught in routine, in the daily boredom of existence. There is no mystery in our personal relationship, in sex, in nature. We have explored all that but we want mystery, we want something beyond, further than what the mind can invent, than what the mind can project. But that very projection of the mystery is the process of the mind. So the mind gets caught in that mystery which is a dogma - whether dogma of the State, dogma of a Catholic, dogma or the belief of a Hindu, or the Master living somewhere beyond, mysteriously behind a hill. So the mind must have a mystery to worship, created either by the hand or by the mind, which has an idea round it. Round that idea, that image, grows a vested interest of property, power, position and authority. So knowing all these - which is an everyday fact - it is only the knave and the thoughtless that fall into the trap by jobs, by personal vanity and by personal ambition.

So, can a mind find that reality? After all, religion implies that search of reality; and can a mind which is steeped in all forms of

superstitious personal ambitions and which believes in dogmas, ever find that reality? Please do listen. If you are to build a new world it must be built on quite a different foundation, not on your or my personal ambition clothed in the name of the Master, in the name of the State or in the name of an ideology. It must be built totally differently, because otherwise we shall have to go on from war to war at different levels, not only physical war but also psychological, inner war with each other in order to bring about a radical revolution. In all that, must not there be a freeing of the mind - freeing of your mind and my mind and the minds of every one, of all of us who are capable, who are earnest, who listen and see the urgency? Is it not important to strip ourselves totally from all these dogmas, rituals and superstitious nonsense, and begin to find out how to enquire? This means really that each one of us must, in our daily life, strip ourselves away from the past, from the tradition, from the usual routine of ritual, the things on which we have been brought up. After all, they are essentially based, are they not?, on our desire to be secure psychologically and physiologically. We want to be safe, and the mind cannot tolerate a moment when it is not safe, when it is uncertain. So the mind must have something to cling to; and the more mysterious, dark, fearful, unimaginable it is, the more and more it clings to that. So is it not necessary in order to build a new house that the house should be built on truth, on reality, with the perfume of the eternal? Must it not be built, not on dogmas but on the understanding of the whole process of the mind that is trying to build, that is destroying and at the same time building, that is deteriorating and bringing something into being? So the problem is not a new philosophy, a

new system, a new economic order. We see divisions, armies, political or physical power do not create a new world. To think in those terms is quite out of order. The mind is a total being, and on the understanding of the mind we must build. So, can we not strip ourselves away from all those dogmas, and face what actuality is - which is, we are ambitious, we are envious, we are seeking personal security, personal immortality? That is all we are concerned with. You may clothe it in all kinds of sweet high sounding words; but, in essence, all we want is physical security, psychological well-being. The physical well-being is destroyed by the psychological demand. So the psychological demand is far greater, far more urgent, far more significant than mere physical demand for security.

So, is it not possible for the mind to understand this problem of envy because our society is based on that, on acquisitive discontent? Is it not possible for the mind to free itself from it? That requires enormous persistent enquiry, to free the mind from the more, from the demand for the more, so that the mind does not project, does not demand. When the mind does not project, it is active and yet still; it is only in that stillness can reality come into being; and it is only such a mind that can build a new world. Please follow this. Do not be deceived by your leaders - political, religious or social. Do not be caught in organizations; they will not lead you to truth because they eventually become personal rackets. So a man who is really seeking the truth must be free from all organizations, the so-called spiritual organizations. Then when he is free of these outward compulsions which he has created, then he can begin to strip his mind of those ambitions, those personal

antagonisms, envies. That is quite an enormous problem in itself, I assure you.

How is one to free the mind from acquisitiveness? For us acquisitiveness means to have more clothes, to have more houses, larger bank accounts; but that is not mere acquisitiveness, that is an expression of something much deeper. Until we understand the deeper impulses, the deeper compulsion, mere reformation in regard to our possessions - how much we should have and what we should not have - will have no result because the approach is totally wrong. But for the mind to be free from the demand for the more, from the demand to be acquisitive, is extraordinarily difficult because until the mind is simple, innocent, it can not know what truth is, and innocence can never exist and come into being when there is this acquiring instinct of the mind. Please follow all this and listen to all this. Do not say that this is not practical.

The mind has to be free from the beginning and not at the end, because there is no freedom at the end if there is no freedom at the beginning. You cannot go from slavery to freedom, from compulsion to freedom. So religion is surely a state of mind in which the `ME', the `I', is absent; and into that absence of the `I' comes reality. But that `I' is not something mysterious; that `I' is made up of our jealousies, ambitions, envies, desire for power, position and intrigues. If one can really think about it, one can dissolve it without constant battle within oneself. So those who would really build a new house cannot build that new house, and their effort will be in vain, unless they understand this problem of revolution, the inner revolution. The outward revolution will not affect the inner; it may find a different substitution. This inward

revolution is not to be learnt from another. You are not going to get this by joining a party. It can be brought about only by constant working, enquiry, and searching. Only then is the mind capable of that freedom in which there is silence, in which there is no movement, but in which there is a stillness and wholeness; the mind is then no longer seeking and therefore still, no longer wanting and therefore completely free from all discontent. Only into such a mind can reality come into being, and it is only that reality that can build a new house.

Would you like to ask, before I answer these written questions, anything that arises out of this talk?

Question: In a private conversation you said that the party system, single or multiple, is not democratic. Will you please go into this a little?

Krishnamurti: Let us consider the question and not wait for an answer. You understand? Let us together find out, rather than you wait for me to answer and then you contradict or accept. Most of us are concerned, in political or any other action, with ideas first, aren't we? A political party is formed on an idea, on a system; and another party is formed either in opposition to it or totally different but still based on an idea, on a system, on a philosophy, on vested interest either in philosophy or in property. So the parties are not concerned with people. They are concerned with a system that will help the people, a system based on an idea, on some philosophy which is essentially a conditioned reaction. You are a communist, I am a socialist or a capitalist; you have a system, I have a system, the communist has a system, which is going to help the people, if they, meaning `I and my group are put into power. So, we - I, my

group, your group have thought out what to do according to certain systems. My group is the outcome of my conditioned reactions, and yours also is similar. So neither of us are concerned with the people, I assure you. We are concerned with systems and how to carry out those systems, because the systems offer the means, either personal or utopian. You understand all this? I say, my party says, 'We know what is good; and if I get into power, I will be ruthless totally and then I will liquidate all the parties except me and mine; because, we know we have the approval of Providence who is going to tell us what is going to happen, and you are going to fit into that plan.'

So long as we have systems, we are not concerned with the people. That is an obvious fact, is it not? If you are really concerned with the people - that is you and I, a poor man - you would not have systems, but you would all be doing, acting, thinking what is good for the whole, and not on an idea. Surely, neither a single nor a multiple party system is democratic, because none of them are concerned with the people and their well-being. They want the people and their well-being according to a certain pattern of action. If every one of us, you and I and others, is concerned not with ideas but how to live rightly, how to find out the true relationship between each other - between you and me and between different parts of humanity - that does not require any system of thoughts, utopian or religious. That requires search and enquiry, not based on an idea and how to carry out that idea, but into how to live together. That requires a total revolution again. So none of us enquire sufficiently deeply into these matters, because we think that by carrying out the idea immediately we shall have a

result, and with results we are concerned; and we are not concerned whether the results multiply more miseries, more problems. So to bring about a revolution in our political thinking also, surely there must not be any action based on an idea or philosophy at the totalitarian religious or political behest, but a quite different approach to the problem, which is not based on an idea but on an enquiry into the ways and means of living together directly.

Question: How can there be any kind of education without some form of discipline, imposed either externally or from within?

Krishnamurti: What is the function of education? Are we educated? Why do you send your children to school? Please think, and let us think together. Again, there must be a revolution in our approach to the problem.

What is the function of education? Is it not to help the student, the boy or the girl, to face life intelligently, being without fear? My mind is clouded with fear when there is competition. There is fear when I do not know how to meet this whole complex problem of living, There is fear when I am ambitious. A man who is happy is never ambitious, and it is only people who are ambitious that are unhappy. So is it not the function of education to help the student to grow without fear so that he can face life intelligently, not according to your intelligence or my intelligence, not according to your particular religious idiosyncracies or political or economic condition; so that he can grow fully, integrally, as a whole human being. The questioner asks then `How is it possible to bring up a child, youth or student without some form of discipline?' What is the purpose of discipline, even for the old or for the young? Why do we discipline ourselves, imposed by another or self-imposed?

Why do we discipline children? What is the function of discipline in a school? You are parents, fortunately or unfortunately and you should know. In life what place has discipline? Is not discipline the cultivation of resistance? Discipline implies resistance, and that resistance brings about fear, does it not? Look, you have a large class of students, 40 or 60. How can you keep order in such a large group? You cannot. Therefore you resort to discipline. You are not interested in education. All that you are interested in is that you wish to give them some information so that they will pass the examination and get jobs in which only the parents are interested. The parents are not interested in education, and, to most of us, education ceases after we pass an examination. Probably none of us ever touch a book. If you do not, you stop thinking also. You just have burnt yourself out and are just living automatically. So, if we are to understand what is the function of education, is it not important to find out how we can bring a student, a youth, up without compelling, without coercing, without persuading him, without disciplining him, so that he can function as a total human being. That requires surely a very small school, a small class with teachers who are capable of understanding this whole process of how to bring about this intelligence without compulsion, without everlasting competition of marks and examination, all this process of burning oneself up in these beastly examinations.

Sirs, you believe in souls; you believe in individual progress; you believe in all the rest of it; and yet you are doing the very opposite of that, are you not? So, there must be a total revolution in our education. A boy or student not only has technical knowledge which will help him to acquire a job but there must be also

something different, a human being, an integrated human being - and not a human being with constant battle within himself - so that he can be a creative human being. You cannot be creative if you are competitive. There can be no reality if you are afraid; and in everything that we are doing, in our education, in our political action, in following the various gurus and in all the rest of it, there is fear, there is no creativeness, there is no happiness but an inward anxiety. How can such people create a new world and a new being? So the question of discipline implies so much; and a teacher, an educator, who does not understand this will naturally resort to discipline because it is the easiest way to control a large group. As the Governments are only interested in mass education, the education that you know prevents revolution, does it not? You are all very educated, are you not? You know how to read, write and read the morning paper. You will never revolt because you always see so many sides that you never see what is true.

Therefore, to bring about the right education which demands a revolution on the part of the parent, on the part of the teacher, there must be an understanding of this whole problem of what is an integrated human being - not a definition, but the enquiry, the constant searching out of this integrated whole. Such a search obviously begins with being free from fear, psychological depths of fear, conscious and unconscious fears. The freeing of the mind from fear is meditation.

Question: India has won home rule by practicing the ideal of non-violence. How then can you be up against ideals?

Krishnamurti: Do you really believe that you won freedom by practicing non-violence? Historical events brought about the

weakness of the ruling people, and so they had to withdraw. Hitler and the previous wars weakened Europe. After you have won your so-called freedom by your so-called non-violence, has there not been violence, Mussalman against Hindu? It is said that six million people have been either displaced or murdered. I suppose you do not call that violence. The problem of ideas is entirely different. Ideals are fictitious, they are not realities, they are the projection of the mind. Please follow this carefully because there also we must have a fundamental revolution in order to create a different world, not this hypocritical, constant, idealistic world with such appalling cruelties. You have the ideal of brotherhood, the ideal of non-violence, the ideal of love, the ideal of being kind. Why? Because, obviously you are not kind, is it not? Otherwise you will not have ideals. Obviously you are violent, fearful, hating. So you have all these marvellous ideals; and you think that, by following these ideals, you will acquire love, you will be non-violent, you will have brotherhood. Surely, by following an ideal, you are avoiding `what is', are you not? 'I hate, or I am violent; I am practicing non-violence; it is my ideal'. How stupid it is! Why can't I deal with `what is', and not with `what should be'? You understand, Sirs? Can a mind strip itself of these ideals? You put that question to yourself and see what your response is. How fearful you are the moment you put the question to yourself, because you think ideals are keeping you within bounds, without over spilling. You say `What shall I do if I have no ideals?' You are doing nothing and you will do nothing if you have ideals. If you have no ideals then there will be no projection of the mind to escape from realities, and you will tackle what is - greed, envy - actually as it is; then there is

the possibility of freeing the mind from the ideal. Sir, we have the ideal of brotherhood preached and not practiced; and yet, we have had no stoppage of war. So why not be away from all our ideals, all our examples and be very realistic - which is to understand what is? As it is, I am envious, I am ambitious, I am cruel, violent; and how can that be levered out? We think ideals are levers by which `what is', is shaped, moved, and so we are always having a conflict between `what is' and `what should be.' That is our problem, is it not?

I am greedy, I am envious and ambitious; and I should not be so. I am therefore struggling, there is a battle going on within me. This creates hypocrisy between `what I am' and `what I should be.' Cannot I strip myself of `what I should be?' What I should be is an invention of the mind and an escape from the fact, from what I am. That is the standard according to which I am trying to live, and the standard has no authority at all because, psychologically, it is an escape. The fact, `what is', is one thing, and `what should be' is totally different; and we are fed on what should be. The more ideals you have, the more wonderful, the more noble you consider yourself to be. But if you are really facing what is, then there is the possibility of dissolving, going beyond. But none of us want to, because we find profit in ambition, we find vested interest in envy. So we have ideals, and we are everlastingly practicing ideals, but never facing what is. It requires a tremendous revolution, does it not?, to break away from this illusion of ideals on which we have been fed and on which the whole world is feeding, and to realize what is and be simply with that, to know that you are envious, that you are angry or violent, not to deceive yourself, and not to create

this conflict between what is and what should be. Then you can put your whole energy in understanding what is, without escaping into 'what should be' which is utopian, which is nothing and never achieved. It is like a man practicing virtue month after month, taking each virtue and meditating upon it. Virtue is something, Sirs, which cannot be practiced. If you practice it, it is no longer virtue. For, virtue is something unconscious and not to be cultivated by the mind; if it is, it is merely another coat, another colour, behind 'the me', 'the I'.

Please listen to what I am saying, and let it penetrate beyond your conscious minds so that there would be revolution, so that you and I can create a new world. It is not possible for one man to create a new world. This world is ours, yours and mine. We must build it together. To build it together, we must be very realistic, not phony, not idealistic but to see things as they are and to go beyond them. To go beyond them requires a great deal of perception, insight into what is. Instead of spending our time, our energy, our thoughts and our days in the understanding of what is, we are losing, wasting, destroying ourselves with ideals. You will listen to all this and you will be temporarily assured to see the truth of what I am saying, or rather, not the truth but the logical verbal conclusions; and you will go away and talk tomorrow of ideals. Leave that to the leaders, to the gurus, to those who have vested interest in philosophies - which means really in property. Let us be simple, you and I, innocent with what is and not with what should be. The innocence of seeing what is and the beauty of that innocence brings about freedom from what is.

Question: I am full of hate, Please teach me how to love.

Krishnamurti: Why do you laugh? Is it not a very sad question? See that question. The questioner is quite conscious of what he is, which most of us are not. Those of you who live are unconscious of yourself. You also hate, you are full of envy, bitterness and everlasting discontent. But the questioner, happily or unfortunately for him, is aware and he says 'teach me how to love'.

Can love be taught? Can you go to school and learn how to love? Can you be taught wisdom, though there are schools for wisdom? Please listen. Is wisdom to be learnt? Is love to be learnt? Can you go to another and learn what love is? Does not that very question bring tears to your eyes? I am not being emotional and hypnotizing you into a state of emotionality. You see how you are, Sirs, empty in yourselves and therefore everlastingly searching for wisdom, love, kindness and understanding. You go from school to school, from people to people, to be taught, because in yourselves you are empty and you want to fill that emptiness by words without much meaning.

Love cannot be taught to you, nor wisdom. Wisdom comes into being when the mind is free from experience. Please listen to what I am saying. When the mind is free from experience, there is wisdom. But as long as there is the mind that is seeking experience, there must be the experiencer who is seeking it; such a mind can never be wise. Similarly, a heart which is seeking to fill itself with love, will only fill it with words without much meaning; it will be just empty words without meaning or conclusion. But one hates; that is the reality. One is miserable; that is what is. One is envious, ambitious; and that is the fact. How do you approach the fact? If I know I hate, it is very important to know how to approach it; if I

know how to approach, then there is the possibility of its dissolution. But if I do not know, then there is merely the suppression of that fact, which introduces another fact. So what is important is to understand the fact; and you cannot understand the fact if you condemn, judge, the fact. You would understand your child, only when you do not condemn him; you have to study him, which means, you must never condemn, never judge, never identify the child with yourself. If you similarly look at hate, ambition, there must be awareness without choice, without judgment; and that is extremely arduous because all our conditioning is to judge, condemn, to throw out, in order to get some other factor. So what we are doing everlastingly is finding a substitution to what is.

Only when there is freedom from hate, freedom from ambition and envy, then you will know what love is. Then also you will know what wisdom is; for, perhaps, love is wisdom. You cannot learn from another what love is, so also you cannot learn what wisdom is. No school, no book, no Master can teach you. It comes into being when you know all the secret recesses of your heart and that can only happen when the mind is very still.

December 19, 1953

MADRAS 6TH PUBLIC TALK 20TH DECEMBER 1953

For the past few weeks, we have been considering the problem of change. It seems to me one of the most difficult things in bringing about this change is the cessation of effort. Because, for us, change implies effort, does it not? We associate effort with change. To us, if we desire to bring about a change outwardly or inwardly, effort is implied, the action of the will. Is it possible to change at all radically, deeply, fundamentally without effort? Or, is there a radical revolution only when there is the cessation of effort? I would like to discuss this problem with you because it must have struck you, when you observe yourself and things about you, how from childhood we are taught that we must make an effort to change. That is all we know, and we have never enquired into the possibility of a change radically without effort. It seems to me that this point is very important. Kindly listen, not with any preconceived idea of what I am going to tell you this evening, not with a prejudiced experienced mind.

For most of us, change implies effort. I am this and, to become that, I must make an effort. In a school when we grow up and almost up to when we are dying, this process of constant effort is inculcated into us: we are conditioned with that idea, and that is all we know. We say there must be right effort, right endeavour, constant practice, constant control, discipline, shaping the mind by words, by explanations, by constant directive; and this continual effort is what we know, and with that we live. When we look into the process of effort more deeply, we see that is not effort, but only

effort is involved. There is this whole problem of power, gaining power not only in ourselves but over nature and also over others. We see man - not the man here, you and I, but man generally - increasing his power over nature, flight, under water, calculating the distance between the various stars, the astonishing brain of the man that can invent the atomic bomb and the super nuclear bombs, the astonishing brain that has produced all these things. All that implies not only the learning of a technique and the perfection of a technique but also the constant application of the mind to find, to discover - the enormous persistency of curiosity. In that is implied the problem of power, power over water, power over nature, power over others, to shape the lives of others, to change circumstances; all these always imply effort, but not for the man who really invents, who really sees something and is creative. So we are concerned with enlarging our power, power over others specially, by every crooked means or by the so-called idealistic means which are also crooked, in order to achieve a position, prestige. All that implies power, power to change the economic conditions of man, power of idea, power of word, power of personality, to drive, to make people change. All that we know. With that we are much too familiar. Does that radically bring about a change in ourselves? That is the problem, is it not?

Until we can bring about a fundamental revolution at the core of our being, the mere conquering of outward circumstances may lead to various forms of convenience; but in the process there is a greater, more destructive element brought into being. So it seems to me that, unless we can radically, deep at the root, bring about a radical change, superficial changes however vital, necessary and

immediate only cause further misery, further damage, further mischief. Every reform brings further misery, further problems. Again, with all that we are quite familiar. When we apply that process of power to ourselves we see that we want power over ourselves, which intoxicates us through asceticism or the extreme form of asceticism, the opposite of money, luxury, position, power, prestige and all the rest of it. We use virtue, love, the action of the will as a means of conquering ourselves, our idiosyncracies, and we think we are changing. But essentially when we go down to deeper layers, there it is still the same. When we are considering revolution, change, surely we are not concerned only with superficial changes which are necessary, but with the deeper issue - which is the revolution, total revolution, the integrated revolution of our whole being. Can that change be brought about by effort or must there be a cessation of all effort?

What does effort mean? With most of us, effort implies the action of the will, does it not? I hope you are following all this, because if you do not listen wisely, you will miss totally what I am going to say. If you listen wisely, you will directly experience what I am talking. Total revolution must be wholly unconscious, not voluntary, not brought about by any action of the will. Will is still the desire, still the `me', the self, at whatever level you may place that will. The will of action is still the desire and therefore it is still the `me', and when I suppress myself in order to be good in order to achieve, in order to become more noble, it is still desire, it is still the action of the will trying to transform itself, to put on a different clothing, it is still the will of the `me' trying to achieve a result.

Please, if I may request, listen not merely to the verbal effect

but also to the deeper significance of the words. Most of us do not listen at all. You are listening to my words, to my ideas, to what I am going to say, through your own interpretations, through your own experience; that is not listening, that is like looking through a dark glass; therefore you see nothing as it is. Similarly, we listen with a conclusion, with the previous knowledge, experience which is always translating what is being said; therefore, you are really not listening. The problem of listening is extraordinarily difficult because, consciously or unconsciously, we do not want to listen; because there is the fear of something happening, some new idea taking place unconsciously which will produce revolution. So, we only hear words without much significance. But if we can listen wisely - which is to listen without translation, without interpretation - then perhaps what I have said and what I will be presently saying will have a deeper significance.

It is very important to bring about a radical change, a revolution first, obviously, in ourselves - which is, in action, in relationship - which will produce a revolution in outward valuations. But the necessary and absolute revolution, a total and complete revolution, is not at all possible through the action of the will, because will is essentially a process of desire, and the action of the will is conditioned. That word 'conditioning' implies limited. I will change according to my conditioning, however wide, narrow, limited that conditioning may be. So my will to change is limited, according to my conditioning, according to my desire; and the change produced by the will of action is limited and therefore never radical. If we are concerned and if we have given thought to this problem at all, the change must be radical, not superficial,

because the problems which we have at present are so great that they need to be tackled radically, not superficially, not as a Hindu, as a Catholic, Communist, Theosophist or something or other. They must be approached totally differently; and because we are not doing it, we are creating more problems and not less. So we are concerned not only with the reduction of the problems, with the resolution of the problems, but also with the radical transformation of man's attitude, values and process of thinking. We must obviously find a way in which change comes into being without volition. You understand the problem? Please follow this because if you do not understand this, what will come after will have very little meaning.

We only know conscious effort, the conscious acquiring of a technique in order to produce a change. That is all we know. The conscious, active drive to change is born out of desire, and that desire is everlastingly conditioned; and if I change voluntarily or involuntarily from that basis, from that function, from whatever idea - however noble or ignoble, however brotherly or the opposite - it is bound to produce more problems. We know this, we are aware of it. But, have we given serious thought to it at all? So, seeing that, how is it possible to bring about revolution basically, radically, without introducing the action of the will? You see the problem? I want to change; and my whole education, social environment, influence in which I have been educated, is acquisitiveness; our social structure and the religious upbringing is based on acquisition. Now, I see that, and I want to change but not superficially, not through any action of will. Because will is still the result of acquisition; and therefore when the will says "I will

bring about action", that action will produce a change; but that change will still be the acquisitiveness.

How am I to produce, to bring about a radical transformation without the action of the will? That is an important question to put to yourselves. I see that every action produced by the will is limited, and therefore productive of greater misery and greater problems. Yet there must be a radical change. Is the radical change possible without the action of will? Let us put the problem differently.

We use function to acquire status. I use office as a means of psychological power. I am an official, a teacher, an engineer - which are all function - and I use that function as a means of acquiring position, prestige power - which is status. Most of us use, practically all of us use, function to acquire status, which is power. So there is conflict between the various functions because each one of us is seeking through function a psychological result. I hope you are following all this. So, in society, we are creating conflict, confusion and competition psychologically, using the function to acquire position. There must be function because otherwise we cannot live; the problem then is how not to acquire through function, status? So, we devise various means to control man, to limit him to function and not exude his desire towards status, position - which brings about calamity between each other. So, through various forms of social sanctions, religious edicts, the status which is the power is held, controlled, which again is the same problem; only that is in action. So when we are concerned with the problem of radical revolution, have we not to understand all these problems, all these issues and whether there is a

possibility of change without the action of will? I say, change is possible without the action of will. That is the only change, none other is change, none other is revolution. But to understand that, it requires a great deal of insight, a great deal of meditation - not the meditation of shutting eyes, gazing at a picture or image, or an imaginary phrase; but the meditation that reveals this whole process of effort.

That is if you are really listening now to what I am saying, you will be meditating; you are meditating, because through that listening, that watchful observation of what I am saying and watching your own mind in operation, you see how in everything you do there is the effort to change - which is the 'will of action' - and as you listen very quietly, you see that the 'will of action' comes to an end. Therefore, with that very ending of the will to act, is the beginning of radical transformation. Please listen.

The action of will is the 'me'; and whatever clothes, whatever change, whatever hopes, failures, sorrows the 'me' has, the 'me' wants, it is still within the field of the 'me'. So, in that, there is no revolution, and the 'me' is the action of the will. When the 'me' says 'I must not be ambitious. I must not be envious', the will that says 'I must not', wants to be something else negatively or positively. Therefore, it is still the 'me'. If you have really understood it - that is, if you are listening to it - you will see that the will of action comes to an end; and with that ending, there is a radical transformation; then you are no longer concerned with the 'me' changing. For instance, I am envious; and I act upon envy in order to change it, to change what is. But if there is an understanding of that, there is the cessation of the will of action,

then there is only the fact that I am envious. If there is no obstruction, no resistance, no judgment no condemnation, which are all the process of will, then that fact has no longer any significance, that fact does no longer affect the whole process of your thinking. So there is the cutting away, at the root, of the problem of acquisitiveness which no superficial, economic, communist or any other kind of revolution can bring about.

So, really this understanding demands a great deal of attention, self knowledge, self-knowledge being the observation of what you are in your relationship from moment to moment. Mere observation, not trying to change what is, is to see yourself in your relationship with your wife, your servant, your boss; is to see in a mirror what it is and not to bring the will of action upon it. Then you will find that a change comes into being unconsciously which is the radical revolution, which is not brought about by the conscious mind; and I assure you that the greatest miracle is to see and the thing ceasing to have any effect. So the mind becomes innocent, free; and it is only in such a free, innocent mind that reality can come into being. No search under the will of action can make the mind tranquil; the mind is tranquil only when it has understood the whole process of the will, the action of the will to be. The will to change comes to an end not through any form of compulsion but only when the mind really understands. When it is understood, there is an astonishing change, a revolution which is transcendental, which is not of the mind. It is only that revolution that can build a new house; and without that revolution, they labour in vain that build, they are mischief makers, they produce sorrow, they multiply problems. Therefore, it is very important for you and

me to understand this whole problem of effort. Perhaps you would like to ask questions out of this talk. If not I have some written questions.

Question: How can a cessation of effort be brought about?

Krishnamurti: That is what I have been talking about. Question: You advocate a small school for educating the young. But even in a small school, several teachers are necessary one for each subject. How can such a school be maintained in these days?

Krishnamurti: So, what is the function of a teacher? Is it merely to impart to the student a subject, a specialized knowledge, which means therefore, you must have innumerable teachers, one for each subject, for English, Mathematics, Geography, History, Physics and all the rest of it. That is, if each teacher imparts only his specialized knowledge, naturally you must have many teachers for a small school. If the teacher is merely a specialized entity, then he is not an educator, because he is only concerned with his subject and knows nothing else and therefore you must have many specialized human beings to teach the children. But even the teacher who has his own special knowledge - knowledge of his own subject - if he is intelligent can teach other subjects too, can he not?

Sirs, our difficulty in the modern world is we want immediate results, immediate success. We do not think in long terms, we think in short terms. We want our sons or daughters to pass the examination in order to get a job; that is all what we are concerned with. So we create an educational structure, where this specialist exists. But if we look at the long term - that is, see the implication of educating children - then the teacher is not only the giver of

information on his subject but he must also be an intelligent fearless human being. So the problem is not the multiplication of many teachers to teach, but teachers themselves having the capacity, intelligence, so that they can partake in different subjects. After all, this is not very difficult; if you are sufficiently intelligent, you can teach not only mathematics but also history. But neither the teacher nor the parent nor the society is intelligent. We do not really love our children. If we did, we would take care of so many things, of their diet, of the kind of teacher, the kind of school; and we would all be concerned with the larger problem. What is the point of education if the educated need be in arms, become lawyers or policemen - which are ways of destruction. They are the people who perpetuate wars. So we educate children to die. So that problem must be tackled but not just verbally; and it is not for me just to say how to do it, how to run a school with a few teachers. It is your problem as a parent, and unfortunately you are not interested in it. So the teacher, the low-paid entity, who is kicked around, who is the least intelligent, has the greatest responsibility in any society. You have heard all this before; but you have never acted upon it because you are really not interested in your children, nor are you really interested in the whole problem of the freedom of the child. So, until you take the responsibility as a parent and see these things are worked out, no Government is going to work them out for you. The Government can only condition the children and make them more and more efficient either to run the industries or to join the army. So, the question is not how to have fewer teachers in a small school, but how to bring about in our relationship an intelligence which is not limited, which is not afraid, but which is

really revolutionary, which is creative.

Question: Does not the mind need verbal preparation before direct perception is possible?

Krishnamurti: What is the mind? Please follow this. Listen to find out whether the mind can ever perceive directly anything true. The questioner wants to know whether the mind must not be prepared verbally to understand the words in order to perceive what is true. That is, does not the mind need verbal preparation before direct perception is possible?

Is perception, direct perception, made by the mind, the mind as it is? We have to find out what is the mind. The mind is memory, is it not?, the memory of all that you have learnt from childhood and all the experiences of the conditioning of the beliefs, dogmas, fears, hopes, longings. That is, the mind is thought is it not? Without thought there is no mind; and thought is based on the past - the past being memory, the past being time, the past being experience. To express all that experience, all that memory, you need words to communicate. So, word, memory, experience, time, is mind - which is, essentially thinking, thinking based on memory, the memory of pain and pleasure, the memory of a mind that is ambitious, that seeks power, position, prestige, uses others. That is the mind we have. Now you say that I must perceive with that mind, and you ask if I must not be verbally prepared to see what is true.

What do we mean by preparation verbally? Learning new words, learning the significance of conditioning, a definition, a conclusion, learning new authorities instead of old authorities, the tradition? Some kind of verbal preparation is necessary, is it not? -

not the conclusions, not a definition, but to know the meaning of words. Otherwise, you and I could not communicate. I want to tell you something; you want to tell me something; I translate what you are saying in terms of my conditioning, of my conclusion, of my tradition; then there is no possibility of communicating, you with me or I with you. But if I am prepared to put away all my conclusions and listen to the words which you are using, then I do not merely stick to the words but go behind and see the whole content beyond; such an insight requires consideration, it needs alertness, watchfulness. So a mind that is merely caught in thought, in words, in memory, can never perceive what is true; it is not still. The mind that is made still through your absurd meditations, compulsions, resistance, is not a still mind; it is a dead mind. But the mind that is really still is astonishingly active, alive, potent - not towards anything in particular. It is only such a mind which is verbally free, free from experience, from knowledge. Such a mind can perceive what is true, such a mind has direct perception which is beyond time.

The mind can only be silent when it has understood the process of time and that requires watchfulness, does it not? Must not such a mind be free, not from anything but be free? We only know freedom from something. A mind that is free from something is not a free mind; such freedom, the freedom from something, is only a reaction, and it is not freedom. A mind that is seeking freedom is never free. But the mind is free when it understands the fact, as it is, without translating, without condemning without judging; and being free, such a mind is an innocent mind, though it lived 100 days, 100 years, having all the experiences. It is innocent because it

is free, not from anything but in itself. It is only such a mind that can perceive that which is true, which is beyond time.

Question: What is meant by the love of God which is advocated by many books and teachers? Krishnamurti: I wonder what would happen if you had no books, no teacher. Would you be ignorant? Is there freedom from ignorance if you have the capacity to quote, to compare? Surely, mind which is thought ceases to function when it is caught in a conclusion, it is not active when it is held in a definition.

You want to know what the love of God is, as advocated by books and teachers. Now, suppose you do not have any advocate, would you want to know what love is - not the love of God because, for us, love of God is the hate of man? Sir, you laugh. But that is a fact. If you really love God and love man, you would not have all these absurd religions, all the innumerable rituals, temples. That is not love of God. Because you do not know what love is, you worship God. You put flowers, you sacrifice, you worship an engraved image, made by the hand or by the mind; and you call that love of God. That is not love, that is fear. Praying for success in this world and the world next is a sign of mediocrity. But the love of God is the love of man; the beginning is the love of man; because we do not know that, we turn to some mysterious thing called God and try to find out what that love is. You will never find it, because you do not love your neighbour, you do not know what love is, you do not love your children. Surely love must begin nearer and not far; and the difficulty with most of us is that we are too intellectual, too verbal, too conditioned in our thinking which we call intellectual.

We have cultivated the brain; we have never thought of the heart; we have filled out minds with words and we try to fill our heart with the word of love. So, surely to understand what love is - which is not merely the love of man to man or woman or child, but beyond all this - we must begin with that which is near, must we not? If I do not understand myself, my mind, how can I understand that which is far more complex, more extraordinary, more mysterious? We seek the mysterious and give it all kinds of significance. If we can understand the mystery of ourselves, then we will find that it leads to one of the most astonishing mysteries in life, to the greatest mystery which is God, which is truth. But that truth, that God, is not of the mind. It comes into being when I understand myself, when there is no hate, when there is no fear. It is only when there is the cessation of hate and not the transformation of hate into love, that there is a possibility of the mind being free from hate and fear then only it is possible to know what that love is which is not merely sensual - love of the senses. But that action implies self-knowledge and meditation.

Meditation of the heart is the beginning of wisdom. But to meditate, one requires essentially to understand the meditator - which is you, the thinker. Therefore it is essential to have self-knowledge, to know yourself, in all your talks, in all your motives, in all your words, in your relationship, to know what you are from moment to moment. That is meditation, that is the beginning of meditation. Without that, do what you will - concentrate, go beyond, do all kinds of tricks - they are not meditation, they are escapes from reality, they lead to illusion. So, the beginning of meditation is self-knowledge, which is wisdom.

December 20, 1953

MADRAS 7TH PUBLIC TALK 26TH DECEMBER 1953

I think most of us must be very concerned in a world that is divided between the catholics and the communists, the capitalists and the socia- lists, a world divided as orient or occident. In a divided world like this, the grave concern for those who are thoughtful, must be `What to do and what is the right action?' It is not so much what to do but how to think about the whole problem.

It seems to me important to enquire into what to do because that question `What to do?' obviously springs from the desire to follow a certain course of action. The implication of what to do is, is it not?, `Tell me the way, show me the way to act in a confused world of this kind where the Christian, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Mussulman, the Communist, each has an idea, an ideology, utopia, belief, a dogma. Each one of us belongs to one of the other of these. We think that, if we follow our particular system, we can shape the world, bring about clarity, a sense of well-being, individually as well as collectively. So, the following of a particular system, the action that springs from that system is what most of us are concerned with. So we ask "What has an individual to do?" Now, is that the problem, `what to do?' Please have patience and let us think out this problem together, because what I may suggest may be entirely different; and if you do not follow sufficiently attentively, closely, you might miss it and you will ask questions that will be irrelevant to the point. Instead of thinking `What to do?', must there not first be the feeling of ourness, `It is our world - not the Christian, not the Hindu, Buddhist or the

Communist; but it is our world, yours and mine?' You follow? We have not that feeling. We are Hindus and we want the Hindu world; or we are Mussalmans and want the Mussulman world; or the Communists the Communist World; or the Christian the Christian world - each desiring to make a world according to his 'ism.' But no one thinks of it as 'It is our world, something that you and I can build together, and that it is your responsibility as well as mine to build it.' The feeling, 'it is ours,' is as you would have when you enter your house - a feeling of care, of love of the earth and the things thereof; the extraordinary feeling that you have when something belongs to you and you nourish it, you care for it, you want to protect it, guide it, help it. You have none of these feelings. You have only ideas, systems, philosophies; and according to those, you want the world to live, to be, to exist. You have not the feeling that it is our world, that you and I are building it together, not as Christians, or Hindus or Communists or Socialists, but as two human beings.

That is a very complex problem, developing each other's intelligence to meet the problem. All that is totally denied when we say 'What am I to do?' The feeling that it is our world, is an extraordinary feeling; it is not a sentimental or emotional feeling but a true feeling, a feeling that you have about a tree that is in your garden a pet dog, a cat, a human being. When you consider something as yours, think of the extraordinary care you bestow on it! Without cultivating that extra ordinary feeling that it is ours - our world, our earth, our rice field, mango tree, the richness of the earth - we turn to ideas, systems, and thereby hope to build a different world. What is important nowadays is not the

technological issue of how to run the world; that is very simple because we have got all the machinery, all the science, the information, the know-how of what to do with things. But as long as the world is divided - Christian, Hindu, Communist, Socialist, the Orient, the Occident - we shall never solve this problem. So it seems to me that the most important thing is not what to do but to bring about this feeling that it is our world, our earth, our garden. From that extraordinary vital feeling, we can discuss what to do; then, I do not think that question 'What to do?' will ever arise.

So I would like this evening to discuss the problem, 'What is it that prevents this extraordinarily rich feeling, rich mind, this rich freedom, the abundance of it when we feel it is our world? There is only one culture; the forms may vary, the expressions may vary; but there is only one feeling which creates the thing though it may be expressed in different ways, orient or occident. But without the feeling, that astonishing sense of this world as yours and mine to build together, we shall not succeed in creating a different world in which, though there may be in equality, the psychological distinction of status is gone. That is what I want to discuss, if we can, this evening.

The problem is this: what is it that prevents this rich feeling that this world is ours, that it is happy to live in a world which is so abundant, on earth that is so productive and that does not belong to some greedy, avaricious capitalists or lawyers or is not under the power of some commissars. What is it that prevents this thing? That is what we ought to go into, and see if we cannot, not temporarily but radically, cut away that impediment.

One of the most difficult things in all our culture, either of the

orient or of the occident, is the psychological attitude towards life. We are all followers. We follow and, therefore, we create a world of hierarchy. Though you are all followers of various forms of hierarchy, please listen to what I am saying. Do not just brush it aside and say 'It is one of his pet aversions, pet complexes, conditioning.' We are not discussing inequality because the world is unequal, not equal. You have more brains than I have. You are totally different from me in many ways. You have gifts which I have not. You appreciate beauty, music and the things of refinement; and I do not. Below me, there are still people unequal and who have no such gifts, capacity, intelligence as I have. So there is inequality; it is a fact which you and I must accept and not brush aside. You may develop your capacity to an astonishing extent; I may have very little and I do not know what to do with it. It is no good trying to bring about equality in that, but we can approach the inequality quite differently. Inequality ceases when there is no comparison, when I do not compare myself with you or with another.

We have to accept the inequality as a fact; but it is much more important to break down the hierarchical attitude towards life - the high and the low, the master, the guru, the worship of authority either of Sankara or any one of the leaders - to cut down this sense of acceptance, following. Following is all we know, is it not?, 'Tell me what to do and I will try to do it.' You have innumerable examples of saints, saviours; and you imitate them, try to follow them. In the very attitude of following, you have set up authority. This hierarchical attitude towards life, this authoritarian justification, evaluation, is one of the most fundamental causes of

all division in this world; and until we really tackle that problem, not accept it, but understand it, see the significance of it, go into it profoundly in ourselves, psychologically, inwardly, we shall not be the creators of a new world. This world will not be our world, yours and mine; it will be somebody else's world according to somebody else's ideas, systems. What we are talking about is of radical revolution and not mere substitution of authority. So, as long as there is authority, the psychological authority of superior and inferior, the one who knows and the one who does not know, the one who does not know follows the other in order to be safe, to be secure. That is why we follow. All our systems of authority are based upon following - psychologically, spiritually and inwardly. I am talking not of an engineer who knows how to build; he is merely an engineer and I treat him as an engineer, as a function; psychologically, I do not follow him. But the moment I create the psychological inward authoritarian value, build a hierarchy of ideas, of people, we shall not create a new world; it will be a most destructive world, as before, with wars and divisions; it will not be our world - yours and mine. So it is your problem, our problem, to discuss this, to find out the truth of it and break it down entirely, totally, in ourselves and to eradicate it. Why do we follow a guru, a master, one who is going to lead us to truth? We follow for the obvious reason that he will help us to get through; getting through is the method; and that which he will give or point out and to which he will guide, is safety, happiness, security and certainty. That is all we are concerned with. We call that certainty, that happiness, that goal as God, Truth or some other name. But in essence, fundamentally what we want is the sense of being secure

psychologically, inwardly certain; and wanting that, we follow. So we create authoritarian values, the master, the disciple; and we believe we are gradually achieving masterhood. But behind the desire, the urge, is this immense craving for certainty. It is a psychological fact that when you follow, you seek certainty, success, like when you follow your boss in a factory or in a school. You know very well why you are doing it. You may totally disagree with him but you want to be economically or psychologically secure. So the following creates a hierarchy in our thinking - socially, mentally and emotionally. We create it. Watch the way you talk to your servants and the way you approach your boss, spiritual or otherwise, with clasped hands or garlands. But with the servant you have a special language, with a kick. You talk of brotherhood. It is all phony because you psychologically want to be sure that you will come ultimately to be a master, to have reached a level which the others have not, in which you are well entrenched, certain, assured. So you create a world of authority. All religions are based on that, are they not? All societies who preach brotherhood follow masters. They are essentially authoritarian.

Now, those who are concerned have this problem: 'Not how to live with out authority but why does the mind create an authority, and can the mind drop authority?' Please follow this a little bit closely. I follow authority. My guru, my law whatever it is, is my authority. I have the hierarchical outlook: 'You are nearer the master; I am going to follow you, the Priest, the Bishop' who has not only economic division but also spiritual division. I see the whole absurdity of authority and that to follow authority is not spiritual; I see it is gross, material, materialistic, though clothed

under the spiritual words of 'brotherhood', 'love' and all that nonsense. I want to break away from it; I break away from it, when I see the impossibility of intelligence working while following authority; so I drop following authority. Then, through action, I want to prove to myself that I have dropped it; I leave the society, or I say to myself that I must not follow anybody, that I must not follow any spiritual leader, though economically I may have to follow someone a little bit painfully; there is going to be no more spiritual leaders for me because it is all nonsense. It is very important to understand this.

To follow another - a guru, a tradition, an ideal - is the most destructive thing you can possibly do, because you are then destroying, by comparing, your own intelligence, your own freedom and the discovery of what is real. When you compare yourself with another, you want to become like him, to have power, position, prestige, patronage like him. You have this constant urge to become better and better, in which there is no end. So, you really do not understand what you are. Ideals also create hierarchy - the one who is nearer and the other who is not nearer. So if I am at all serious, if I am at all earnest in my endeavour, I understand this whole process of living. I drop the following of another. But, I want to prove to myself that I have dropped. That is what we are concerned with. I follow, then I drop following; then I want to be sure that I have dropped following, my action is going to show it, I will no longer do rituals because that is tradition, that is based on hierarchy, imitation. The very process of authoritarian judgment of valuation, is imitation, copying, comparing. To prove to myself that I have dropped the authoritarian evaluation, I am

going to find out through action if I have dropped it or not; I am going to give up rituals, I am going to give up Masters, to drop being a member of a particular sect or society because, through action, I am going to prove to myself that I have dropped it. That is it. You follow? To me, action is proof that I am sincere in what I believe, is it not?

I believe hierarchy to be the most stupid way of acceptance of hierarchical judgment, values, following; and I wish to prove it to myself, and I think that I must do certain things; and I do those things - which shows that I am an honest person in my thought, in my outlook because I have shown it through my action. I may have lost my job because of this; but I feel I am very honest because I am following what I think to be true. But if you go behind that action through which you want to see whether you have dropped the hierarchical principle or not, you will find that, through action, you are seeking certainty, that you are doing the right thing. You understand? I followed in order to be certain in order to be assured that I was doing the right thing, not making a mess of my life. That is why I follow another. Now I see the absurdity of it, and drop following; but, through action, I want to be assured that I am doing the right thing by not following. I have not changed at all. Only I have changed my coat. I used to follow but I do not follow now; yet, the inner `me' is still the same because I want to be sure that I will thrive in not following. Therefore, though I have discarded authority, I have created another form of authority. So what we are concerned with is the action that proves that I am honest, and the honesty is the sign of certainty. You see how the mind deceives itself.

I have followed; I have given up certain things which the spiritual bosses demanded; I have dropped following. Now, I want to prove to myself that I am not following, by doing certain things - behind which is the fact that I still want to be sure of the sense that I am doing the right thing. You understand, Sirs, what I am talking? You have followed: and you see that the very nature of following is criminal, unspiritual, disintegrating and will lead you to nowhere. So you say to yourself, 'I had better listen to that man; he has reputation etc; so I had better be quite sure that I drop that and, through action, prove to myself that I am not following.' So you are concerned with action that will show that you are honest; and being honest is to be certain. You understand?

You follow to be certain, you give up to be certain. So you have not changed at all. You have played a trick. The mind has played a trick upon you. The mind creates illusion when it seeks to be certain. But it is only a radical revolution of the mind, which is going to create a new world and not an illusion. You have followed, you have created illusion, a hierarchy. If you follow another, you cannot like to be yourself. If you follow another, there is no self-knowledge. If you follow another, however noble, wise, you will not know the workings of your own mind; and without knowing, without self-knowledge, there is no wisdom. So, if there is a desire to be certain, the mind creates an illusion. Now what we are concerned with is the power to create illusion from which there is action. If there is to be a fundamental deep revolution, this power of creating illusion must stop, which means really that the desire to be certain - the psychological demand for safety, for assurance, for encouragement - must come to an end.

So, if you say that you are following and then dropping it and, through that, your mind is still craving to be certain, what are you to do? It is the mind that wants to prove to itself, through action, that it is doing the right thing. That is all we know, is it not? That is all our life. Action will prove that I am honest, that I am respectful, that I am this. But the proof of your action is born of this illusion, the escape of the mind which wants to be certain.

If you have followed so far, the next thing that is important is not to prove to yourself that you have dropped the ugly authoritarian evaluation or to find out whether you are following, but to find out if you have radically cut at the root of the problem - which is, that the mind, as long as it follows its own ideals, its own demands to be certain, its own cravings, will create illusion, and the cutting away of the power to create this illusion is what we are concerned with. You might say 'what has all this long, complicated talk to do with action? I want to know what to do, and you tell me all this rigmarole.' But without this rigmarole, your action will lead to mess, confusion, as it is doing now. So, what is important is to see the fallacy of following and to cut it, to drop following, and not to want to prove to yourself through action that you are not following. When we want action to convince us, we want action to spring from the known; we have no action springing from the unknown. It is the action that is springing from the unknown, that is the liberating, creative action - not the action that is born from the known saying 'I have given up and I am going to show that to myself.' You can be sincere and yet be caught in illusion. You can prove to yourself that you are doing the right thing; but the doing of the right thing will be the outcome of an illusion.

So action born from freedom, freedom from all authority, is creative. We can build together; and then you and I can say we have no spiritual authority, and we can build this world which is yours and mine. You are not my spiritual leader. You may know a little about mathematics, build houses, bridges, by stresses and strains; but you are not my authority spiritually, I am not following you. Therefore, you and I are discovering together how to build this world because it is our world. It is only the mind that is free from all authority, that can do this. Because we have been wrongly educated, because we have been conditioned so heavily in authority, we think that freedom will come at the end. So what is important is to understand the process of the mind - the ways of its thought, how it creates illusions, but not what are illusions - and to understand that there is the creation of illusion as long as the mind wants certainty. This certainty creates the follower and the leader; and the moment you have that relationship of a follower and a leader, you will create a world in which there will be no sense of yours and mine, of our world. There will not be that feeling. There will be the commissars, warmongers, the capitalists, exploiters - spiritual or otherwise. If you want to understand all this process, you have to go into this problem of action.

Perhaps you would ask questions out of this talk. If not, I have got some questions written down.

Question: A vast number of people are inclined to think that another is more intelligent than themselves, and therefore they follow.

Krishnamurti: Sirs, what is intelligence? Does intelligence consist in comparison? If you follow this for a minute, you will

see. When a teacher in a school compares one boy with another, is he making him intelligent by comparison, or is he destroying him by comparing him with the cleverer boy? You understand, Sirs? Are you not destroying by comparing one boy with another boy, one human being with another human being. When you compare yourself with another, the master with the disciple, by all these ugly horrors, are you not destroying yourself? Is that destruction intelligence? So, what is intelligence? Intelligence is that state when you are not comparing. In understanding what you are, you do not really compare yourself with somebody else. But in a school imparting the so-called education in which all of us have been brought up and in which we have all been conditioned, we are always comparing. Therefore we are destroying that thing by the way we talk. When you compare your sons - the elder with the younger - and you want the younger to work, to imitate, to copy, to struggle, to push up, to be as good as the elder, it means really that the younger is not important at all, you have an idea what the elder is, and you are pushing the younger into that. You call that education, you call that intelligence!

So to have this radical revolution, there must be no comparison. Surely, we are human beings, Sirs. You are as good as I am. We are human beings, suffering, struggling and understanding. You are not my master, I am not your follower. To create a new world, we must think of all this totally, differently. I can only think totally differently when I do not compare. I am what I am. I want to understand what I am. I may be the greatest idiot; I want to understand what I am because out of this idiocy something marvellous would come; but if I smothered, I remain an idiot for

the rest of my life.

So, Sirs, if there is to be radical revolution there must be radical thinking, and thinking does not come by mere action. Action is not the proof of the integrity of thought. The integrity comes when you understand what you are, whatever you are. You cannot understand what you are, if you are comparing, judging, beating out. To look at things as they are is the greatest thing; and therefore a free mind will not create any illusion.

Question: Is not the idea of one world an utopia?

Krishnamurti: I did not say any thing about one world. I talked of the world that is ours. That is not utopia. You can make of it into an utopia, an ideal which you are practicing, all the nonsense which are escapes from the actual fact that it is our world. You and I are living in the world but we do not know how to live in it together. I say it is only possible to make that world ours when we have not a leader and a follower.

Question: If we give up authority what is it we are living for? In giving up authority, is there another form of security?

Krishnamurti: That is just what I have been talking about all this evening. A mind that follows security and the demand for security, creates hierarchy in the authority, which is the poison of our present society. That is very clear. It is not giving up that matters but the desire to be certain. I want to be certain that I am living rightly according to the Bhagavad Gita, according to the Master, according to Stalin, according to somebody else. I want to live rightly and so I ask the Masters behind the hills, ask the gurus round the corner. So the moment I want to be certain, secure, I have created an authority, and that is the greatest illusion which the

mind can create, because it destroys freedom and therefore creativeness.

Sirs, how many of you are really free from imitation? You all know the Bhagavad Gita by heart. You do not know anything about yourself; or, if you know about yourself, it is from Sankara. Sirs, you live and you all aspire for a noble life - which is, copying, imitating and repeating; and that is what you call a noble life. But you never discover for yourself what you are, you never discover truth. You may say you are a great soul, Atman, as stated by Sankara or Buddha; that is all nonsense because that is repetition, that is false. Even though Sankara or Buddha said it, you have to find the truth through every day, discovery from moment to moment.

Question: What is spontaneous action?

Krishnamurti: This is not the moment for that. We are discussing this spontaneous mind in which there is no authority, in which there is no sense of security. I will not answer that question now.

Question: If everybody thinks of his individual liberty then where is the question of feeling ourness?

Krishnamurti: Are you individually free? You are conditioned, you are not a free individual. But to understand your conditioning, to understand it fully, requires a great deal of work, does it not? Freedom is not a thing that you can easily buy. You do not know what it means. When you talk of freedom, you think you must be free according to me, or according to the pattern, or according to the idea. All that is not freedom. Freedom means something entirely different. It means being free in itself. There is such a state

of being free in itself and not from something. That is what I have been talking about, being free, not free of authority, of the hierarchy; because, you have cut at the root of authority, and that is going to produce action. The cutting is going to produce action, and there is not the action that is going to prove that you have cut it. If you really understood what you are, then you will not want prestige, power, position and patronage; you will not think of your individual liberty; you are free.

Question: May we know if you yourself have experienced that state of freedom? Krishnamurti: Sirs, why do you want to know? Please do listen. Do not laugh. I am not giving a clever, smart answer. You see how the mind works very cleverly. This is a meeting in which no discussion is possible. Discussions are over. To morrow will be the last day of the talks.

The gentleman wants to know if I have experienced directly that freedom. Please see the importance of that question and the implications of that question. Is it setting up of authority when I say 'Find out for yourself?' When I say there is, is that setting up of authority? If you followed it, it would be authority. But I am cutting at the very root of authority by saying 'Find out for yourself. Do not follow another'. Why do we ask such questions? The gentleman says that you should not follow what I say. What have I said that you should follow? I have pointed out to you, if you have followed the talk, the workings of your minds, the operations of deception, how the mind thinks it has given up when it actually has not given up, how the mind creates illusion. I have not told you what to do. Therefore you are not following. I am showing the ways of your own mind. I have several times said to

you to follow nobody including myself. To follow anybody, including myself, is the most destructive, deteriorating factor in life. But do not misapply.

It is very interesting to find why this gentleman said. `We are not going to follow and why the other asked `Do you know that freedom?

Question: The gentleman who says `Give up authority,' clings to authority.

Krishnamurti: I am afraid you have not followed at all what I have been talking about. I said to you at the beginning of the talk that the mind creates authority and accepts it or rejects it, and the very rejecting of it and the seeking of proof is another form of authority. There is only one process, one way of looking at it, the dropping of it but not being convinced that you have dropped it. I went into the problem how the mind works, and this really demands attention. It is really a process of meditation, not the attention of enforced thought but the attention that comes when you are really interested in something which is of vital importance.

This question is a vitally important question because it is confronting the whole world, the commissar and the worker, the Pope and the layman. The whole problem is there. Do not brush it aside. That is what we are tackling and, to understand it, you must follow it. There must be meditation. This is very important, not to be accepted or rejected but which requires extraordinary insight; and that insight can only come when you understand the working of your mind, why the mind creates authority and accepts it or rejects it, and how the very rejecting of it is another form of authority. That is what we have been discussing. It is very

important to see this thing as a whole and not because you belong to some society, or because you have some power over somebody else. It is a complex problem that necessitates your thinking very deeply about it; and you cannot think deeply if you are attached to any authority.

December 26, 1953

MADRAS 8TH PUBLIC TALK 27TH DECEMBER 1953

For the last four weeks we have been discussing what, I think, is a very important problem, which is, the way of total revolution, not the method, not the system, not how to bring it about, but the necessity of such a state. There is a vast difference between the two: the method or how to bring about such total revolution in oneself, and seeing the importance and the necessity of total revolution. The way, the system, the method, will not bring it about, because the method implies practice, repetition, routine, thereby bringing about a mediocre mind. But if one can see that it is essential to have total revolution in oneself - not at any one particular level of our consciousness, not the economic or social or environmental, but a total psychological revolution - if one can see the importance of it, the necessity of it, the urgency of it, then it will not be a conscious revolution but an unconscious involuntary revolution. That is what we have been discussing through different angles, from different points of view.

I would like this evening, if I can, to discuss how is it possible to bring about a fresh mind, a new mind, a mind that is not condemned by the past, a mind that is not merely the outcome of a time process; how to bring about, how to have a mind unburdened, a mind totally innocent. That is necessary, because all the leaders - economic, social, religious - have totally failed; because we still have wars; appalling miseries in the world, starvation, social divisions, growing unemployment, overpopulation and so on. Each of us who are at all serious has tried to solve these problems

according to his knowledge, according to his experience, according to his system, according to the communist, socialist, capitalist, Catholic, or Hindu ideal; and we have not solved them. The problem is not that we have not fully, completely, practiced the ideals of Hinduism or Catholicism or Capitalism or Communism, intelligently or continuously. Because, the ideals and the practicing of ideals make the mind incapable of meeting the fresh challenge; and the practicing is only a constant repetition, the dulling of the mind, making the mind mediocre, small, petty, and bringing about the pursuit of the ideal. So what matters is not the ideal nor a better system, nor the search for a better system, a better philosophy, a better leader; the very following of authority is destructive, is disintegrating.

Is it not necessary to have a fresh mind, not an open mind, but a totally new mind to meet all these problems? Is it possible? I do not know if you have asked this question of yourselves. We have always asked how to meet the problem, what methods we should adopt, what ideals we should practice, the way; but we never set to ourselves that we must have a new mind, a totally innocent mind that can meet the problems, a fresh mind uncluttered, a mind that can see the problem without any bias. So when we enquire into that, should we not go into that question of what is experience, because it is the experience that is dulling the mind? That is, does experience, as we know it, help to meet this extraordinarily complex problem of living? If I may suggest, it is important to know how to listen. You are listening obviously from experience, you have conclusions, you have had innumerable experiences, various trials, sorrows, afflictions, and with that background you

are listening you are listening with a conclusion. Is that listening at all? If I listen to what you are saying, which may perhaps be new, different, with a mind already entrenched in a particular ideology, in a particular experience, in a specific knowledge, can such a mind listen? That may be one of our difficulties because I feel that if we can listen rightly, we shall be able to break down the whole process of the mind that is entrenched in a particular point of view. So there is an art of listening, and I think it is very important specially when we are dealing with the problems that confront each one of us.

Various leaders - economic, social, spiritual, and so on - have not solved our problem; and no leader will ever solve our problem - no guru, no Master - because the problems are created by each one of us. The only person that could solve the problem is none other than each one of us, as there are no leaders any more. It may be that each one of us will become a leader to himself; and to bring about the leadership in oneself or to oneself as understanding, liberation, I think it is very important to enquire into this whole question of experience - that is, what our mind is. The mind is the result of experience not only of these few years but the experience of centuries of man, man throughout the world, not just here. There is this process of experience going on all the time. After all, life is experience, living is experience; there is the impact of life all the time going on whether you are conscious or unconscious of it. When you walk down the street, when you meet a person, when you read, listen to music, when you see the stars, the shades of the evening, when you talk, when you cry, when there is the anguish to find out - all that implies, does it not?, experience, the impact of

various reactions of the mind to those impacts. That is experience, and the experience is the outcome of our conditioning, is it not? That is fairly simple. I experience according to my background. The back ground is either the conscious or the unconscious, the residue of all thoughts, of all experiences, of all knowledge. After all, that is my mind, that is your mind. It is the store house of experience and that experience does not react to any new stimuli, any new challenge, but translates the new challenge, the new demand, according to its conditioning, according to its background. So, the new challenge, the new demand, the new problem only strengthens the background; it does not liberate the background. I think that is fairly clear, is it not?

There is a challenge, there is a problem. I who am a Communist or some kind of 'ist' or belonging to something, meet that problem according to my conditioning, the way I have thought, the way I have lived, the way I have been educated. So instead of the problem or the challenge liberating my mind, I translate the problem, the challenge, according to my education, according to my conditioning, according to my ideology, according to my belief, dogma. So, in the process of translation, my background, my conditioning is strengthened. It is not weakened. So, my mind is all the time gathering, strengthening in its own conditioning, in its own background, in its own limitation, in its own pettiness, narrowness and in its own beliefs, and there is never liberation from experience. I think it is very important to understand this, because we generally say 'Life will teach us.' The more experience you have, you think you are more wise; the more you read, the more you search, the more you enquire, practice, you think you are

achieving more.

If you really go much deeper and look at it, you will find there is always this entity that is accumulating, that is gathering. This entity is already conditioned; and so it is always translating, living, using every experience, every new challenge, every new problem in terms of the old, and therefore strengthening itself; so strengthening is the process of time. After all, that is what we mean by time, is it not?, not the time by the clock, but the time process of thought - I was, I am and I shall be. That is the whole psychological process of and in that time, we are gathering experience, and our mind is the experience. Now, with that mind we approach all life's problems. I hope I am making myself clear. Because that is the only mind you and I have, not a higher mind or a lower mind. Because, the higher mind is still a thought process. The higher mind has been invented by thought, and thought is the result of time, experience; and therefore the higher self is still within the field of the mind. Therefore, it is incapable of meeting the problem. Though you may look to it, pray for it, long for it, the higher self, the thing that you are looking to as the higher entity is still within the field of time, which is the process of thought. When you look at the self, the mind, to solve the problem, you are still creating illusion of time and there is no solution. So if that is clear, if you are really paying attention, you will see that all experience only conditions the thought process.

So, can a mind which is experiencing, which is caught in experience, a mind which is bound, held in tradition, in knowledge, can such a mind be a fresh mind? Obviously not. Is it possible, not how is it possible, to have a fresh, uncontaminated and innocent

mind and yet have experience? You cannot live without experience, living is the process of experiencing; without experience, life is not possible; there is experience or death. Is it possible to have a fresh mind though it is experiencing? Please follow. This is an important question because the revolution of which I have been talking implies that, and implies having a mind which, though it is experiencing is not contaminated by experience and therefore is capable of meeting the problem afresh.

Am I talking Greek? I feel there is no contact of what I am saying with what you are thinking.

Look, Sirs, we have problems at different levels of our existence - not the problem of bread and butter, or the problem of war. There is this whole problem of living, inequality, brutality, death, war, sorrow, hatred, acquisitiveness, the sense of antagonism. There is this whole existence implying all that. Now we have always to approach this problem of living with a conditioned mind - as a Hindu, as a Theosophist, as a Catholic, as a Buddhist, as a Communist and so on. So we are translating the problem according to our conditioning, and we are acting according to that translation; such action only strengthens our conditioning, and therefore there is no liberation. So, should not one ask oneself whether it is possible to have an uncontaminated mind, a fresh mind, a mind which is innocent, though it is living with its innumerable experiences?

What makes the mind contaminated? That is the problem. What makes the mind dull, stupid, routine, bound to routine, bound to habit, tradition? What makes the mind decay, grow old? If the mind can remain fresh, not decaying, not deteriorating, then

experience cannot contaminate it, though we have to live, though there is experience.

What is the thing, or the way, or the process, that makes the mind corrupt? Let us think out this problem together. Do not listen to me to tell you what it is. If you are waiting in the hope that I will discuss it presently, if you are waiting merely for me to tell you, you become a mere automaton waiting to be told what to do. That is the very state of mind which is the deteriorating factor, to be told what to do, what to think. Our education is, is it not?, `What to do and what to think? All our religions tell us what to do and what to think. But there is not the release, the creative power of enquiry. So please do not wait for me to tell you. Let us find out together.

What is this thing that makes the mind dull, that makes the mind all deteriorating? One of the major factors is effort - this constant struggle to become, the struggle to do the right thing, to be successful, the struggle to understand, the struggle and the practicing of virtue, the following of an idea or ideal. Because of this everlasting struggle of the mind, the mind has never a moment of tranquillity, or rest. You watch your own mind; it is never, even for a moment, quiet, quiet by itself. A mind that is enforced or disciplined to be quiet, is a dead mind. There is this constant struggle of the lawyer trying to become a judge, and the clerk trying to become the boss, the pupil trying to become the master; there is this constant struggle to become; and there is never a moment of being. Such a mind, both conscious and unconscious, is like a machine that is running all the time ceaselessly. The consciousness is everlastingly in movement, ever lastingly pushing and pushing, struggling and struggling to acquire, struggling to

change, struggling to understand, struggling to fulfil, and when not fulfilling, feeling thwarted, agonised, held, finding resistance, hindrance, blockages; and having ambitions, successes. That is our life. How can the mind that is everlastingly struggling be a fresh mind? The problem is not how such a mind can become a fresh mind; such a mind can never be come a fresh mind. But if such a mind ceases its activity of everlasting struggle to be, then there is a possibility of the conditioned state ceasing and the mind being a fresh mind.

After all, the thing that we call the `Me', the `I', is the entity that is gathering experience. Is that the entity that is everlastingly struggling? Please follow this, Sirs. If you really listen, you will see an extraordinary thing that will take place in front of truth; there is a disintegration of the `I', and therefore there is the possibility of a fresh mind, a mind that is really experiencing what is true, and therefore the mind itself is the truth.

What is after all the `I', the `Me'? That is the centre of the struggle, that is the centre of ambition, this everlasting becoming - I was, I am, and I shall be - and that is the centre, that is the deteriorating factor that makes the mind corrupt, that makes the mind dull, heavy, stupid, mediocre. Just see the fact that the struggle is the central factor of deterioration, the struggle of the `Me' becoming something, and therefore never a moment of real tranquillity, real stillness of the mind. A still mind can experience and yet be uncontaminated. But a mind that is acquiring, pushing, struggling gathering, in itself experiencing - such a mind is a deteriorating factor. Simply see the thing as it is - not as I am describing but actually what is taking place in your own mind.

We have had discussions for the last four weeks, every morning at 7:30 A.M. But this is not a meeting of that kind. We are together here trying to enquire into the process of the mind. There are innumerable problems still, which I have not touched. But if one can understand the major root, the major factor that is destroying our minds, that is corrupting our minds, that is making our minds dull, mediocre, then one will see that it is only the still mind, the mind that is not becoming, the mind which is still, that can experience without gathering. The factor of gathering anything is deteriorating; it is that factor of gathering that must be understood, that must be seen, and not how to put away that factor. The moment you understand that accumulation, gathering, is the destructive factor, the mind will cease to gather; really the mind then is capable of being still and experiencing; but the experiencing is no longer the gathering process of memory which will be used for further experiencing.

A mind that is understanding, that sees the truth of becoming, of being, that sees the truth of gathering - such a mind is a still mind; and a still mind can experience without corrupting itself. Then the still mind can know, go deeper into the extraordinary state which no conscious mind or disciplined mind or a mind that is gathering can ever touch. Truth or God is not to be gathered, it is only from moment to moment. A mind that is continually becoming, that only knows the continuity of becoming, can never know the truth.

I think instead of your asking me questions as you did yesterday about the things I have talked just now, it may be better that I answer these questions that have been given to me. But really I am not answering them as there is no answer.

Question: What is a tender mind?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, as I said, I am not answering questions from the audience this evening. I am only answering questions that have been given to me written down. As I was saying, I am not answering questions because there is no answer and there are only problems. You understand? Sirs, there are only problems and no answers. If I can understand the problem completely, totally, understand the inward nature of the problem, I need not seek the answer. It is easy to ask questions but it is extremely difficult to uncover the problem and to go to the root of the problem, to understand it. So I am not answering. What we are doing is exploring the problem together; and in the exploration of that problem, you will see the truth of the problem, and the truth of the problem will free the mind from the problem. But if you wait for an answer, like a school boy, then you will miss what we have been talking about.

Question: I have listened to you for a long time. My mind has grown dull, weary, with endless repetition of a few basic statements. Is there any hope of my liberation?

Krishnamurti: The questioner says that he has listened for a long time, his mind has become dull, weary by the few basic statements made by me.

The problem is, has he listened at all? Please do listen, Sirs. This is not a matter of laughter. This is not a political meeting or a meeting of amusement or entertainment, and after 20 or 40 minutes you need distraction and therefore you laugh. The problem is: has he listened? If he has listened for a life time, naturally he has grown weary because he has been listening, has he not?, according

to his background, according to his fixations, his formulations, his experiences. He is not listening. That is why, Sirs, to listen properly is an astonishing thing. If I know how to listen to one truth, one thing that is truth, that one thing is going to be the liberating factor. A mind becomes dull through routine, and is so eager to gather, to accumulate. You have to just listen sweetly without any argumentation. When in front of a magnificent scenery, in front of a lovely thing, if your mind is chattering or comparing itself with another, do you ever see the magnificent thing? Because your mind is occupied with comparison, you do not see. So, if you can just listen without comparing, that very listening will tell you whether the thing that is being spoken is true or false. The truth of that will bring to the mind a freedom from innumerable burdens effortlessly. You are not listening; your mind is either already dull or already gone dull or already gone away somewhere else.

Sirs, it is a great art just to listen not only to another but to oneself, to all the prompting, to all the unconscious demands, motives, pursuits, desires, and to be aware of them choicelessly. That very awareness without choice will show you the truth of that motive and the truth of this is the creative factor, the liberating factor.

Question: Is it not better to have a contented mind than a still mind? In that case, do not the problems themselves cease to exist?

Krishnamurti: What is the problem, to have a contented mind or a still mind? Is it not a problem that your mind is not contented, is not still, is disturbed is confused? Being confused, you say "I must have a contented mind or a still mind." So you are pursuing again a

contented mind, or gathering or saying "How is my mind to be still?" Sirs, contentment is something which comes into being when I understand what is. What is important is not to have a contented mind but to understand the things as they are, not as you like them to be, to understand what is. Sirs, look! I am envious, and my mind is struggling not to be envious; and I think that, by becoming non-envious, I shall have a contented mind. But instead of pursuing the ideal which is utterly illusive, which is not existent, if I understood the whole content of envy, that which is in actuality, in reality, the thing as it is - 'I am envious' - then with that understanding comes the contentment of the mind. To understand the thing as it is requires an extraordinary awareness in which there is no comparison, no judgment, no condemnation - to look at it as it is, not as you would like it to be, not as something different which you wish it to be. That requires extraordinary insight; and out of that insight, the mind becomes quiet, which you may call contentment. A mind that is contented is a shallow mind. It is like the mind of a cow.

A still mind is entirely different from a contented mind. A still mind is acutely active. But that activity is not the activity of getting, conquering, making, gathering and progressing. That is not active. That is death, decay, deterioration. The mind is still, with the understanding of what is, the thing I am and not what I think I am, the thing that I am - envious, jealous, anxious, fearful, struggling, afraid of what my neighbours say, afraid of my uncertainty, afraid of my job. To understand myself as I am requires a choiceless awareness in which there is no condemnation but watching without any deflection, without any destruction.

Seeing the thing as it is brings about the breaking down of a mediocre mind, and it is only that mind that really understands, that is capable of receiving that which is eternal.

Question: What we have learnt about meditation from our sacred books, from our spiritual leaders, seems to be essentially different from what you term as meditation. Will you kindly go into this?

Krishnamurti: Sirs let us see what is meditation because this is a very important problem and if I know how to meditate, then the problem of existence will be understood. Can I learn meditation from another, from the sacred book or from the teacher or from the school which teaches you to meditate? Please listen.

What is the problem involved in meditation? There is only the be comer; there is, in meditation, the thinker with the thought. Please watch your own minds through the description of my words. Do not follow my words but watch your own mind in operation, in listening to what I am saying. The problem of meditation is the meditator. But the meditator has many thoughts. The thoughts and the meditator are pursuing the becoming. That is, I am meditating in order to find God, in order to understand, in order to cultivate virtue, in order to acquire tranquillity, in order to put away something from me, hoping in that state to be in a position where there is only being. So when we enquire into the question of meditation, the problem is the meditator and the becoming. What we know in meditation is the thinker and the thought, is it not? That is all we know - the thinker trying to change his thoughts, trying to push his thoughts higher up, climbing, climbing. The maker of the effort is the thinker, the `I', moulding, shaping,

controlling, guiding, aspiring, suppressing thought. That is what you call meditation. You have the image of a master, a picture of a guru, or some image made by the hand or the mind, and you concentrate. So there is a concentrator with the thing that is concentrated upon. In this, there is a division between the thinker and the thought. Now, is there actually such a division? We have created the division, the thinker and the thought. But is there actually the thinker apart from thought? If you take away thoughts, is there a thinker? Sirs, if you have no thoughts, is there a thinker?

The thoughts have created the thinker because thoughts are transcendent, and so we say the thinker is permanent. So thoughts seeking permanency have created a thinker. Then the thinker dominates thoughts and shapes thoughts in order to reach something else which is obviously not truth. Thoughts have created a thinker, whether the thinker is Paramatman or a supreme being, whatever it is. Thoughts have created it, and without thoughts there is no thinker. So seeing the truth of that, there is no longer the controlling of thoughts, there is no entity shaping, pushing thoughts into all directions or in one particular direction; there is only thinking. If I say that and if that is understood, there is already a tremendous revolution, is there not?, because there is no longer the thinker to actually experience, to actually see the truth of that, namely that there is no thinker. To see the truth of that is the beginning of meditation. Without seeing that, you are merely going to all classes of gurus, all the experiments of going to high and low, are all tricks of the mind. They are not meditation. They will lead nowhere, they are all illusion. Till you have understood this primary thing that the thought creates the thinker and without the

thought there is no thinker, and till you experience that - not verbally but really - reality will not come into being. Reality comes into being after a great deal of meditation - the meditation being the thinking out, watching, observing, not letting the mind play tricks upon it, seeing the trick which the mind plays and has played upon us for centuries that the thinker is completely different from thought, something divine, something extraordinary, totally out of time. As long as there is the thinker apart from thought, do what you will, your meditation is an illusion which will lead you to nowhere; it is the most destructive factor.

So meditation is not merely sitting still, controlling your mind. Meditation is something entirely different. Without self-knowledge, there is no meditation, self being how the mind works and not the self of Sankara or Buddha; but the self is your mind, and you have to understand how it operates, how it works. Without understanding that, you do not know how to meditate; and all meditation and the labours of discipline are in vain, and they have no meaning. So, when you come to that point when there are only thoughts, then quite a different issue arises. Then what is the significance of thought, what is the significance of thinking? You understand, Sirs? Thinking before had a significance because it created the thinker; then the thinker came into being, and he lived, functioned, experienced, acquired or rejected. But when through self-knowledge - not the reading of books about self-knowledge but the observation of self-knowledge in your relationship, in your talks, in your looks, smiles, watching everything - you know how the self works, there is the beginning of meditation; and as you go into it, you must invariably come to the point when you will see the

thinker and the thought are one and not separate. Then when you come to that state, what is the significance of thinking? That is merely a reaction to any response, to any stimuli; and if it is merely the stimulation that makes you think, then the mind is God. When there is no stimulation, when there is no asking, looking, then the mind is still. If there are only thoughts, then you see the significance of thoughts. From there, the mind is still.

The still mind is not a disciplined mind. There is no discipliner, one who controls and says 'I am still.' That still mind has no experiencer because the moment there is the experiencer, he is experiencing, gathering; he is different from the experience. Yet, if you observe, all of us want to continue experiencing - 'I want to experience truth', 'I want to experience God.' You will never experience God, never the truth, as long as there is the experiencer who is separate from thought. So there is only thinking, thinking without the thinker. Therefore, the mind is no longer concerned with what to think or with what is right thinking. It is only thinking and seeing the significance of thought. Therefore, there is no continuity of thinking. So the mind is still. That still mind is not experiencing, because the experiencer has ceased. There is only the state of being in which there is no experiencer. Therefore, in that silence, in that stillness, the mind is non-recognizing. I am using all these words; and if you have gone so far, you will immediately know what I am talking about.

The still mind is the creative mind. That which is creative is not of time, it is something beyond time. It is of no nationality, no race, no individuality. It is timeless, it is something eternal. If the mind can perceive that which is eternal in itself, the stillness, then the

mind itself is the eternal. But all these will remain as so many words if you do not understand the beginning which is self-knowledge. That self-knowledge is to be found in our daily life from moment to moment; and without that, if you go and sit at the feet of any master, or any guru, you are just wasting time. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. That which is creative - the creativeness of God, of truth - does not come into being, cannot come into being, when the mind is seeking. The mind must cease to seek, and then only reality can come into being. December 27, 1953

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 20TH JUNE, 1953

I think it is very important to know how to listen; but most of us have innumerable opinions, ideas, experiences and foregone conclusions through which we filter everything that we hear, and so we never listen to any thing anew; we always translate what we hear according to a particular bias. So perhaps it is important to know how to listen without translating, without interpreting; but this is really quite a difficult problem. Most of us do not want to listen to anything completely, fully, because in that process we may discover what we are; therefore we are always throwing up screens between ourselves and what is being said. So it would obviously be a good thing if we could simply listen, because we have a great many problems - not only personal, but also social, political, economic - to all of which we have to find the right answer; and I do not think we will find the right answer through any opinion, through any book knowledge, or through listening to any talks, including my own. Surely, to find the right answer we must know how to listen to the issue, to the problem itself; and we are not listening when we merely interpret the problem to suit our particular idiosyncrasies or opinions. There must be a right answer to all our problems; but the right answer does not lie through analysis through judgment, comparison, or through any amount of learning. The right answer comes into being only when the mind listens quietly, almost indifferently, so that it is capable of considering the problem without any special motive or intention, without an end in view - which is a very difficult thing to do, for most of us want a particular result, a satisfactory answer. To find

the right answer to our human problems we must have a great deal of patience, especially those of us who are used to living in a mechanistic world where the answer to so many technical problems is very quickly discovered. If we have a problem we want an immediate answer; so we turn to a book, to a doctor, to an analyst, a specialist; or we battle within ourselves to find a solution. We are impatient for results and therefore in constant conflict.

So, even though we may have heard before everything that is going to be said during these talks, it may be profitable if we can listen with a great deal of patience. What is important, surely, is that each one of us shall find lasting freedom from all the conflicts, from the innumerable responses which create such chaos in the mind, and through that freedom perhaps we shall discover something which is beyond the mind; but before we can be free we must obviously understand what is the self, the "me".

Can you and I ever be free from our problems, from our suffering, from our innumerable wants? To be free implies a complete aloneness, which is freedom from fear. It is only then that we are individuals, is it not? We are individuals only when there is a complete cessation of fear: the fear of death, the fear of what our neighbours say, the fear arising from our own desires and ambitions, the fear of not fulfilling, of not being. To be alone is entirely different, surely, from being lonely. It is our very loneliness that creates fear; and as a defensive measure we have a great many blockages, a great many ideas, shelters, securities. Most of us are not true individuals, are we? We are the result of the various influences of society, of the impressions we have gathered,

of the inner problems that crush our minds and our hearts. We are not individuals in the sense that we are not free from fear; and it seems to me that without being free from fear we can never find a true answer to any of our human problems.

Now is it possible for us to be completely free from fear? And of what are we afraid? Of being insecure, of not having everything one wants physically, of not complying with a particular political or religious system, and so on. The desire for security implies fear in our relationship with each other. To be capable of expressing the truth which we see, independently of all the threats around us, requires a great revolution in our thinking, does it not? And is it possible for each one of us to be completely free from the desire to be secure, which engenders fear? If we can understand this matter fundamentally, deeply, I think many of our problems will be solved. Freedom from fear, surely, is the only revolution for when we are free from fear we are neither American nor Hindu, we do not belong to any organized religion, there is no longer the sense of ambition, the desire for success, for achievement, and therefore we are not putting our strength against another. Freedom from fear is not an idea, nor is it an ideal to be striven after; but when one puts oneself that question, "Can one be free from fear?", what is the inward response? Fear is a basic impediment, a fundamental blockage in all our relationships, in our search for reality; and can you and I, without a series of efforts, without analysis, be free from that contagion which brings about so many problems? Can one be totally free from fear? It is a difficult question to answer to oneself, is it not? To be free from fear is really to be free from any desire to be secure economically or socially, or to find security in one's

experience. Surely, this is a very important question, because our whole outlook is biased through fear; our education our religion, our social structure, our efforts in every field are essentially based on fear. And can one be free from fear through any practice, through any form of discipline, through self forgetfulness, through self-immolation, through the pursuit of any belief or dogma, or through identification with any country? Obviously, none of these things can give us freedom from fear, because the very process of imitation of conformity, of self-immolation, is rooted in fear; and when one recognizes the futility of these things and sees how the mind in its various activities is constantly projecting defence, taking shelter in belief, in knowledge - in all of which lurks fear - what is one to do? How then is one to be free from this state we call fear? If we are at all serious, is that not a fundamental question which we have to ask ourselves? From childhood we have been brought up to think in terms of fear; all our defence, psychological as well as physical, are based on fear; and how can a mind which is so educated, so conditioned, free itself from fear? Can the mind free itself from fear? Can any activity of the mind bring freedom to the mind? Is not the mind, is not thought itself, the very process of fear? And can thought ever negate fear?

Please, this is a problem not easily to be answered; but what one can do is to be aware of fear without fighting it, without analyzing it and thereby throwing up other defence; and when the mind is really very quiet, passively aware of all the various forms of fear as they arise without acting against them, then in that quietness there is a possibility of the resolution of fear, which is the only real, fundamental revolution; and then there is individuality. As long as

there is fear, there is no uniqueness, there is not an individual. At present most of us are merely the result of various influences: social economic, political, climatic and so on; we are not true individuals therefore we are not creative. Creativeness is not the expression of a talent, a gift; it arises only when there is no fear, that is, when the individual is completely alone.

Surely, this question of how to be free from fear is one of our major problems, is it not? Perhaps it is the only problem; because it is fear, lurking in the innermost recesses of our minds and hearts, which cripples our thinking, our being, our living. So it seems to me that what we need it seems to me that what we need now is not more philosophy, better systems, or greater knowledge and information, but true individuals who are utterly free from fear; because it is only when there is no fear that there is love.

Now, can you and I set about freeing ourselves from fear? Can we put aside all opinions, all dogmas, all beliefs, which are merely expressions of fear, and come to the source, the fundamental issue, which is fear itself? Surely, as I said, creativeness is not a mere talent, a gift, a capacity - it is far beyond all that; and can come into being only when the mind is utterly quiet, no longer hedged about by fear, by judgment. by comparison, when it is not burdened with knowledge and information. But with most of us the mind is constantly agitated, it has many problems, it is everlastingly seeking its own security; and how can such a mind be alone, uninfluenced, unafraid? How can it comprehend that creativeness, that reality, whatever it be, or find out whether or not that creative state exists? It is only when the mind is utterly free from fear that there is a possibility of bringing about a fundamental revolution -

which has nothing to do with economic or political revolution; and to be free from fear requires, not quick judgment, but constant watchfulness, a great deal of patient and persistent awareness of the whole process of thought, which can be observed only in relationship, in everyday activity. Self-discovery lies through the understanding of what is, and what is is the actual process of thought at any given moment. Surely, that is meditation, and it requires a quietness of spirit in which there is no demand. It is only when you and I begin to know ourselves that the mind can be free from fear, and then there is a possibility, not only of inward peace; but of outward happiness for man.

Question: How can we know what is right and what is wrong without commandments or books?

Krishnamurti: Why do you want to know what is right and what is wrong? Can anyone tell you? Can any book, can any teacher impart to you the knowledge of what is right and what is wrong? If you follow the authority of a book or of a teacher, you are merely imitating a pattern of thought, are you not? And do you discover anything through imitation, through conformity? You follow in order to achieve a certain result; and is that process not based on fear? Is that which is right to be discovered through fear, or only through direct experience? As long as the mind is caught in the dual process of right and wrong, there must obviously be incessant conflict. But is it not possible to discover what is true all the time without being caught in the conflict of right and wrong? That is our problem, is it not? What is right and what is wrong will vary according to the conditioning and experience of each person, and therefore it has very little significance; but to know what is true all

the time - surely, that is important.

Please listen to this very carefully. As long as we are caught in the conflict of duality, which is the choice between what is right and what is wrong, we shall never know what is true all the time. What is right and what is wrong may be an opinion, what we have been brought up on from childhood, the imprint of a particular culture, of a particular society; and as long as we are imitating, conforming to a pattern, how ever noble, there must be this endless choice between right and wrong, the desire always to do the right thing and therefore the fear of making a mistake, which only leads to respectability. But to know what is true all the time, inwardly, deeply - that is not an opinion, a judgment, a dogma. What is true does not depend on any belief. To find out what is true is to understand what is from moment to moment, and that requires a great deal of alertness in which there is no judgment or comparison, an openness of mind to observe, to feel out, to be sensitive. What is true does not create conflict; but when the mind chooses between what is true and what is false, that very choice produces conflict. Most of us have been brought up to think rightly and to eschew certain things which are said to be wrong, and therefore our minds are always seeking the one and avoiding the other; and that process of thinking is in itself a conflict, is it not? The "right" may be what the priest says, what your neighbours or your political leaders say, so the pattern of conformity is set going; and the mind that conforms can never be in revolt, and therefore it can never find that which is everlastingly creative.

So is it possible to discover what is true all the time? Surely, there can not be discovery as long as there is the conflict of choice.

To discover, the mind must be basically quiet, free from the fear of making mistakes. But we want success, do we not? From childhood we are brought up to think in terms of success, and every book, every magazine exemplifies it: the poor boy becoming the president, and so on. Seeking security in success, the mind must conform to what is right, and so the battle is set going between what is right and what is wrong, the everlasting conflict of duality. In that conflict one never finds out what is true. What is true is what is, and the release that comes from the understanding of what is. Do please listen rightly to this, think it over; and if you can understand that which is actually taking place from moment to moment, you will see what a release there is from the conflict of right and wrong. That understanding cannot come about if you are judging or condemning what is, or comparing it with past experience; and when there is no understanding of what is, there is no release. To understand what is, the mind must be free from all condemnation and judgment; but that requires infinite patience, and it may produce an extraordinary revolution in your life, of which the mind is afraid; so you never look at what is, you merely give opinions about it. As long as the mind is caught in the choice between what is right and what is wrong, it remains immature; and that is one of our difficulties, is it not? Our minds are immature; we have been told what is right and what is wrong, and we want to conform. Conformity is the very nature of an immature mind, whereas the understanding of what is is the revolutionary factor in creativeness.

Question: Although I am aware that I am flattered by admiration and resentful of criticism, my mind continues to be

swayed by these influences; it is drawn or repelled like the compass needle in the presence of a magnet. What is the next step to be really free?

Krishnamurti: The difficulty is that you want to be free, you do not want to understand the problem. You are antagonistic to both flattery and criticism. You resent being criticized; and while you want to be attractive you want to be admired, yet you despise yourself for being so childish; and you want to be free from both. So you have three problems, have you not? And that is what we always do: having one problem which we do not know how to resolve, we introduce other problems, and so multiply problem after problem. Now what is the question? Not how to be influenced by admiration and criticism, but why do you want to be admired, why do you mind so much when you are criticized? That is the problem, is it not? Why do you want admiration? Because when you are admired you feel happy, it gives you encouragement, it makes you work better. You want to be encouraged because in yourself you are uncertain, and so you look to others for support; and you are sensitive to criticism because it uncovers what you are. That is why you are always running away from criticism and longing for admiration, encouragement, flattery; so again you are caught in this battle of wanting and not wanting. Surely, all this indicates an inward poverty of being, does it not? There is no deep sense of confidence. I don't mean the aggressive confidence of experience, which is only a strengthening of the "me", and therefore without much significance. I am talking of that confidence which arises when you begin to understand yourself, when you begin to see all the implications of admiration, of

encouragement, of criticism. The understanding of yourself does not depend upon anyone; it comes if you are aware, alert, meeting what is from moment to moment without judgment. Self knowledge gives a confidence in which the self does not become important. It is not the confidence of the "me" who has gathered innumerable experiences, or the "me" who possesses a large bank account, or the "me" who has a vast store of knowledge. In that there is no confidence, there is always fear. But when the mind begins to be aware of itself and its responses, when it sees all its own activities from moment to moment without any sense of comparison or judgment, then out of that knowledge there is a confidence free of the self. Such a mind does not seek admiration or avoid criticism; it is no longer concerned with either, because it is finding release from moment to moment in the understanding of what is.

What is is the reaction, the response, the urge, the desire of the mind at any given moment; and if you really observe what is, become fully aware of all its implications, you will find that there is an extraordinary freedom which comes into being without the mind seeking it. When the mind seeks freedom, it is freedom from something, which is not freedom at all: it is only a reaction, like the political revolution, which is a reaction against the existing regime. The freedom which comes with the understanding of what is, is not a reaction against something; it is a creative release, and therefore it is complete in itself. But to understand what is, requires great insight, quietness of mind. Freedom does not come about through any form of compulsion, through any attraction, through any desire; it comes only when the mind is aware without judgment,

without choice, so that at every moment it is seeing itself as it is. The mind that seeks freedom will never find it, because to seek freedom is to block, to push aside what is; but when the mind begins to understand what is, without choice, that very understanding brings about a creative release, which is freedom. Freedom is alone, it is true individuality, and in that there is bliss.

June 20, 1953

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 21ST JUNE, 1953

I would like this morning, if I can, to talk over the problem of change. Considering the world situation, the starvation, the wars, the competition, the incessant conflict between man and man, the extraordinary prosperity of some nations and the extreme poverty in the East, where millions of people have one meal or less a day - taking all this into consideration, it is clear that there must be some kind of radical transformation, a revolutionary change. And I think it is fairly obvious, if one has thought about this matter, that any change through conformity, compulsion, or fear, is no change at all. Mere peripheral change, adjustment on the outward circle, whether economic, political, social, or even so-called religious, is no revolution. Revolution must naturally be at the centre, not on the circumference, on the outside; and how is this revolution at the centre to take place? I am using the word "revolution" advisedly, for if there is change at the centre, it is a revolution, a complete transformation of thought; and it is only when there is this revolution at the centre that there can be significant changes on the outside, on the periphery. But most of us are concerned, not with the revolution at the centre, but with changes on the outside: we want a better economic position, more riches, more comfort, more prosperity, more luxury, a greater variety of entertainments and distractions. With that most of us are concerned. Or we change from one special activity to another, from one religion to another, from one dogma to another, which is merely going from an old cage to a new one. And if we are somewhat inclined to be serious, we talk about the stopping of war - again considering how to bring

about a change on the outside. Scientific research, social reform, political adjustment, are all concerned with outward change, as are the various religions and sectarian societies.

Now, how is one to bring about a change at the centre? That is the problem for most of us, is it not? If we are at all serious and see the superficiality of merely seeking a better job, or an immediate solution for our problems, whether economic, political, or religious, we will naturally want to know if it is possible to bring about a change at the centre which will in turn bring about a transformation in our relationship with our family, with our immediate partners, and so on, which is society.

I do not know if you have thought about this matter, but I consider it a fundamental issue, not easily to be put aside. For years we have tried to reform ourselves outwardly, we have sought to transform our manners, our thoughts, our conduct, our society, and it has not brought about a radical change, a creative release; and it seems to me that without this deep, inward revolution at the centre, whatever effort we exert to change things on the outside is utterly useless. It may bring about changes which are satisfactory for the moment; but if the revolution does not take place at the centre, mere alteration on the circumference, on the outside, is of very little significance, and it may ultimately lead to greater mischief. So realizing that, let us find out how to bring about this change, this revolution at the centre.

What is this centre? Surely, it is the mind; and we are going to find out if the mind can change, can bring about a revolution within itself. The mind is obviously made up of the conscious as well as the unconscious levels; and any effort to change itself on

the part of the conscious mind is still on the outside. Please see the importance of this.

As I said yesterday, if I may repeat it in a different way without boring you, it is important to know how to listen. When you make a conscious effort to listen, to understand, then understanding is thwarted by that very effort. When your whole attention is given to trying to find out, your mind is in a state of tension, and therefore there is no listening, there is no penetration, there is no spontaneous response to something that is not completely or fully understood. And yet to listen requires a certain attention, you cannot just go to sleep. But to listen is entirely different from hearing. You may hear what I am saying and comprehend the significance of the words; but if the mind does not go beyond the mere verbal communication between you and me, there is no real understanding. What I am trying to convey is not so much the verbal implication but much more the things that lie between words, the space, the interval between thoughts. If the mind can be quiet, attentive to that which lies between the words, if it can be so attuned, then it can listen wholly totally; and perhaps it is that very listening which brings about a revolution, and not the conscious effort to achieve understanding.

Most of us know only the conscious effort to change, to discipline the mind, and therefore what we call change is a partial process, it is not a total revolution. I am talking of that total, integrated revolution, not a partial, a superficial action; and that total revolution cannot take place through any conscious effort on our part. We know what consciousness is we are familiar with the conscious mind that thinks and desires, that is moved by impulse,

by motive, and brings about conformity. The conscious mind is constantly making an effort in a particular direction, either to conform through fear, or through fear to change itself to fit another pattern of action. So any conscious effort to change must be influenced by conformity, by fear, by the desire to succeed, or to better oneself in order to achieve a certain result, either in this world, or in the world of sainthood. It is imperative that there should be a deep revolution, but that revolution must obviously be unconscious; because, if I deliberately bring about a revolution in myself, it will be the result of desire, of memory, of time. I want to be better, I want to achieve a result, I want to find out what God is, what truth is, I want to be happier; so I say there must be a change. Positive or negative effort, the effort to be or not to be, is based on fear, on the urge to gain, to find comfort, peace, security; so any change through conscious effort is not a change at all, it is merely an adjustment to a different pattern. Of that one must see the truth completely. Like all economic revolutions, whether of the right or of the left, it is still not a change at the centre. Both bring about tyrannies. So the wise man is not concerned essentially with peripheral changes: he is concerned with that revolution which is inward, which is at the centre. And how are you and I to bring about that change?

I do not know if you see the importance of this question. All schools of religion, all religious societies, seek to bring about a change through conscious effort, through discipline, through conformity, through fear, through the desire to achieve a better state, whether socially, religiously, or psychologically, all of which is on the outside. But surely, the man who is consciously becoming

virtuous is immoral, because he is virtuous for his own security, for his own comfort, for his own happiness. We are not talking of such a change, such a transformation.

So how is one to bring about this revolution at the centre? We see that the deliberate, conscious effort of everyday thought cannot do it. And can the unconscious do it? Do you understand what we mean by the unconscious? The unconscious is the residue of the past, is it not? It is the result of the racial instincts, of the cultural imprints, of all that we have been in the past, of the whole human struggle with its hidden urges compulsions, drives. Can that unconscious help to bring about a change, a revolution at the centre? And is there a difference, a gap, a hiatus between the unconscious and the conscious? Surely, the conscious mind, the mind that is awake during the day, functioning in our daily activities, is only the outer edge of the unconscious, is it not? There is not a fundamental difference between the two. As the leaf of a tree is the outcome of the deep roots in the earth, so the conscious mind is the outcome of the deep unconscious. There is not a division between them, the two things are not different, only we are not familiar with the unconscious. We are familiar with the conscious mind, the every day activity of greed, competition, jealousy, envy, wanting this and not wanting that, the ceaseless struggle; but the same urges are also at the deeper level, are they not? So can one look to the unconscious to bring about a radical transformation?

If you really listen to all that I am saying and follow it easily, you will find the right answer; and the finding of the right answer is the revolution at the centre. What is the state of the mind when

there is no effort either by the conscious or the unconscious? Is there a centre then? With the majority of us there is a centre, which is the "me", the ego, the self; and whether that centre be at a higher or a lower level is not of great significance. The centre is the "me", the acquisitive instinct which expresses itself through the ownership of property, through the desire to become better, to acquire virtue through control, through discipline, and all the rest of it. The fears, the anxieties, the affections, the longings, the hopes, the failures, the frustrations - that is the centre we know, is it not? And for that centre to cease completely is the only revolution; but that revolution cannot come about through any effort on the part of the conscious or the unconscious.

Now, when one realizes all this, what is the state of one's mind? Obviously, the first response is an extraordinary sense of anxiety, of fear, of not knowing what is going to happen. The "me", the centre which is an accumulation of innumerable reactions, of innumerable cultural, political and religious influences - it is that centre which has been functioning; and if that centre has to go completely for the mind to be pristine, incorruptible, single, alone, the first reaction is obviously a sense of tremendous negation, of not being; and very few of us can stand that, which is to face what we actually are. So at the centre there is fear, and from that centre we begin to create defence, we cling to gifts, capacities, talents, thereby bringing about the constant conflict between what we actually are, and what we should like to be. And yet, at intelligent moments, we perceive that this mere traffic with the outward affairs will never bring about a deep, lasting, fundamental revolution. So those of us who are at all serious and religiously

inclined must obviously be concerned with this question of revolution at the centre.

Since neither the conscious nor the unconscious mind can bring about a radical change at the centre, what is the mind to do? Can the mind do anything? As we have seen, the mind is the conscious as well as the unconscious activity of thought, of reaction, of memory. Mind is the result of time, and time does not bring about revolution. On the contrary, it is the cessation of time that produces the fundamental revolution at the centre. The centre is used to time, the centre is time, the whole psychological process of yesterday, today and tomorrow, "I have been", "I am", "I shall be: the frustration, the fear and the hope. So the mind cannot produce a revolution; when it does, it creates more brutality, more tyrannies, more horrors, a totalitarian compulsion. And if the mind cannot bring about a radical change, then what is the function of the mind?

I hope you are following all this, because I am talking not only for myself, but also for you. I feel that if this extraordinary revolution could take place in each one of us, we would bring about a different world, we would be missionaries of a totally different kind, not those who convert, but who liberate.

So what is the function of the mind when it realizes that neither a conscious effort nor an unconscious urge on its part can bring about complete transformation? What is it to do? It can only be still, can it not? Any effort on its part to change itself is the outcome of its conditioning, of its fear, of its desire for success, of its hope that things will be better, and such effort only thwarts the discovery of the right answer. Please see the importance of this. If I realize that the fundamental revolution cannot be brought about

through any response of the mind, conscious or unconscious, that all such responses are based on acquisitive fear, on memory, on time, and are therefore on the outside, on the periphery - if I realize that, then the mind has to be completely quiet, has it not? So the mind's function is only to see how these responses arise, and not seek to capture a particular state, or try to bring about a change at the centre through an action of will. All that it can do is to watch its responses. But to watch requires infinite patience; and if you are impatient, then that very watching becomes a drudgery, because you want to get on, you want to achieve a result. It is only when the mind is constantly aware of its own responses of fear, of greed, of envy of hope, that these responses come to an end; but they cannot come to an end if there is any condemnation, comparison, judgment. They come to an end by mere observation, by complete cessation of all choice. Then the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet, utterly still, and in that stillness there is a revolution at the centre. Only then is there a possibility of being truly individual, because then the mind is alone, uninfluenced. That state is creativeness. There is no longer an experiencer who is experiencing. As long as there is an experiencer, there is the process of time.

So this revolution at the centre, which is so obviously essential, is not possible through any form of compulsion or discipline, which is all childish; it can come about only when the mind is utterly quiet, choicelessly aware of its own responses, outward and inward, as a total process. Then you will find that there comes an extraordinary sense of inward bliss - which is not a promise, nor a reward for your valiant effort of days or years to come to it. That

happiness, that bliss, is not the opposite of sorrow; it has nothing to do with sorrow. But in the understanding of sorrow, and being free from sorrow, that state comes into being.

In considering some of these questions, I hope you and I are really thinking over the problem together. You are not waiting for my answer, because I am not giving an answer. It is very simple to give answers, to say "yes" or "no", like a school teacher. What is important is that you and I together uncover the answer in the problem, which is the only right answer; and to do that, you must be alert, and I must be alert. The right answer is not easily found. Most of us are so eager to find the answer and get on with the next problem that we never examine the problem itself. There is only one problem, though it may have different expressions; and to understand that problem through its various expressions requires a great deal of wisdom penetration insight, and a patience which is not laziness. To penetrate, to understand, the mind must be free from all authority, from all book knowledge, from what some one else has previously said. Unfortunately, most of us have read so much, we know so well what the Buddha, the Christ, or someone else has said, that we are incapable of thinking the problem right through. But if we are to find the right answer together, you also have to think, to inquire, to penetrate into the question.

Question: You say that to be free of the self is an arduous task, and at the same time you assert that any effort to be free is an impediment to that very freedom. Is this not a vicious circle? How can one perform the arduous task without effort?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by effort? When do you make an effort? And if there is no effort does it imply laziness,

stagnation? So let us begin to find out what we mean by effort, in what direction we are making effort, and why we make effort.

When we talk of making an effort, we always mean exerting ourselves in order to achieve a result, do we not? We want better health, better understanding, a better social, economic or political position, and so on, which means that we are always making an effort to arrive somewhere. Or we make an effort to remove certain psychological blocks. If we are envious, we say we must not be envious, and therefore we create a resistance against envy. Or we want to be very learned, we want to know more in order to impress, or to have a better job; therefore we read, we study. That is all the effort we know is it not? For most of us, effort is either positive or negative, it is a process of becoming or not becoming; and that very process is the centre of the self, is it not? If I am envious and I make an effort not to be envious, surely the entity who makes that effort is still the self, the "me". Any effort to dominate the self, positively or negatively, is still part of the self, and therefore it only further strengthens the self; and in that vicious circle one is caught. So the problem is how to break that vicious circle, that continuous chain of effort which only gives greater strength to the "me".

Now please follow this. You can break the vicious circle only if you are aware of it as a total process. When the mind sees that it is envious, it wants to be un-envious, because it thinks that not being envious will pay it in some way; it derives a certain satisfaction from the effort not to be envious, it makes a spiritual record. So in not being envious, the mind finds security, shelter, and the maker of the effort is still the "me", the ego the self. Please just realize

that, only that. Then the problem arises, what am I to do when I am envious? I am used to denying, creating resistance against envy; now I see the futility of that, the absurdity of one part of me denying another part, when I am the whole. So what am I to do? But we never come to that point, we never recognize that we are both the envy, and the desire not to be envious. When we are envious, we exert effort to dominate envy, and we think that effort is beneficial, that it will bring about freedom from the self. It will not. But when I understand, when I am fully aware that envy and the desire not to be envious is a total process, then is there an effort? Then something entirely different takes place, does it not?

Is all this too much for this morning?

Audience: No, no.

Krishnamurti: All right. The moment we are conscious that we are envious, or angry, or jealous, a process of condemnation is set going; and as long as one is condemning, there is no comprehension. The very words "envy", "anger", "jealousy", imply judgment, comparison, condemnation, do they not? Through centuries of education, of culture, of religious training, these words have come to connote a sense of denunciation; they stand for something to be put aside, resisted, fought, and our whole reaction is in that direction. So I find that when I name certain feelings, I am already in a position of condemnation; and the very act of condemning, of resisting a feeling strengthens it. If I don't condemn envy, will I yield to it? Will I become more envious? Surely, envy is always envy, it is not more or less. The demand, the direction may vary, but envy is always the same whether its object be a Ford or a Cadillac, a large house or a small one. So not to

name and therefore not to condemn envy, is not to indulge in it. When one understands that the very word "envy" connotes condemnation, that the feeling of antagonism to envy is embedded in the word itself, then a freedom comes into being. That freedom is not opposed to envy, it is not freedom from envy. Freedom from a particular quality is not freedom at all, and the man who is free from something is like the man who is against the government: as long as he is against something he is not a free man. Freedom is complete in itself, it is not from any position, or against any state or quality.

So all effort to overcome, to be free from something, only strengthens the "me", the self, the ego; and when one really understands this, when one is aware of the quality and its opposite as a total process and sees how the word itself contains condemnation or encouragement, then one is no longer caught in words, and therefore the mind is free to regard, to observe what is. The understanding of what is, and the freedom that it brings, is not the outcome of a persistent practice, of a drudgery to which you devote so many minutes every morning; it comes into being only when one is aware throughout the day of the trees, of the birds, of one's own reactions, of the things that are happening inwardly and outwardly as a total process. When there is condemnation or justification, comparison or identification, there is no comprehension of what is, and that is why it is very arduous to be aware. What is can be understood only from moment to moment, which means that one must be completely aware that one is judging, that every word has either approval or denial. As long as the mind is the verbal expression of its own conditioning, it can

never be free. There is freedom only when the mind is empty of all thought.

June 21, 1953

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 27TH JUNE, 1953

Perhaps this evening we could consider the significance of authority in life, and the relationship between authority and fear. During the last two meetings we have been going into the question of individual freedom, and whether it is possible to be individual in the sense of being free from fear; and I suggested that there can be individuality only when there is no fear at all. It is one of the most difficult things to be free from fear, because fear takes so many forms. When the mind is completely absorbed in a certain idea, that absorption may be an escape; and the man who disciplines his mind according to a pattern of thought may still be caught in fear. When we conform to a particular standard of morality, in which there is authority, compulsion, are we free of fear? To follow authority in any form, without fully understanding the whole significance of authority, is surely to be burdened with fear.

So let us go into this question of authority; but before we do so, I would like to suggest that you listen rightly. To listen rightly is not to conclude. When you jump to any conclusion, you are not open to find out, to discover. You cannot be led to discover: discovery must be spontaneous. If you are listening in order to be led, you will never discover. That is fairly clear, is it not? If you are waiting to be shown, you will never find out anything for yourself; you will find out only what the speaker wants you to find out. Therefore you must listen, not merely to what I am saying, to the description I am giving, but rather to what is taking place in your own mind - which is to be aware. Though I may use certain words and phrases as a means of communication, what I am

actually describing is what each one of us is thinking, whether consciously or unconsciously. If you are merely listening to me, you are not listening to yourself; you are only following a description. But if through this description you begin to be aware of the activities of the mind, with all its tendencies and idiosyncrasies then there is a possibility of discovering, of becoming fully conscious of what is actually taking place within your own being; and that, it seems to me, is very important.

I am not saying anything that is so very difficult to understand; but if you merely listen to words, you will miss the whole point. I am describing what is actually going on, consciously or unconsciously, within ourselves; and what is going on is a very complex affair which requires a great deal of patient attention, an awareness in which there is no judgment, an observation without choice. If we can listen with that attitude of mind, then I think we shall begin to understand the whole significance of authority. Surely, as long as the mind is caught in authority, it is not an individual at all; and to find out what is real, what is God, what is truth, to discover that which is nameless, must one not be completely individual? To be individual means complete freedom from all fear, from all compulsion, from the desire to find a right way of living. That is what we all want, that is the cry in our hearts: to find a right way of action, a right way of conduct, right method to live happily, to have peace. And does not that very cry create authority, the authority of a book, of a person, of an idea? We want to be told what to do, how to live, in what manner to overcome the innumerable problems that we have; and with that desire in our minds and in our hearts, we pursue those who can

give us what we are seeking, those who we think will lead us to reality, to happiness, to God. So we set up an entity, a teacher, who is the result of our own projection, and we cloak him with what we want. The urge to guide our lives through teachers, through books, through any form of compulsion, is essentially the desire to be secure, is it not? That is what we want: to be secure in our relationships, to be secure in this world and also in the next.

Now, desire for security sets going the mechanism of compulsion, of resistance, of conformity to a pattern, to an idea, or to a person who represents the idea; and that is our life, is it not? So must one not be completely free from this desire for security, which creates authority? Authority is a very complex problem. There is authority at different levels: the governmental, the social, the religious, and the individual authority of one's own experience. From childhood we are compelled to conform. Our education, our social and religious training, our whole environment encourages us to conform, to resist, or to follow, which is our daily mechanism of thought; and as long as you and I are in that state, can we be free individuals? If we are not free, obviously we can never discover what is real; and to be free requires a great deal of understanding of this problem of authority. You cannot just throw aside all external authority and follow what you want, because the very following of what you want creates authority. You may reject external authority, but there is the inward authority of experience, and that experience is based on your conditioning. It is fairly easy to reject all external authority, but one is still the result of that authority, of tradition, of society, of the culture, the civilization about one. To reject the outer and follow the inner is not to be free of authority.

Surely, authority is a unitary process. There is no division between outer and inner authority: there is only authority. And can a mind which is following authority in any form ever discover what is true?

Please listen to this very carefully, don't jump to conclusions. Compulsion, resistance, discipline, the following of authority, is the outcome of fear; and can a mind hedged about by fear ever be free? It is only when the mind is free that there is individuality; but to bring about that freedom of the mind is extremely difficult - difficult in the sense that mere desire, mere effort, will not bring it about. Desire and effort are the reactions to our conditioning; and reaction is not freedom. So can the mind be free from all resistance, from all desire to find a way out of our problems?

I do not know if I am making myself clear. This is really quite a difficult subject to deal with, because when we approach it we are immediately confronted with the thought, "If I have no authority, no mode of conduct, how shall I guide myself tomorrow? If I can not use my past knowledge to discover what is true, then what am I to do?"

Now, is it not possible to live from moment to moment, understanding each incident, each experience, each relationship, as it arises? Cannot the truth of things be seen from moment to moment? Must I have the burden of knowledge, the authority of experience, to discover what is true? To understand, must not the mind be totally free of the past? Must it not stop translating the immediate experience according to its previous knowledge, which becomes the authority? But that is what we are doing, is it not? When we have a problem, how do we deal with it? We translate the

problem in terms of the background of our conditioning, our previous experience; we evaluate it according to the standards which we have established, or which society has set up; and in translating the problem, we are never free to comprehend the truth of that problem. Can the truth of any human problem be understood through the authority of experience or of knowledge? Is not intelligence the freedom of understanding from moment to moment?

Life is very complex, and the mind is still more complex, with extraordinary capacities; and to understand any human problem, must not the mind come to it anew, afresh, and not from a centre which has gathered, which has accumulated? After all, that is creative understanding, is it not? The centre which accumulates is the "me", the ego, the self, and therefore any action from that centre will only increase the problem. Reality, God, or what name you will, must be something totally new, never experienced before, completely original; and can a mind which is the residue of time, of the past, of authority, of compulsion, resistance, fear - can such a mind understand, see the significance of what is true? Yet every church, every religious organization, every sect is always talking of God; and those who believe in God have visions which strengthen their belief. Surely, that which you can recognize has already been known, therefore it is not true. That which is true has never been known, therefore the mind must come to it afresh, anew; and one of our major difficulties is how to denude the mind of all compulsions, of all fears, of all resistances, of all authorities, so that it is free to observe, to listen and to understand. Tomorrow is never the same, the next reaction is never what has been; and it is

because we translate every reaction, every tomorrow, every next moment in terms of the old, that more and more complications arise. There is never a moment when we can look at life, at the trees, at the birds, at every incident, originally freely fully.

Surely, then, the question is not how to be free of problems, or how to find the answers to our problems, or how to be free of authority; but rather can we look at all the extraordinarily complex and subtle problems of life with a mind that is pristine, original, uncorrupted? It is possible to do that only when we are free of fear, because it is fear that breeds authority, whether it be the authority of a person, or the authority of a church, of a belief, a dogma; and though we may be free of dogma and belief, if we are slaves to what our neighbours think, or to that which we have known, we are obviously still bound by fear.

So it is fear which breeds authority; and can the mind be free from fear, the fear of being insecure in all our relationships, the fear of not knowing, of not being? In our desire for security, in our fear of the unknown, we create heaven and hell, we create gods, visions - it is out of our own minds that all these things are born. Because intrinsically, deeply, there is a fear of being completely alone, the cunning mind begins to accumulate property, knowledge, experience; and being caught in that process, we project what reality or God should be, which is mere speculation and therefore of no significance; we create innumerable forms of belief behind which the mind takes shelter.

Now, can the mind be free of this whole process and live simply from day to day, understanding life as it arises from moment to moment? After all, that is the timeless, the nameless eternity: when

the mind itself is the unknown. At present the mind is the known, it is the result of time, of yesterday, of accumulated knowledge, experiences and beliefs, and such a mind can never know the unknown. This is not some vague form of mysticism. Surely, if I want to know something that has never been experienced before, that is not of time, that cannot be put in the frame of authority my mind must be totally free from the past, which means that it must be free from fear. To this the immediate reaction is, "How am I to be free from fear? I know I am afraid, but how am I to be free?" Is that not your instinctive response? Please listen to the question and you will find the answer. Can the mind, which has created fear, free itself from fear? In its desire for security, the mind takes shelter in belief, thereby engendering fear and rendering itself incapable of facing the unknown; and can the entity which is giving birth to fear ever be free from fear? Surely, its very desire to be free from fear is the outcome of fear; therefore any effort of the mind to be free from fear is still part of fear. All that the mind can do is to be aware of fear and be completely passive with regard to it. In that passive awareness there is no choice, no overcoming; and when the mind is so aware, you will find that there is no fear at all. But the mind cannot be in that state as long as there is any effort to overcome.

Please listen carefully and you will see the truth of this. The mind, which is thought, creates fear, does it not? Most of us are lonely, and we do not know what that loneliness means; we have never gone into it, understood it, because we are always running away from it through some form of distraction. We can understand loneliness only when we can look at it, and we can look at it only

when we are not afraid of it. Fear comes in when we are running away from loneliness; the running away, the flight is fear. So the mind is creating fear all the time - fear of what is going to happen tomorrow, of what will happen when we die. Thought, which is the result of the past, is projecting itself into the future and creating fear.

The mind can never be free of fear as long as it is making an effort to get away from fear. All that it can do is to be aware that it is frightened and be completely passive, without any choice. Then you will see that the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet, and in that quietness the problem of fear can be resolved. In that stillness of mind, authority has wholly vanished. What need have you of authority when from moment to moment you are seeing what is true? Truth is not dependent on valuation, on judgment, and if once the mind sees that completely, then the mind itself is both the experiencer and the experienced; therefore the mind is capable of going beyond itself.

All this requires a great deal of patient attention, an awareness in which there is no desire to become, to avoid or to gain. It is because we are everlastingly desiring to achieve, to be successful, or to avoid something, that we engender fear. Fear multiplies problems, fear cripples the mind and holds it to the past, and so the mind itself is the centre of fear. Only when the mind understands the full significance of not desiring to be something, of being, not blank, but completely empty, utterly silent - only then is it possible for the mind to resolve every problem as it arises.

Question: I would like not to be competitive, but how is one to exist without competing in this highly competitive society?

Krishnamurti: You see, we take it for granted that we must live in this competing society; so there is a premise laid down, and from there we start. As long as you say, "I must live in this competing society", you will be competitive. The society is acquisitive, it worships success; and if you also want to be successful, naturally you must be competitive.

But the problem is much deeper and more significant than mere competition. What lies behind the desire to compete? In every school we are taught to compete, are we not? Competition is exemplified by the giving of marks, by comparing the dull boy with the clever boy, by endlessly pointing out that the poor boy may become the president, or the head of General Motors - you know the whole business. Why do we lay so much stress on competition? What is the significance behind it? For one thing, competition implies discipline, does it not? You must control, you must conform, you must toe the line, you must be like all the others, only better; so you discipline yourself in order to succeed. Please follow this. Where there is the encouragement of competition there must also be the process of disciplining the mind to a certain pattern of action; and is that not one of the ways of controlling the boy or the girl? If you want to become something, you must control, discipline, compete. We have been brought up on that, and we pass it on to our children. And yet we talk about giving the child freedom to find out, to discover!

Competition hides the state of one's own being. If you want to understand yourself, will you compete with another, will you compare yourself with anyone? Do you understand yourself through comparison? Do you understand anything through

comparison, through judgment? Do you understand a painting by comparing it with another painting, or only when your mind is completely aware of the picture without comparison? You encourage the spirit of competition in your son because you want him to succeed where you have failed; you want to fulfil yourself through your son, or through your country. You think that progress, evolution lies through judgment, through comparison; but when do you compare, when do you compete? Only when you are uncertain of yourself, when you do not understand yourself, when there is fear in your heart. To understand oneself is to understand the whole process of life, and self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. But without self knowledge there is no understanding there is only ignorance; and the perpetuation of ignorance is not growth. So, does it require competition to understand oneself? Must I compete with you in order to understand my self? And why this worship of success? The man who is uncreative, who has nothing in himself - it is he who is always reaching out, hoping to gain, hoping to become something; and as most of us are inwardly poor, inwardly poverty-stricken, we compete in order to become outwardly rich. The outward show of comfort, of position, of authority, of power, dazzles us, because that is what we want.

All this is obviously true, but if you are listening to it with the thought that you have to live in this world, you are not listening: you are only comparing. If you do not compete, you may lose your job; if you lose your job, what about your responsibilities, who will feed your children? And so you go round and round. A man who is intent upon finding out what is true, who is in a state of revolt, must obviously go through a great deal of physical discomfort,

must he not? He may lose his job. Why not? The mind that clings to security can never find reality. It is only when the mind understands the real that our problems will be resolved not till then. Do what we will, however cunning our minds may be, however much knowledge we may acquire, whatever process of analysis we may go through till we find the real, which is at every minute to be discovered, there can be no lasting solution to our human problems.

Competition arises when there is the desire to be successful, to become something, whether in the material world, or in the world of knowledge, of psychological intention. and as long as the mind is comparing, judging, it can't see the real. It is only when the mind is completely choiceless, not comparing, judging, or condemning, that there is a possibility of seeing what is true from moment to moment; and in that lies the resolution of all our problems.

June 27, 1953

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 28TH JUNE, 1953

I think it is important with what attitude we come to these meetings, because to me they are very serious, You are not here to meet your friends which you can do afterwards, or to spend an hour in entertainment, in mere verbal discussion, opposing one idea or opinion with another. What we are trying to do is to go into the very complex problem of living, and for that there must be a great deal of earnestness. Bearing that in mind, it is obviously quite out of place to take photographs, or to ask for autographs, which are among the many flippant things we do when we are not really in earnest; and I would beg of you to regard our meeting here, not as a curious gathering of very odd people, but as a coming together of those who are seriously endeavouring to find out the full significance of living. At least, that is my approach, and I am very earnest about it. There is such chaos, such misery and confusion in the world; and, however small our gathering may be, if we can go into this problem very intently, not just for an hour or so on Saturday afternoon or Sunday morning, but continuously throughout the week, then perhaps we shall come to a point when we ourselves will be the missionaries, not merely the listeners, when we ourselves will begin to talk of these things out of our own depth of understanding and experience. So my intention in talking here is not to express or to fulfil myself, which would obviously be most childish, but rather to see if we cannot together awaken that intelligence, that integrated outlook on life which will enable each one of us to be the flame that brings about a fundamental, radical revolution in our own thinking, and so perhaps in the world about

us. If there is a sense of quietness, a sense of dignity, a mutual respect which demands equal attention on the part of all, then perhaps we can go deeply into these problems and not be satisfied with descriptions, with mere scratching on the surface.

This morning I would like, if I can, to talk over the problem of what it is to experience; and, if we do not bring about a fundamental revolution at the centre, whether there is any possibility of experiencing except as a mere continuation of past experience. Now, what is this centre? Surely, it is the "me", the self, the ego, the mind: the mind which is so sensitive, so extraordinarily capable which can understand such a variety of experience, which can store up in numerable memories, which can invent, which can design a plane capable of flying at forty thousand feet and at six hundred miles an hour. This centre, which is a complex machine with unlimited potentialities, is edged about with the thought of "me: my pleasure, my security, my vanities, my possessions, my advancement, my fulfilment. It is a centre of affection, of hate, of passing pleasures, of envy, greed and pain. And can I bring about a revolution at this centre so that the self, the "me" is non-existent? Because, the "me" is the source of misery, is it not? Though the "me" may have passing satisfactions, superficial joys and affections, it is constantly multiplying problems, producing pain. However high I may place the self, at whatever level, it is still within the field of thinking; and thinking, with most of us, is pain, suffering, a constant battle between what I am and what I should be. And yet this machine, this mind which is always thinking about itself and its own security, is also capable of infinite unfoldment.

I do not know if you have ever thought what extraordinary significance, what nuances, what subtle profundities words like "love" and "death" have for the mind. And yet this mind, with all its subtleties and swiftness of movement, is bound by the thought of "me: the "me" that is not loved and must be loved, the "me" that should love, the "me" that is going to die. And is it possible for this "me", the self, to completely come to an end? That is fundamentally our problem, is it not? All religions, not the organized churches, but all real teachers, all civilizations and cultures, have always struggled to eliminate the "me", the sense of separate effort. Various governments have made extraordinary efforts to destroy the "me" through tyranny, either of the left or of the right, through the totalitarian domination over the thought of "me", hoping to bring about a culture of co-operative work. Yet this "me", is constantly asserting itself; it is always translating every experience, every reaction, every movement of thought in terms of its own centre. The "me", the self, the ego, is the source of conflict, of pain, of the everlasting strife. to become, to achieve, to gain; and as long as we do not see this fact, however capable, however subtle and learned the mind may be, it will only create more problems, produce more misery. So those of us who are really in earnest must obviously direct our inquiry to finding out if this "I" can come to an end.

Now, what is this "I"? It is a process of recognition, is it not? It is a centre of experience, of fear, of joy, of passing fulfilment, of memory. If the "I" is not, there is no experience with which the mind identifies itself as my experience.

I am not telling you anything new. On the contrary, I am just

describing what is actually taking place in each one of us. My verbal expression must inevitably be very limited; but if, as you listen, you observe this process in yourself you will begin to see the intricacies, the extraordinary subtleties of your own thinking; you will become aware of your own centre, of this aggressive or negative state of the mind which is called the "me" and which is constantly reaching out to gain through acceptance or denial.

So the "I" is a centre of recognition and experience; and as the mind translates every experience in terms of this centre, it is constantly limiting itself. As long as the "I" is there the mind cannot go beyond, however capable, however fantastically subtle it may be. When every experience is translated in terms of the self, in terms of like and dislike, how can the mind go beyond? A mind that is caught in the pursuit of gratification and the avoidance of pain, that is always limiting itself by its efforts, by its demands, by its fears - how can such a mind ever experience or comprehend that which is beyond itself? And yet, if we are at all earnest, that is what we are seeking, is it not? Of course, if we are satisfied to be caught in the pleasures and pains of daily life, there is no problem; we will merely go on substituting one pain for another, one pleasure for another, one belief or dogma for another. But if we want to go beyond, to search out, to discover, surely the "me" which is everlastingly putting a limit on the mind, must come to an end. Now, how is this "I", the self, the ego, this self-centred and self enclosing movement of thought, to come to an end? This centre is fed by experience, is it not? And what is experience, whether it is conscious or unconscious? Please this is a very important question, so let us think it out together.

Experience is a continuation of memory, is it not? If I meet you and you are a complete stranger, there is no recognition. But if I know you, there is set going the process of recognition, which is the experiencing of pleasure or pain, of flattery or insult. So the mind is always translating experience in terms of the known. Therefore the unknown, that which cannot be found out, becomes something fearful, something to be afraid of: to morrow, death, the future. Being afraid, the mind builds theories, hopes, ideas, all of which further strengthen the "me". That is the process we know. But if we can find out how not to feed the "me" at any level, high or low, then perhaps we shall negatively be capable of bringing about the ending of the "me". It cannot be done positively, but only negatively, by finding out how this "I" nourishes itself and continues to survive. Surely, the "I", the mind can think only in terms of past experience, in terms of the known. Our religions, our culture, our outlook, our ideals, are all in terms of the known, and the mind, the "I", clings to these things and strengthens itself through its knowledge of the known.

So, being aware of this whole process, can the mind free itself from the known and come to a state in which the unknown can be? Surely, that is the only revolution: when the fear of the unknown is not. And that revolution can take place only when the mind sees the futility of the known. But consciously or unconsciously we are always seeking the known; it is our desire for the known that creates gods, heaven, the ideal future, the perfect State. We project what should be and force man to fit into the known, and that is our Utopia.

Man can never perfect himself, because his perfection is always

the known. Please, it is very important to think this out. We are striving to make ourselves more and more perfect, technologically as well as psychologically. The effort to bring about technological perfection one can understand. But the desire to make oneself inwardly, psychologically, more perfect is always to conform to the known, to something which has already been experienced - which implies that the mind can perfect itself only in terms of the past, or in terms of reaction to the past. As the communist society is a reaction to the capitalist state, to which it is constantly opposed, so the mind's effort to perfect itself is a reaction to its conditioning; and reaction is never perfect, it is only an extension of the known.

The "me" is a total entity. Though we talk of the conscious and the unconscious, actually there is only one state: consciousness. We are aware of that part which we call the conscious, and of the other part we are hardly aware; but the mind is a total process which includes both the inner and the peripheral consciousness, the hidden as well as the open. Now, can one be aware of this total consciousness which is the "me", with its desires, its anxieties, its fears, its motives, its constant struggle to better itself, its urge to fulfil - can one be completely aware of this process without strengthening the activity of the "me"? And can this whole process of the "me" come to an end? Surely, it cannot come to an end by any act of volition, nor by any trick, nor by repeating phrases, chants, mesmerizing oneself with words, nor by losing oneself in some idiotic phantasy such as that of the nation, or the phantasy of God.

If you will really go into it, you will see that this is a very

important inquiry, because the solution to our human problems does not lie at any conscious level. Our consciousness is now limited by the "me", and any answer that comes out of the "me" will only produce further mischief, further sorrow. Knowing this, being aware of the total process of the "me", can there be an ending to the "me"?

Do you understand how we have tried to end the "me", the self? We have tried it through discipline, through controls, through defence, through resistance; we have tried it through compulsion, through conformity to dogma and belief. We have tried it through various forms of self immolation, forgetting oneself for the bigger thing, for one's property, for one's wife and children, for the State, for the world. We have tried to forget ourselves in war, in service, in loving another, and ultimately in the idea of God. We have tried all these tricks - and they are tricks - and have only brought about more misery, more tyranny, more chaos in the world.

You don't have to read a great deal to understand all this. You are the result of the past, of all human struggle, of all human endeavour, joy and sorrow. The whole story of humanity is in you, and if you know how to read that, then you don't have to read a single book. To discover that, no philosophy, no system is necessary. So the question I am putting to myself, and which I hope you will also put to yourself, is: can this thing called the "me", which runs like a thread through every action, through every thought, through every movement of affection, come to an end? Please just put the question to yourself, don't try to find an answer, because whatever you find will be a positive answer, which is an invention of the mind, and there- fore it will become another means

of perpetuating the "me". But if you put the question to yourself, being totally aware of this whole process, then you will find, not a verbal answer, but that spontaneous answer which is a revolution and which comes into being only when you ask the question without any volition; and that is true listening. If you become choicelessly aware of the "me" in all its activities, of the whole process of your thinking, the cognitive as well as the hidden, if you see it without judgement or condemnation, you are bound to bring about revolution at the centre. Then the mind becomes extraordinarily subtle, astonishingly active and alert.

At present our minds are crippled by our fears, by our frustrations, by the desire to succeed; but if, without judgment, without condemnation or choice, we begin to be aware of this whole process of consciousness that is going on, whether we are awake or asleep, then we will find that, in spite of ourselves and our desires, in spite of our conflicts, our wars and brutalities, there is a revolution at the centre; and like a wave that reaches further and further, from the centre all our difficulties will be solved. But if merely approached from the outside, our problems can never be solved. It is from the centre that all human problems arise; and if there is an ending, a complete cessation at the centre, that in itself will bring about a total revolution. But a mind that deliberately tries to bring about a revolution, to deny the centre, will only create further misery. Then it becomes an ideal, and an idealist is not a revolutionary: he is merely conforming to a pattern of his own invention.

So please just listen to all this, absorb it silently, and you will see that creativeness is a thing that comes into being when the

mind is quiet, when the "me" is totally absent. The creativeness which we occasionally know through turmoil is not the same as the creativeness which is free from the centre. Creativeness free from the centre is not of time, because it is not the invention of the mind; and without that creativeness life has very little significance, though we may have all the prosperity, all the latest gadgets in the world. We soon get tired of that; we want more of these gadgets. But this creativeness is not of satisfaction, it is something totally unknown it cannot be conceived or speculated upon. It can come into being only when the mind, being fully aware of the total process of the "me", understands its significance and therefore does not feed it through experience.

Question: Why is it that those who have a secure income and are able to retire from responsible work so often deteriorate and go to pieces psychologically?

Krishnamurti: Is the deterioration merely a matter of secure income? Perhaps the secure income only exaggerates the deterioration which has already taken place. No, sirs, please don't brush it off by laughter. Are we concerned with why the mind deteriorates at a certain stage, or with why the mind deteriorates at all? A man who is working, earning money, going regularly to an office, is apparently not deteriorating because he is active; but when that activity stops, you perceive the deterioration. The mind that is caught in routine, whether it is the routine of an office, of a ritual, or the routine of a certain dogma, is already deteriorating, is it not? Surely it is much more worthwhile to find out what are the causes which bring about this deterioration of the mind, than to inquire why your neighbour who has money goes to pieces when

he retires. Please, if we can really understand this one question, perhaps we shall know the eternity of the mind. Why does the mind deteriorate - not your mind only, but the mind of man? One can see that the deteriorating factor arises when the mind becomes a machine of habit, when its education is merely a matter of memory, and when it is ceaselessly struggling to conform to a pattern whether imposed or self-created. There is fear, deterioration, a destruction of the mind when it is constantly seeking security, or when it is burdened with the desire to fulfil itself. And that is our state, is it not? Either we are caught in habit, in routine, doing the same thing over and over again, practising virtue, conforming to the pattern of a discipline in order to arrive somewhere, to find psychological or material security; or else we are competing, making tremendous effort in our ambition to achieve worldly success. Surely, that is what each one of us is doing, and therefore we have already set going the mechanism of deterioration. If any of these responses exist in us, at whatever level, we are deteriorating.

Now, can the mind renew itself constantly? Can the mind be creative from moment to moment? I do not mean creativeness in the sense of mere design, expression, capacity, the cultivation of a technique. I am not referring to creativeness in any of those terms. But can the mind experience the unknown? Surely, it is only in the state of unknowableness that there is no deterioration. Any other state is bound to bring old age to the mind. Like any other piece of machinery that is kept running day after day for weeks, months, years, the mind that is always active inevitably deteriorates. As long as you use your mind as a machine to achieve, to produce, to

gain, you have the seeds of deterioration, of old age and senility; and whether in a boy of sixteen or in a man of sixty, it is the same process. But of that deteriorating process most of us are not aware. All that we are aware of is that we are caught in the machinery of pleasure and pain, of misery and the struggle to get out of it. So the mind is never still, never unoccupied, it is everlastingly occupied with something: with God, with communism, with capitalism, with growing wealthy, with what one's neighbour thinks, or with the kitchen - oh, innumerable things! Being constantly occupied, it is never free, quiet. It is only the mind that is quiet, not out of dullness, but because it is in that state of silence which is creative - it is only such a mind that ceases to deteriorate. Freedom from deterioration is not possible for the mind that fulfills itself through capacity. As you grow older, capacity becomes dull. You may be an expert player of the piano, but as you grow older rheumatism sets in, disease comes on, you go blind, or you are destroyed by an accident. The mind which is seeking fulfilment in any direction, at any level, has already within it the seed of destruction. It is the "me" that is wanting to fulfil itself, to become something; being empty, frustrated, the "me" seeks fulfilment in my family, my child, my property, my idea, my experience. When one recognizes all this and sees the danger of it, only then is it possible for the mind to be empty from moment to moment, from day to day uncrippled by the burden of the past or the fear of the future. To live in that moment is not something fantastic, something given only to the few. After all, as I said, each one of us is caught in misery, in strife, in pain, in passing joy, and each one of us must find this unknown; it is not reserved for one and denied to the rest. It is

together that we can create a new world; but the new world cannot come into being through revolution on the outside, which is the revolution of decay.

The mind deteriorates as long as it is seeking an end, or as long as it is conforming to authority bred of fear. There is a withering away of the mind when there is no self-knowledge, and self-knowledge is not a thing to be learnt from a book. It is to be uncovered at every moment of the day, which requires a mind that is extraordinarily alert; and the mind is not alert when it has found an end. So the factor that brings about deterioration lies in our own hands. A mind that is caught in experience, that lives on experience, can never find the unknowable. The unknowable comes into being only when the past is not; and the past is not only when the mind is still.

June 28, 1953

OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 4TH JULY, 1953

I think it is particularly important to understand the question of what is knowledge. Most of us seem so eager for knowledge; we are always acquiring, not only property, things, but also ideas. We go from one teacher to another, from one book, from one religion, from one dogma to another. We are always acquiring ideas, and this acquisition we think is important in the understanding of life. So I would like, if I may, to go into the problem and see whether this additive process of the mind does bring about freedom, and whether knowledge can solve any human problem. Knowledge may solve superficial, mechanical problems, but does it free the mind fundamentally so that it is capable of directly perceiving what is true? Surely it is very important to understand this question, because in understanding it perhaps we shall revolt against mere methodology, which is a hindrance except in achieving some mechanical result. I am talking about the psychological process of the mind, and whether it is possible to bring about individual creativeness - which is naturally of the greatest importance, is it not? Does the acquisition of knowledge, as we conceive it, bring about creativeness? Or, to be capable of that state which is creative, must the mind be free from the whole additive process?

Most of us read books, or go to talks, in order to understand; when we have a problem, we study, or we go to somebody to discuss it, hoping thereby that our problem will be solved, or that we will see something new. We are always looking to others, or to experience, which is essentially knowledge, in the hope of resolving the many problems that confront us. We turn to the

interpreters, those who say they understand a little more - the interpreters, not only of these talks, but also of the various sacred books. We seem to be incapable of tackling the problem directly for ourselves without relying on anyone. And is it not important to find out whether the mind, in its process of accumulation, is ever able to resolve any psychological, spiritual problem? Must not the mind be totally unoccupied if it is to be capable of perceiving the truth of any human conflict?

I hope you will have the patience to go into this problem, not merely as I describe it, but as each one of us is involved in it. After all, why are you here? Obviously, some are merely curious, so we won't concern ourselves with those. But others must be very serious; and if you are serious, what is the intention behind that seriousness? Is it to understand what I am saying - and, not understanding, to turn to another to explain what has been said, thereby bringing about the process of exploitation? Or are you listening to find out if what I say is true self, not because I say it, or because someone else explains it? Surely, the problems which we discuss here are your problems, and if you can see and understand them directly for yourself, you will resolve them.

We all have many problems and there must obviously be a change; but is change brought about by the process of the mind? I am talking of fundamental change, not of mere sociological or economic reform. Surely, it is the mind that has created our problems; and can the mind resolve the problems it has created? Does the resolution of these problems lie in acquiring more knowledge, more information, in learning new techniques, new methods, new systems of meditation, in going from one teacher to

another? All that is clearly very superficial; and is it not important to find out what makes the mind superficial, what brings about superficiality? With most of us, that is the problem, is it not? We are very superficial, we do not know how to go deeply into our conflicts and difficulties; and the more we turn to books, to methods, to practices, to the acquisition of knowledge, the more superficial we become. That is an obvious fact. One may read innumerable books, attend highly intellectual talks, gather vast stores of information; but if one does not know how to delve within oneself and discover the truth, understand the whole process of the mind, surely all one's efforts will only lead to greater superficiality.

So is it possible for you, while listening, not merely to remain at the superficial, verbal level, but to uncover the process of your own thinking and go beyond the mind? What I am saying is not very complicated. I am only describing that which is taking place within each one of us; but if you live at the verbal level and are satisfied with the description without directly experiencing, then these talks will be utterly useless. Then you will turn to the interpreters, to those who offer to tell you what I am talking about - which is so utterly silly. It is much better to listen directly to something than to turn to someone else to tell you what it is all about. Cannot one go to the source without interpretation, without being guided to discover what the source is? If one is guided to discover, it is no longer discovery, is it?

Please see this point. To discover what is true, what is real, no guidance is necessary. When you are guided to discover, it is not discovery: you merely see what someone has pointed out to you. But if you discover for yourself, then there is quite a different

experience which is original, unburdened by the past, by time, by memory, utterly free of tradition, dogma, belief. It is that discovery which is creative, totally new; but to come to that discovery, the mind must be capable of penetrating beyond all the layers of superficiality. And can we do it? Because all our problems - political, social, economic, personal - are essentially religious problems; they are reflections of the inward, moral problem, and unless we solve that central problem, all other problems will multiply. That problem cannot be resolved by following anybody, by reading any book, by practising any technique, In the discovery of reality, methods and systems are utterly valueless, because you have to discover for yourself. Discovery implies complete aloneness, and the mind cannot be alone if it is living on explanations, on words, if it is practising a method or depending on someone else's translation of the problem.

So, realizing that from childhood our education, our religious training, our social environment, have all helped to make us utterly superficial, can the mind put aside its superficiality, this constant process of acquisition, negative or positive - can it put all that aside and be, not blank, but unoccupied, creatively empty, so that it is no longer creating its own problems and seeking the resolution of what it has created? Surely, it is because we are superficial that we do not know how to go very deeply, how to reach great depths within ourselves; and we think we can reach great depths by learning or by listening to talks.

Now, what is it that makes the mind superficial? Please don't merely listen to me, but observe, be aware of your own thinking when a question of that kind is put to you. What makes the mind

superficial? Why cannot the mind experience something that is true, beyond its own projections? Is it not primarily the gratification which each one of us is seeking that makes the mind superficial? We want at any price to be gratified, to find satisfaction; so we seek methods to achieve that end. And is there such a thing as satisfaction, ever? Though we may be temporarily satisfied, and change the object of our satisfaction depending on our age, is there satisfaction at any time? Desire is constantly seeking to fulfil itself, so we go from one satisfaction to another; and getting caught in each new satisfaction, with all its complications, we again become dissatisfied and try to disentangle ourselves. We cling to persons, pursue teachers, join groups, read books, take up one philosophy after another, but the central desire is always the same: to be satisfied, to be secure, to become somebody, to achieve a result, to gain an end. Is not that whole process one of the primary causes of the mind's superficiality?

And is not the mind superficial because we think in terms of acquisition? The mind is constantly occupied with acquiring, or with putting aside, denuding itself of what it has acquired. There is tension between acquisition and denudation, and we live in that tension; and does not that tension contribute to shallowness of mind?

Another factor which brings about shallowness is the mind's ceaseless occupation with its own troubles, or with some philosophy, or with God, ideas, beliefs, or with what it should do or should not do. As long as the mind is absorbed, concerned, taken up with something, is it not superficial? Surely only the unoccupied mind, the mind that is totally free, not caught in any

problem, that is not concerned with itself, with its achievements, with its pains, with its joys and sorrows, with its own perfection - only such a mind ceases to be shallow. And cannot the mind live from day to day, doing the things it has to do, without this preoccupation?

For most of us, with what is the mind occupied? When you observe your own mind, when you are aware of it, what is it concerned with? With how to make itself more perfect, how to be healthy, how to get a better job, whether it is loved or not loved, whether it is making progress, how to get out of one problem without falling into another - it is concerned with itself, is it not? In different ways it is everlastingly identifying itself with the greatest, or with the most humble. And can a mind occupied with itself ever be profound? Is it not one of our difficulties, perhaps the major difficulty, that our minds have become so extraordinarily shallow? If any difficulty arises, we rush to somebody to help us; we have not the capacity to penetrate, to find out: we are not investigators into our selves. And can the mind investigate, be aware of itself, if it is occupied with any problem? The problems which we create in our superficiality demand, not superficial responses, but the understanding of what is true; and cannot the mind, being aware of the causes of superficiality in itself, understand them without struggling against them, without trying to put them aside. Because the moment we struggle, that in itself becomes another problem, another occupation which merely increases the superficiality of the mind.

Let me put it this way: If I realize that my mind is superficial, what am I to do? I realize its superficiality through observation. I

see how I turn to books, to leaders, to authority in various forms, to Masters, or to some yogi - you know the many different ways in which we seek to be satisfied. I realize all that. Now, is it not possible to put all that aside without effort, without being occupied with it, without saying, "I must put it aside in order to go deeper, be more thoughtful"? This concern to become something more - is it not the constant occupation of the mind, and a primary cause of superficiality? That is what we all want: to understand more, to have more property, to have better brains, to play a better game, to look more beautiful, to be more virtuous; always the more, the more, the more. And as long as the mind is occupied with the more, can it ever understand what is?

Please listen to this. When the mind is pursuing the more, the better, it is incapable of understanding itself as it is; because it is always thinking of acquiring more, of going further, achieving greater results, it cannot understand its actual state. But when the mind perceives what it actually is without comparison or judgment, then there is a possibility of being deep, of going beyond. As long as one is concerned with the more at any level of consciousness, there must be superficiality; and a superficial mind can never find what is real, it can never know truth, God. It can concentrate on the image of God, it can imagine, speculate and throw up hopes; but that is not reality. So what is needed, surely, is not a new technique, a new social or religious group, but individuals who are capable of going beyond the superficial; and one cannot go beyond the superficial if the mind is occupied with the more or with the less. If the mind is concerned with having more property or less property, if property is its occupation, then obviously it is a very

superficial, silly mind; and the mind that is occupied with becoming more virtuous is equally silly, because it is concerned with itself and its acquisitions.

So the mind is the result of time, which is the process of the more; and cannot the mind be aware of this process and be what it is without trying to change itself? Surely, transformation is not brought about by the mind. Transformation comes into being when the truth is seen; and truth is not the more. Transformation, which is the only real revolution, is in the hands of reality, not within the sphere of the mind.

Is it not important, then, for each one of us, not merely to listen to these talks, but to be aware of ourselves and remain in that state of awareness without looking to interpreters or leaders, and without desiring something more? In that state of awareness, in which there is no choice, no condemnation or judgment, you will see what is taking place, you will know the process of the mind as it actually is; and when the mind is thus aware of itself, it becomes quiet, it is unoccupied, still. It is only in that stillness that there is a possibility of seeing what is true, which brings about a radical transformation.

Question: Why is it that in this country we seem to feel so little respect for anybody?

Krishnamurti: I wonder in what country one feels respect for another? In India they salute most profoundly, they give you garlands, flowers - and ill-treat the neighbours, the servants, the animals. Is that respect? Here, as in Europe, there is respect for the man with an expensive car and a big house; there is respect for those who are considered superior, and contempt for others. But is that the problem? We all want to feel equal to the highest, do we

not? We want to be on a par with the famous, the wealthy, the powerful. The more a civilization is industrialized the more there is the idea that the poor can become the rich, that the man living in a cabin can become the president, so naturally there is no respect for anyone; and I think if we can understand the problem of equality we may then be able to understand the nature of respect.

Now, is there equality? Though the various governments, whether of the left or of the right, emphasize that we are all equal, are we equal? You have better brains, greater capacity, you are more gifted than I; you can paint, and I cannot; you can invent, and I am only a labourer. Can there ever be equality? There may be equality of opportunity, you and I may both be able to buy a car; but is that equality? Surely, the problem is not how to bring about equality economically, but to find out whether the mind can be free from this sense of the superior and the inferior, from the worship of the man who has much, and the contempt for the man who has little. I think that is the problem. We look up to those who can help us, who can give us something, and we look down on those who cannot. We respect the boss, the man who can give us a better position, a political job, or the priest, who is another kind of boss in the so-called spiritual world. So we are always looking up and looking down; and cannot the mind be free from this state of contempt and false respect?

Just watch your own mind, your own words, and you will discover that there is no respect as long as there is this feeling of superiority and inferiority. And do what the government may to equalize us, there can never be equality, because we all have different capacities, different aptitudes; but what there can be is

quite a different feeling, which is perhaps a feeling of love, in which there is no contempt, no judgment, no sense of the superior and the inferior, the giver and the taker. Please, these are not mere words; I am not describing a state to be desired, and being desired gives rise to the problem, "How am I to get there?", which again only leads to superficial attitudes. But when once you perceive your own attitude and are aware of the activities of your own mind, then perhaps a different feeling, a sense of affection comes into being; and is it not that which is important?

What matters is not why some people have respect and others do not, but to awaken that feeling, that affection, that love, or what name you will, in which this sense of the high and the low will totally cease. And that is not a Utopia, it is not a state to be striven after, something to be practised day after day until you ultimately arrive. I think it is important merely to listen to it, to be aware of it as you would see a beautiful picture, or a lovely tree, or hear the song of a bird; and if one listens truly, the very listening, the very perception does something radical. But the moment the mind interferes, bringing in its innumerable problems, then the conflict arises between what should be and what is; then we introduce ideals and the imitation of those ideals, so we never discover for ourselves that state in which there is no desire to be more and therefore no contempt. As long as you and I are seeking fulfilment, there is no respect, there is no love. As long as the mind wants to fulfil itself in something, there is ambition; and it is because most of us are ambitious in different directions, at different levels, that this feeling, not of equality, but of affection, of love, is impossible.

I am not talking of something superhuman; but I think if one

can really understand ambition, the desire to become more, to fulfil, to achieve, to shine, if one can live with it, know for oneself all its implications, look at it as one would look at oneself in a mirror, just to see what one is without condemnation - if one can do that, which is the beginning of self-knowledge, of wisdom, then there is a possibility of this affection coming into being.

Question: Is fear a separate, identifiable quality of the mind, or is it the mind itself? Can it be discarded by the mind, or does it come to an end only when the mind ceases altogether? If this question is confusing, can it be asked differently: is fear always an evil to be overcome, and is it never a necessary blessing in disguise?

Krishnamurti: The question has been asked, and let us try to find out, you and I together, what fear is and whether it is possible to eradicate it. Or, as the questioner suggests, it may be a blessing in disguise. We are going to find out the truth of the matter; but to do that, though I may be talking, you must investigate your own fears and see how fear arises.

We have different kinds of fear, have we not? Fear exists at different levels of our being; there is the fear of the past, fear of the future, and fear of the present, which is the very anxiety of living. Now, what is this fear? Is it not of the mind, of thought? I think of the future, of old age, of poverty, of disease, of death, and of that picture I am afraid. Thought projects a picture which awakens anxiety in the mind; so thought creates its own fear, does it not? I have done something foolish, and I don't want my attention called to it, I want to avoid it, I am afraid of the consequences. This is again a thought process, is it not? I want to recapture the happiness

of youth; or perhaps I saw something yesterday in the mountain sunlight which has now escaped me, and I want to experience that beauty again; or I want to be loved, I want to fulfil, I want to achieve, I want to become somebody; so there is anxiety, there is fear. Thought is desire, memory, and its responses to all this bring about fear, do they not? Being afraid of tomorrow, of death, of the unknown, we begin to invent theories, that we shall be reborn, that we shall be made perfect through evolution, and in these theories the mind takes shelter. Because we are everlastingly seeking security, we build churches around our hopes, our beliefs and dogmas, for which we are prepared to fight; and all this is still the process of thinking, is it not? And if we cannot resolve our fear, our psychological block, we turn for help to somebody else.

As long as I am thinking in terms of achieving, fulfilling, of not becoming, of dying, I am always caught in fear am I not? The process of thinking as we know it, with its self-enclosing desire to be successful not to be lonely, empty - that very process is the seat of fear. And can the mind which is occupied with itself, which is the product of its own fears, ever resolve fear?

Suppose one is afraid, and one knows the various causes that have brought about fear. Can that same mind, which has produced fear, put aside fear by its own effort? As long as the mind is occupied with fear, with how to get rid of it, with what to do and what not to do in order to surmount it, can it ever be free from fear? Surely, the mind can be free from fear only when, it is not occupied with fear - which does not mean running away from fear, or trying to ignore it. First, one must be fully aware that one is afraid. Most of us are not fully aware, we are only vaguely aware

of fear; and if we do come face to face with it, we are horrified, we run away from it and throw ourselves into various activities which only lead to further mischief.

Because the mind itself is the product of fear, whatever the mind does to put away fear only increases it further. So can one just be aware of one's fear without being occupied with it, without judging or trying to alter it? To be aware of fear without condemnation does not mean accepting it, taking it to your heart. To be aware of fear without choice is just to look at it, to know there is fear and to see the truth of it; and seeing the truth of fear dissolves fear. The mind can not dissolve fear by any action of its own; in the face of fear it must be very quiet, it must know and not act. Please listen to this. One must know that one is afraid, be fully conscious of it, without any reaction, without any desire to alter it. The alteration, the transformation cannot be brought about by the mind: it comes into being only with the perception of truth, and the mind cannot perceive what is true if it is concerned with fear, if it condemns or desires to be rid of it. Any action of the mind with regard to fear only increases fear, or helps the mind to run away from it. There is freedom from fear only when the mind, being fully aware of its own fears, is not active towards them. Then quite a different state comes into being which the mind cannot possibly conceive or invent. That is why it is so important to understand the process of the mind, not according to some philosopher, analyst, or religious teacher, but as it is actually going on in yourself from moment to moment in all your relationships, when you are quiet, when you are walking, when you are listening to somebody when you are turning on the radio, reading a book, or talking at table. To

be fully aware of oneself without choice is to keep the mind astonishingly alert, and in that awareness there is self-knowledge, the beginning of wisdom. The mind that struggles against fear, that analyzes fear, will never resolve fear; but when there is passive awareness of fear, a different state comes into being in which fear does not exist.

July 4, 1953.

OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 5TH JULY, 1953

I think that it would be worth while and quite important to go into the question of what is true religion; and perhaps in going into this matter rather deeply, we might be able to discover, directly experience for ourselves, that state which is not of the mind and which must be something unknown, totally new, never experienced before. But to discover and experience that state, it seems to me that we will first have to understand the process of the intellect, the mind. The mind is made up not only of the conscious, but also of the many layers of that which we call the unconscious; it is a total process, though for convenience we may divide it as the conscious and the unconscious, with the different gradations of consciousness that lie between the two. To understand the various activities of the mind, surely we must not only inquire at the superficial or verbal level, but also go deeply into the process of thought itself.

What I would like to do this morning, if it is possible - and I don't know if it is - is to bring about that state which is not conceivable, which is not imaginable, which cannot be systematized or speculated upon; and surely that requires, not a condition of self-hypnosis or mere autosuggestion, but rather the gradual unfolding, as I talk, of the process of your own mind. Can we discover together and directly experience that state to which all religions, stripped of their churchianity, their dogmas, their rituals and innumerable stupidities, always refer? I am not going to lead you to discover it, because discovery is spontaneous. You must discover it for yourself. What I shall try to do is to describe how that state comes into being; but if you merely follow the verbal

description, then you will obviously not comprehend or experience that state which arises only when the mind is no longer projecting or resisting.

As I was saying, we have first to understand the intellect, the process of consciousness, not only the superficial, but also the deeper layers; and to do that we must obviously begin with the verbal reactions and responses. Besides their outward meaning, words like "God", "communist", "capitalist", "greed", "progress", "death", have very great significance for most of us, have they not? They have a neurological as well as psychological significance. Words are symbols; and if we do not use words, we have symbols in other forms, like the cross and the religious symbols of India. And is it possible to abstain from reacting, from throwing up barriers in response to symbols? Can the mind, at that superficial level, put aside the imaginative, the speculative, the verbal process, with all its responses? To do so is quite arduous, because at present the mind thinks only in terms of words, symbols, images.

And must we not go into the process of desire? Surely, desire is part of the mind, of the intellect, of the intelligence which we use in every day life. Desire is the very process of the mind, of the mind that accumulates, holds, that has innumerable motives, that pursues sensations, that demands more, that avoids pain and is caught in the urgency of pleasure. The mind is continually seeking a place of safety where it can dwell without disturbance, is it not? It tries to be permanently secure in an idea, in a belief, in an experience, in a relationship. All that is the process of the mind, of what we call the intellect, the individual intelligence; it is all part of consciousness, either open or hidden, and it is all we know.

Now, knowing the total process of itself, can the mind go beyond this process? Can it be quiet so as to discover what is true, what is real, what is God? That is what I would like to go into this morning. Can the mind be aware of its many layers, of the verbal responses, of the purely physical appetites, the biological urges, of the imprint of tradition and environment, of the open and hidden memories - can it be aware of all this without in any way interfering? Thought is always conditioned as long as it is the verbal expression of memory; and until the mind is totally free of this extraordinary accumulation of the past, the unknown is obviously not possible. Until the process of recognition ceases, the new cannot be.

Please, let us talk it over a little more. After all, what we call experience is a process of recognition, is it not? When you see a certain animal you know it is a dog because you have had previous experience of the species and given it a name. When you meet a friend you recognize him because you have already experienced the friendship. When there is a psychological experience, that experience has been tasted before, and you have given it a name; and from that there is a further experiencing. The mind can recognize only that which has been experienced; it cannot recognize something new, because what is new is not recognizable. So truth, God, or what name you will, must be totally new, it cannot be recognized. If it is recognized, it has already been experienced and what has been experienced is within the field of time. Please see this clearly and you will understand something. It is not difficult. The words I am using may be difficult, but the feeling, the import of what I am saying is quite simple.

The function of the mind is cognitive, is it not? The mind recognizes, thinks; and its thinking, recognizing, experiencing, all comes from the background of memory. After all, if I am a Hindu, my conditioning limits my thinking; I think of God, of morality, in terms of tradition, according to what I have read in the the various Hindu scriptures. And those who are Christians, or Buddhists or what you will, and who are religiously inclined, are equally conditioned by all that they have been taught.

Now, what we are trying to - not only now, but always - is to find out if the mind can free itself from its conditioning and thereby experience that which has never been experienced before. Surely, that is reality, that is true religion, is it not? Religion has nothing to do with beliefs, with symbols, with rituals, with the promises, hopes and fears around which creeds and churches are built. Nor is it a question of morality. The moral person may never know reality - which does not mean that to know reality he must be immoral. Morality which is the result of conscious effort circumscribes the mind. Virtue is necessary only because it gives freedom, but a man who is trying to become virtuous is never free.

So, knowing the whole content of the mind - its denials, its resistances, its disciplinary activities, its various efforts at security, all of which condition and limit its thinking - can the mind, as an integrated process, be totally free to discover that which is eternal? Because without that discovery, without the experiencing of that reality, all our problems with their solutions only lead to further misery and disaster. That is obvious, you can see it in everyday life. Individually politically internationally, in every activity we are breeding more and more mischief, which is inevitable as long as

we have not experienced that state of religion, that state which is experienceable only when the mind is totally free.

Now, after hearing this, can you, if only for a second, know that freedom? You cannot know it merely because I am suggesting it, for then it would be only an idea, an opinion without any significance. But if you have followed all these talks very seriously, you are beginning to be aware of the process of your own thought, of its direction, its purposes, its motives; and being aware, you are bound to come to a state in which the mind is no longer seeking, choosing, struggling to achieve. Having perceived its own total process, the mind becomes extraordinarily still, without any direction, without any volition, without any action of will. Will is still desire, is it not? The man who is ambitious in the worldly sense has a strong desire to achieve, to be successful, to become famous, and he exercises will for his self-importance. Likewise we exercise will to develop virtue, to achieve a so-called spiritual state. But what I am talking about is totally different, it is devoid entirely of any desire, of any action towards escape, of any compulsion to be this or that.

In examining what I am saying, you are exercising reason, are you not? But reason can lead only so far and no further. We must obviously exercise reason, the capacity to think things out completely and not stop half way. But when reason has reached its limit and can go no further, then the mind is no longer the instrument of reason, of cunning, of calculation, of attack and defence, because the very centre from which arise all our thoughts, all our conflicts, has come to an end.

So, now that you have listened to these talks, surely you are

beginning to be aware of yourself from moment to moment during the day in your various activities; the mind is coming to know itself, with all its deviations, its resistances, its beliefs, its pursuits, its ambitions, its fears, its urge to fulfil. Being aware of all this, is it not possible for the mind, if only for an instant, to be totally still, to know a silence in which there is freedom? And when there is that freedom of silence, then is not the mind itself the eternal?

To experience the unknown, the mind itself must be the unknown. The mind, so far, is the result of the known. What are you but the accumulation of the known, of all your troubles your vanities, your ambitions, pains, fulfilments and frustrations? All that is the known, the known in time and space; and as long as the mind is functioning within the field of time, of the known, it can never be the unknown, it can only go on experiencing that which it has known. Please, this is not something complicated or mysterious. I am describing obvious facts of our daily existence. Burdened with the known, the mind seeks to discover the unknown. How can it? We all talk of God; in every religion, in every church and temple that word is used, but always in the image of the known. It is only the very, very few who leave all the churches, the temples, the books, who go beyond and discover.

At present the mind is the result of time, of the known, and when such a mind sets out to discover, it can discover only what it has already experienced, which is the known. To discover the unknown, the mind has to free itself completely from the known, from the past, not by slow analysis, not by delving step by step into the past, interpreting every dream, every reaction, but by seeing the truth of all this completely, instantaneously, as you are sitting here.

As long as the mind is the result of time, of the known, it can never find the unknown, which is God, reality, or what you will. Seeing the truth of that frees the mind from the past. Don't immediately translate freedom from the past as not knowing the way to your home. That is amnesia. Don't reduce it to such infantile thinking. But the mind is freed the moment it sees the truth that it cannot find the real, this extraordinary state of the unknown, when it is burdened with the known. Knowledge, experience is the "me", the ego, the self which has accumulated, gathered; therefore all knowledge must be suspended, all experience must be set aside. And when there is the silence of freedom, then is not the mind itself the eternal? Then it is experiencing something totally new, which is the real; but to experience that, the mind must be that. Please don't say the mind is reality. It is not. The mind can experience reality only when it is totally free from time; and this whole process of discovery is religion. Surely, religion is not what you believe, it has nothing to do with whether you are a Christian or a Buddhist, a Mussulman or a Hindu; those things have no significance, they are a hindrance, and the mind that would discover must be totally stripped of them all. To be new, the mind must be alone; for eternal creation to be, the mind itself must be in that state to receive it. But as long as it is full of its own travails and struggles, as long as it is burdened with knowledge and complicated by psychological blockages, the mind can never be free to receive, to understand, to discover.

So, a truly religious person is not one who is encrusted with beliefs, dogmas, rituals. He has no beliefs; he is living from moment to moment, never accumulating any experience, and

therefore he is the only revolutionary being. Truth is not a continuity in time, it must be discovered anew at every moment. The mind that gathers, holds, that treasures any experience, cannot live from moment to moment discovering the new.

Those who are really serious, who are not dilettante, not merely playing with all this, have an extraordinary importance in life, because it is they who will become a light unto themselves and therefore, perhaps, to others. To talk of God without experiencing, without having a mind that is totally free and thereby open to the unknown, has very little value, it is like grown-up people playing with toys; and when we play with toys, calling it religion, we are creating more confusion, greater misery. It is only when we understand the whole process of thinking, when we are no longer caught in our own thought, that it is possible for the mind to be still; and only then can the eternal come into being.

Question: To help my three children, do I just watch myself? And how am I to instruct them?

Krishnamurti: Is not life, everyday living, a process of educating the children and yourself too? Please, this question with its answer is not limited to teachers and students; you are all concerned with this, because you are parents.

Now is education merely the imparting of knowledge? Is it a matter of teaching the children how to read, how to add, how to get a job? But that is what we are now chiefly concerned with, is it not? And what is the result? The boy either ends up in the army, to be destroyed, or he destroys himself in a job. So what does it mean to educate oneself and the children? Does it mean spending years in learning a technique, and then becoming cannon fodder, or a

machine in the social structure? Please just follow this; I am asking you to find out for yourself. Does it mean surrounding oneself with innumerable gadgets, with things or beliefs, in order to safeguard oneself and not to be afraid? Does it mean the superficial covering of the mind with information? But that is what we call education, is it not? We spend enormous sums of money to train a boy, and then he ends up in a war in Korea, or in Germany, or in Russia. We are everlastingly creating wars, destroying each other, from the most ancient of times until now. So education as we know it has obviously failed; it has no meaning any more. And if education is none of these things for any intelligent man who thinks about it, then what do we mean by education? Does it not mean an integrated view of life, which will bring about integrated human beings? And one obviously cannot be an integrated human being if one is an American, or a Russian, or a Hindu; those are mere labels without much significance. An integrated human being is one who is no longer caught in fear, who is not shaped by society into a particular pattern of thought, either Catholic communist, or any other. Each sect, each national or religious group, wants to educate its children according to a certain formula; and is that education? Will it bring about integrated human beings? To educate the children, must one not begin to free oneself from fear, from all these limitations of thought as the Christian, the communist, or the idealist?

Surely, to educate oneself and others, one must become aware of oneself, of one's thoughts, of one's motives, of one's contempt and fears; one must become aware of the words one uses, and of the psychological response of the mind to words like "American",

"Russian", "German". To educate others, one must begin to educate oneself; and is that not the right process of education? True education exists when the educator is being educated as well as the children, and that implies freedom for the child as well as for yourself. Freedom is not at the end of a long course of discipline, coercion. There is no freedom at the end of compulsion; the outcome of compulsion is still compulsion. If you dominate the child, compel him to fit into a pattern, however idealistic, will he be free at the end of it? If we want to bring about a true revolution in education, there must obviously be freedom at the very beginning, which means that both the parent and the teacher must be concerned with freedom, and not with how to help the child to become this or that.

The right kind of education also implies freedom from competition, does it not? We give marks, compare children and encourage competition because when there is the competitive spirit it is much easier to discipline the child, and through fear he is forced to conform, to study more. But if we want to create the right kind of education we will be concerned with freeing the mind so that it is able to look at life with an integrated outlook and meet all its complications as they arise from moment to moment. Surely, that is far more important than the mere drudgery of learning. Book knowledge may or may not come in, but what we are concerned with is to bring about a new human being who is no longer coerced, no longer competitive, no longer seeking success, but who understands what is and is therefore freeing himself from what is. But that requires an extraordinary patience, an integrated understanding which comes only through self-knowledge; and that

is why it is so important that both the educator and the educated, the teacher and the taught, should be fully aware of the process of the mind, of their own being.

I believe it used to cost twenty-five cents to kill a Roman soldier, or for the Roman soldier to kill some other soldier; and now, to kill a soldier, it costs something like a hundred thousand dollars. We go on developing mere technique, the ways of memory, of the cunning intellect, and there is no revolt against all this. And when we do revolt, we become pacifists, idealists, or adopt some other label. There can be fundamental revolution only when there is an integrated outlook on life, when each individual is a total being; and that totality, that integration of the individual cannot exist as long as there is fear, competition, ambition, this constant urge to fulfil oneself in some activity, all of which implies "me" against the whole. The world is ours, the riches of the earth are yours and mine. No one can be prosperous while others are starving; but to see this requires an integrated outlook, and we cannot have that integrated view of life as long as you remain an American and I a Hindu. We are human beings, but we cannot partake of this earth if you are competing with me and I with you. As long as you and I are ambitious to fulfil, to become, we must be in constant conflict not with each other. If you see all this, not merely verbally, but inwardly, deeply, I assure you, you will be in revolt; and then, perhaps, we shall be able to produce a new culture, a new world.

Question: The basic struggle throughout history, as in the modern world, seems to be the clash between the forces of tradition and conservatism on the one hand, and the progressive forces on

the other. To which side should one give one's support in this great battle to advance human welfare?

Krishnamurti: Cannot we look at this problem without taking sides? Because the moment you take sides, you have not an integrated outlook, you are not free. If you are a progressive and I am a conservative, we clash, we are against each other. Instead of looking at the problem from your point of view or from my point of view, can we not find out what it is that makes the mind conservative or progressive? Do you understand the problem? If I am conservative and you are progressive, we must inevitably be in conflict. I want to conserve, to retain, to keep things very much as they are; and you want to bring reform, you want to produce revolution. We are in constant battle with each other, and so we never solve the problem. But if you and I are intent on solving the human problem, then we will be neither progressive nor conservative; we will be concerned with the problem itself, not with how you look at it or how I look at it. I hope the question is now clear; but the question will never be clear if we have already taken sides. So let us inquire into the conservative and the progressive mind.

Both the conservative and the progressive desire change. That is obvious. It is only the most stupid, the totally blind who want no change at all. Those who have all the things of this world, a large bank account, comfort, luxury, who are satisfied and want everything guarded - such people do not want change. But those who observe, who are aware of the world problem, not just the American or Indian problem, who see this whole human struggle - they all want change. There is starvation in Asia of which you

know nothing. Millions and millions have only half a meal a day, and not even that. There is famine, disease, superstition, the degradation of poverty, the multiplication of children, everincreasing populations, poor soil. Naturally they are clamouring for change. And there must obviously be a change from war. Something must be done to stop all wars, so that man can be free to educate himself, to live peacefully, harmoniously, creatively. So, if we are at all thoughtful, we all want change, the conservative as well as the progressive.

The problem, then, is not whether to support the conservative or the progressive, but how to bring about change. Isn't it? Please, one can answer superficially, but I want to tackle this problem fundamentally, deeply. What brings about change? Do revolutions bring about change? There have been revolutions in the past, the French and the more recent ones; and have they brought about change? They may have brought about superficial political changes, but not a basic change of mind and heart, not a fundamental, integrated change in which the individual is no longer nationalistic, no longer French, Russian, German, Hindu, but a human being. So, when we are inquiring into change, revolution, must we not ask if the mind, regardless of whether it is conservative or progressive, can ever bring it about? Does change, revolution come into being through a process of the mind, or does it come about entirely differently? Have you ever observed how you change as an individual human being? When do you change? Surely, not when you are trying to change through the exercise of thought. You change in spite of yourself, when the mind is no longer planning to change.

It is very, very important to understand this, so please have the patience to inquire into it. If envious, how am I to change? Can I change by volition? When I try to get rid of greed, is not that very effort the result of greed in another form? When I say, "I must not be greedy", why do I say it? Because it no longer pays me to be greedy, it causes me pain, so now I have a different motive, a different urge, there is a new sensation which I am after; therefore, in discarding greed, I am still greedy. As long as change is the result of thought, it is not change, regardless of whether that thought is conservative or progressive. Change, revolution can come into being only when calculated thought has come to an end. Please think it over, see the truth of what I am saying. The change that is brought about by thought, by calculation, is a modified continuity. All political revolutions are merely a modified continuity, a reaction to the past, and therefore not a change at all.

So if they are concerned with change both the progressive and the conservative must inquire whether thought can ever bring it about. Change comes into being when there is the perception of what is true; and the perception of what is true is not of the mind. The mind may translate history according to its prejudices, according to its bourgeois or proletarian instincts; but the revolt of those who have nothing, like the conservatism of those who have everything, is always a reaction; and reaction is not change. Change comes about when the mind sees what is true; and it cannot see what is true as long as it is thinking in terms of the progressive or the conservative. You and I must be concerned directly with the problem of change. Change cannot be brought about by any act of will, by any application of knowledge; it comes into being only

when reality is seen by you and me. And reality can be seen only when the mind is no longer caught in reaction, when it is neither dreaming of Utopia nor wanting to conserve everything as it is. There is transformation when you and I are truly religious, and that is the only revolution, the only permanent change.

July 5, 1953

OJAI 7TH PUBLIC TALK 11TH JULY, 1953

It seems to me that it is one of the most difficult things to live simply; and perhaps this evening we can go into it, not just at the superficial level, but deeply, and try to find out what in essence it means to live simply. If one is at all alive, life has innumerable problems. Every problem seems to breed several more. There is apparently no end to problems, not only at the conscious level, but also at the deeper levels of consciousness. We never seem to escape or solve any problem without introducing other problems. But if we could understand what it is to live simply, or to think simply, then perhaps we might be able to produce in ourselves a state of being in which we would not bring about problem after problem.

Why is it that the mind accumulates? Why do we store up knowledge? Why is it that experience conditions us? If we can inquire into this accumulative process of the mind, it may help us to understand what it is to think directly, simply; and in perceiving why the mind gathers, holds, accumulates, perhaps we shall be able to dissolve our many difficulties as they arise.

We think that by gathering knowledge, by having experience, we shall be able to understand life with all its complex struggles. But what happens when we accumulate knowledge, experience? We are always translating any incident, any crisis, any reaction, in terms of our past experience, which is memory. With this burden of the past, we are incapable of looking at things directly - and perhaps there lies the crux of our difficulty. We never meet anything anew, but always in terms of the old, of what we have

known. It is because we never meet each problem directly and understand it for ourselves that we go on introducing other problems, creating further struggles.

Now, our conception of a simple life is to possess only a few things, or to have no possessions at all; but surely, that is not a simple life. We look up to those who lead a simple life in the physical sense, who have few clothes and no property, as though that were something marvellous. Why? Because we in ourselves are attached to things, to property. But is living a simple life merely a matter of denudation, the putting aside of physical things? Or is it much deeper? Though we may have but few things, inwardly we are always gathering, accumulating; we are bound to beliefs, to dogmas, to every form of experience and memory, and there is in us a ceaseless conflict between various wants, longings, hopes, desires. All this indicates, not a simple life, but a very complex inward life. So I think it is important to find out why the mind accumulates, consciously as well as unconsciously, why it cannot meet every incident, every reaction as though it were something new, fresh. Why must it translate each experience in terms of the old, in terms of what it has known? The mind is always accumulating experiences, reactions, storing them away as memory in order to use them for its own security. And is understanding, is intelligence the result of innumerable experiences? Or is it the capacity to look at things anew, to face life from moment to moment without the darkening effect of experience, of the past?

As I said the other day please do not listen to all this in order to understand what I am talking about, but rather to find out how you

are thinking. You are not here merely to follow my description of a certain state of mind, but to discover how your own mind operates when any new experience arises.

Take, for example, the problem of fear. Can you and I understand fear and dissolve it without bringing in the accumulation of the past? Most of us are afraid of various things: of tomorrow, of what the neighbours say, of being poor, of not fulfilling, of death. Now, what is this fear? Can we not go into it, understand it very simply, and thereby be free from fear - not everlastingly, but as it arises from moment to moment, from day to day - so that the mind is not burdened with the anxiety of tomorrow? Fear, after all, is a reaction, is it not? I have done something of which I am ashamed, I have made a mistake which I do not want somebody to discover, and of that I am afraid. So fear is a reaction, and it is no good fighting fear, trying to overcome it, to analyze or avoid it. Fear is the shadow of the thing I have done; so the problem is not fear, but my approach to what I have done. Now, can I look anew at what I have done? That is, can I, knowing the cause of fear, look at it very simply without accumulating, without making the understanding of the cause a technique of how to meet fear? Do you follow? When, knowing the cause of fear, the mind tries to understand that cause in order to protect itself against further fears, the fears of tomorrow, it introduces the complex process of self-protection, and therefore it is never able to meet each experience clearly, simply, directly.

Now, cannot the mind observe the cause, the incident which has produced fear, without interpretation, without judgment? Can it not merely look at the cause of fear, listen to it, let it tell its whole

story without interpreting, accepting or denying it, without trying to hide it, without taking refuge or running away from it? I think it is this that brings about the simplicity which is so essential in understanding. If we are capable of looking at the cause of the problem very simply, without translating or condemning it, then I think it is possible to be free moment by moment, not only from fear, but from envy, jealousy, the desire to be successful, and all the other human problems that inevitably arise. Problems will always arise, there are bound to be reactions as long as we live; so is it not necessary to have the capacity to meet them as they arise from day to day without accumulating, which limits our thinking and prevents our understanding of the problem?

Simplicity of thought, of mind, is essential, but there cannot be simplicity as long as the accumulative process of self-protection is going on; and this self-protective process of thought exists not only at the conscious level, but also at the various unconscious levels of our being. It is because we want to protect ourselves that knowledge, experience, becomes so vastly important to us. When we are confronted with a problem, we are never completely denuded of the past. And is it possible for you and me to empty the mind of the past, of the accumulated knowledge of yesterday?

Please, I think it is rather important to go into this and understand it. Burdened with the past, the mind creates its own problems, does it not? And can the mind begin to meet every problem anew, observe it as it arises without bringing in all the shadows of past experience? Surely, that is our problem: to look at every incident, every reaction without prejudice, without bias, without interpreting it according to the things we have learned,

which is the desire to protect ourselves. Can the mind be free from all that and look directly at each problem as it arises? If it can, then there is no death, then every human problem can be resolved - but not to its satisfaction, not to its gratification. The moment we introduce the desire to be satisfied, we are accumulating, which brings about fear. But cannot we look at the problem, whatever it is, without judgment, without evaluation? To evaluate a problem implies memory, judgment, weighing, calculating, all of which indicates, that the mind is constantly protecting itself. The desire to protect, to safeguard oneself, is conscious as well as unconscious; and knowing this whole process, can the mind at the same time put it all aside and look at the problem directly? It can do that only when you and I understand the necessity of freeing oneself from fear.

Fear corrupts, it shadows all our actions; where there is fear, there is no love. We know that theoretically, we have read about it; but, being aware that one is afraid of innumerable things, cannot one go into it completely? Cannot one find out the cause of fear and really understand it without fighting, without translating, judging or interpreting what is? And when the mind is aware of what is, not only at the conscious level, but as the total process of one's whole being is there not a release, a freedom from the cause which has produced fear? But there is no release if there is not the intention to understand what is, to look at it, to be familiar with it, to listen to its whole content, to see its flow, its movement.

So, simplicity of thinking does not come about through the accumulation of knowledge. On the contrary, the more you know, the less simple the mind is; and the mind must be extraordinarily

simple to understand what is. What is, is never the same, it varies from moment to moment, and its movement cannot be understood by a mind that is burdened with condemnation, with judgment, with self-protectiveness and fear of the future.

Please, I think it is very important to find out if one can really observe what is, without resentment, without recoil. After all, what are we? We are the result of many reactions, responses, conditioning influences, desires, fears, and in this turmoil the mind is caught; it is always in battle, in conflict. And to put an end to this ceaseless struggle, to this misery and pain, must we not understand simply, from moment to moment, the movement of what is? If I am greedy, or angry, or envious, surely I must understand that as it is and not try to resolve it, overcome it; because the very overcoming is a struggle, a new conflict, and hence there is no release from what is. But if I am aware, not only of my envy, but also of the deeper cause to which it is a response, and of the desire to be free from envy - if I am aware of that total process without judgment, choicelessly, then I think such awareness does bring about the clarification and the resolution of that cause. This requires, not practice or discipline, but watchfulness, alertness of mind; and the mind cannot be alert if it is constantly choosing, condemning, judging, escaping, or trying to alter what is.

Simplicity is the understanding of what is; and the understanding of what is comes into being only when the mind is no longer fighting struggling with what is no longer trying to mould it according to its fancies, desires, hopes and fears. In understanding what is, the movements of the self, the "me", the

ego, are revealed; and that, surely, is the beginning; of self-knowledge, not only at the conscious level, but at those levels where the self is so deeply hidden and from which it comes out occasionally, spontaneously, when you are off guard.

When we are aware of ourselves, is not the whole movement of living a way of uncovering the "me", the ego, the self? The self is a very complex process which can be uncovered only in relationship, in our daily activities, in the way we talk, the way we judge, calculate, the way we condemn others and ourselves. All that reveals the conditioned state of our own thinking; and is it not important to be aware of this whole process? It is only through awareness of what is true from moment to moment that there is discovery of the timeless, the eternal. Without self-knowledge, the eternal cannot be. When we do not know ourselves, the eternal becomes a mere word, a symbol, a speculation, a dogma, a belief, an illusion to which the mind can escape. But if one begins to understand the "me" in all its various activities from day to day, then in that very understanding, without any effort, the nameless, the timeless comes into being. But the timeless is not a reward for self-knowledge. That which is eternal cannot be sought after, the mind cannot acquire it. It comes into being when the mind is quiet; and the mind can be quiet only when it is simple, when it is no longer storing up, condemning, judging, weighing. It is only the simple mind that can understand the real, not the mind that is full of words, knowledge, information. The mind that analyses, calculates, is not a simple mind.

To be creative, the mind must be denuded of all its accumulations, and without that creativeness, our life is very

empty; though it may be full activity, of resolutions and determinations, they have very little significance. But the mind that sees this whole process of accumulation as a means of self-protection, that is aware of its implications without trying to alter it or put it aside - such a mind, being simple, quiet, understands what is; and in that there is an astonishing release, a freedom in which there is reality.

Question: You say that only a still mind can solve the problem of fear; but how can the mind be still when it is afraid?

Krishnamurti: There are several problems involved in this question. First, how to make the mind still in order to resolve fear? And can the mind which is afraid ever be still? And does stillness of mind come about through any technique? After all, that is what disturbs many people: the "how", the method, the technique of arriving at peace. The "how" implies habit, maintaining a certain attitude day after day, repeating a certain action, conforming to an established plan, disciplining the mind to be still. And is quietness, stillness of mind, the result of a habit? Is it the outcome of constant practice? Or does stillness of the mind come about only when there is freedom, when there is the understanding of what is?

Surely, if I want peace of mind, I can never have it. It is because I want a still mind that I go through various practices which I hope will bring it about; but such a mind is dead. A dead mind is very still, but it is not a mind in which creativeness can come into being. So there is no "how". All that the mind can do is to be aware that it is seeking a method because it wants something. If you want to be rich, you accumulate money, you choose your friends, you move among people who can help you get what you want. Similarly, if

you want peace of mind, if you feel the urgency of it, you try to find out how you can arrive at that; you listen to various teachers, you practise disciplines, you read certain books, always with the intention of having a quiet mind; but your mind merely becomes dull. Whereas, if you are aware of this whole process of your thinking, of the unconscious as well as the conscious, if you see all your thoughts from moment to moment without condemnation or judgment, just watching each thought as it arises without rejecting or laying by, then you will find there is a freedom in which stillness comes into being without your volition, without any action of your will.

The problem, then, is not how to free the mind from fear, or how to have a quiet mind in order to dissolve fear, but whether fear can be understood. Though I may be afraid of many things - of my boss, of my wife or husband, of death, of losing my bank account, of what my neighbours say, of not fulfilling, of losing my self-importance - fear itself is the result of a total process, is it not? That is, the "me", the self, the ego, in its activity, projects fear. The substance is the thought of the "me", and its shadow is fear; and it is obviously no good battling the shadow, the reaction. The "me" is protecting itself, longing, hoping, desiring, struggling, constantly comparing, weighing, judging; it wants power, position, prestige, it wants to be looked up to; and can that "me", which is the source of fear, cease to be, not everlastingly, but from moment to moment? When that feeling arises, can the mind be aware of it, examine it without condemnation, judgment, choice? Because, the moment you begin to judge, to evaluate, it is part of the "me" that is directing and so conditioning your thinking, is it not?

So, can I be aware of my greed, of my envy, from moment to moment? These feelings are expressions of the "me", of the self, are they not? The self is still the self at any level you may place it; whether it is the higher self or the lower self, it is still within the field of thought. And can I be aware of these things as they arise from moment to moment? Can I discover for myself the activities of my ego when I am eating, talking at table, when I am playing, when I am listening, when I am with a group of people? Can I be aware of the accumulated resentments, of the desire to impress, to be somebody? Can I discover that I am greedy, and be aware of my condemnation of greed? The very word "greed" is a condemnation, is it not? To be aware of greed is also to be aware of the desire to be free from it, and to see why one wants to be free from it - the whole process. This is not a very complicated procedure, one can immediately grasp the whole significance of it. So one begins to understand from moment to moment this constant growth of the "me", with its self importance, its self-projected activities - which is basically, fundamentally, the cause of fear. But you cannot take action to get rid of the cause: all you can do is to be aware of it. The moment you want to be free from the ego, that very desire is also part of the ego; so you have a constant battle in the ego over two desirable things, between the part that wants and the part that does not.

As one becomes aware at the conscious level, one also begins to discover the envy, the struggles, the desires, the motives, the anxieties that lie at the deeper levels of consciousness. When the mind is intent on discovering the whole process of itself, then every incident, every reaction becomes a means of discovery, of

knowing oneself. That requires patient watchfulness - which is not the watchfulness of a mind that is constantly struggling, that is learning how to be watchful. Then you will see that the sleeping hours are as important as the waking hours, because life then is a total process. As long as you do not know yourself, fear will continue and all the illusions that the self creates will flourish. Self-knowledge, then, is not a process to be read about or speculated upon: it must be discovered by each one from moment to moment, so that the mind becomes extraordinarily alert. In that alertness there is a certain quiescence, a passive awareness in which there is no desire to be or not to be, and in which there is an astonishing sense of freedom. It may be only for a minute, for a second - that is enough. That freedom is not of memory, it is a living thing; but the mind, having tasted it, reduces it to a memory, and then wants more of it. To be aware of this total process is possible only through self-knowledge; and self-knowledge comes into being from moment to moment as we watch our speech, our gestures, the way we talk, and the hidden motives that are suddenly revealed. Then only is it possible to be free from fear. As long as there is fear, there is no love. Fear darkens our being and that fear cannot be washed away by any prayer, by any ideal or activity. The cause of fear is the "me", the "me" which is so complex in its desires, wants, pursuits. The mind has to understand that whole process, and the understanding of it comes only when there is watchfulness with out choice.

July 11, 1953.

OJAI 8TH PUBLIC TALK 12TH JULY, 1953

I would like to talk over this morning a problem which I think is sufficiently important: that of the constant urge in each one of us to seek a permanent state which nothing will disturb. It is really quite a complex problem, and may I suggest that you listen to it passively, without acceptance or rejection, as one would listen to the song of a bird. Surely, if one would try to understand a very complex problem, there must be a certain alertness in which the mind is passive but not hypnotized by words. This does not in any way imply that you must accept what I am saying. On the contrary, mere acceptance, or conformity to what you consider to be the truth, has no significance at all. What has significance is to discover for yourself what is true; and you cannot discover what is true if your mind is constantly agitated by comparison, or by remembering what somebody else has said, or what you have read in various books. All that must intelligently be put aside so that one can listen with a passive awareness in which there is no self-projection, no defensive or antagonistic spirit. One cannot find out what is true if one is over-anxious, or in any way distracted. To see the truth of anything requires a peculiar attention, does it not? It is an attention which is effortless, as when you are listening to something which you really love.

Are not most of us seeking permanency at different levels of our consciousness? If we are merely worldly, we want permanency in name, in form, permanency in our good looks, in furniture, in property. That is, desire is seeking a permanent state in which there will be no disturbance of any kind; and if we are very superficial,

we look for that permanency in the social order, either of the left or of the right. If we are not caught up in that kind of worldliness, then we seek permanency in what we call love, in our relationship with certain people; and if we go beyond that, we seek permanency in belief, in ideas, in knowledge dogma, tradition. And there is also the desire to find a permanency in which there is no action from oneself. The mind says, "I surrender my will to God; he knows best, therefore let him function". One immolates oneself to what one considers to be God, or to the idea of the group, of the nation. Whether our activities are imposed by external circumstances, or are self-imposed through fear, through hope, through various forms of utopian illusion, the fundamental desire is to find a permanency in which the mind can take shelter and feel safe.

So desire is constantly seeking a state of permanency, a state in which there will be complete self-fulfilment through property, through persons, or through ideas, and in which the mind can never be disturbed. Is that not what most of us are after, consciously or unconsciously? We want to fulfil, to find permanent security, and this very urge gives rise to anxiety, to fear, and to various forms of destructive activity which we then try to reform, control, discipline.

Now, is it possible for the mind not to seek permanency, not to pursue a state which it has conceived to be happiness, reality? Can the mind be free from the experience of yesterday so that it does not permanently condition the present? And is there an action, a state of being, which is not the outcome of desire, which is beyond time, which has no continuity? To find out if there is such a state, surely the mind must inquire into and understand the process of its own desire. As long as one is seeking any kind of permanence, any

kind of security, every experience becomes a hindrance to further understanding, all knowledge a block to further discovery. Surely, then, if you and I would discover whether there is or is not the timeless, we must first understand how the mind is seeking, through property, relationship or belief, a condition in which it can dwell securely day after day. In whatever guise, that is, in essence, what we are after, is it not? Our life is very complex, fluctuating, changing; there is uncertainty, pain, sorrow. Realizing all that, consciously or unconsciously we want the opposite, something quite different from what is; and that is why we build churches, pursue Utopias, cling to dogmas, beliefs. We may see the fallacy of all that and consciously reject it, we may reason out that there is nothing permanent - and there is nothing permanent - but unconsciously, deep down, the human urge, the individual urge, is to find something which is beyond the conflict of desire.

Now is there such a thing as security? Is there a permanency which continues everlastingly in spite of calamities, in spite of death? Is there something which the mind can cling to? If through education, culture, tradition, through the conditioning of certain beliefs, one asserts that there is or is not, surely that response has no validity. A man who would really inquire into this question must obviously free himself from his conditioning; and that is one of our greatest difficulties, is it not?

The mind, which is thought, is constantly seeking in many subtle ways to have a permanent, unvarying state in which it can continue day after day. Though we don't say so, that is what we consciously or unconsciously demand; and thought finds the means to produce that permanency. Thought creates the thinker, and then

the thinker becomes the permanent entity who guides and controls thought. But the thinker is the thought; there is no thinker apart from thought.

Thought is seeking security at various levels; and when it seeks outward security, it is inviting insecurity. When you build up armaments in the hope of creating security for yourselves in this world, your security is destroyed by war. The mind that has found some measure of security becomes conservative, it wants to hold, to build, to continue as it is without being disturbed; it changes only under compulsion, when the pressure of the inevitable forces it to do so. But there is no such thing as security, permanency, that is, a state of complete conservation.

Inwardly, psychologically, the whole process of memory, which is the accumulation of experience, of knowledge, is a means through which the "me", the ego, can find security and perpetuate itself. Deep down there is the unconscious desire to fulfil, so we try various forms of fulfilment, various activities, jobs, functions. And is there fulfilment for the "me"? Can I ever fulfil myself? Surely, the "me" is only an idea, it has no reality. The "me" that is seeking prosperity, wealth, position, pleasure, the "me" that is avoiding pain, that is constantly endeavouring to increase, to become, to grow - that entity is merely an idea, it is a desire which has identified itself with a particular form of thought. So, is there ever fulfilment for you and me? And as long as each one of us is trying to fulfil, we are antagonistic, in competition with each other. You want to fulfil yourself through beauty, through harmony, and I want to fulfil myself through violence, through irresponsibility, through so-called freedom. Are we not antagonistic to each other?

You are seeking peace, and I am ambitious. Can the man who is pursuing peace and the man of ambition live together in the same social order? Obviously not. To seek fulfilment in peace, or in anything else, is not to be peaceful, and as long as each one of us is seeking fulfilment there must be conflict. And yet, for most of us, the desire for fulfilment is an intense urge which must at all costs be satisfied. At all the different levels of our being, waking or sleeping, we are constantly seeking a state which nothing can disturb, a continuity of thought as the "me" - the "me" with experiences, the "me" that has suffered, the "me" that has gathered so much information, knowledge. Not having found outward security, the "me" proceeds to find that state at other levels, beyond the superficial. So we meditate in order to achieve peace, to have a quiet mind. We think that a still mind will give us the state of permanency which we have not found in any other direction, and then the question arises, "How am I to be still?" So a whole new problem begins, and in that we get caught.

Surely, the thought that wants to be still can never free itself from conflict, because it is the very centre of the "me". It is thought as the "me" which identifies itself with the group, with the nation. You forget the "me" by throwing yourself into this or that activity. The "me" is forgotten, but the activity remains. Being an escape from the "me", your activity must be protected; and so there is antagonism, there are battles between various activities, between various national groups. And if you do not indulge in some activity, or in nationalism, you become a religious entity, identifying yourself with a particular belief, which then becomes immensely important because you are part of it.

Now, without going into too many details, all this is a true statement of an obvious fact; and if you really see the truth of what I am saying, surely your mind is no longer consciously or deeply seeking any state; it is beginning to be aware of everything as it arises, and is trying to understand it without storing up that understanding for use on future occasions. So there is a certain sense of freedom, and when you come to that point, you will find that there is an action taking place which is not the outcome of desire. Ordinarily we know only the activity of desire, which is the activity of the mind identified as the "me". That "me" is very petty, very small, narrow, shallow; though it may extend widely through identification, it is still very shallow, and therefore it can never find that which is real. A petty mind seeking God will find a god which is also petty. A superficial mind, however much it may discipline itself and assert that it must love, be compassionate, kind, gentle, will still be superficial.

Now, if the mind can see the truth of all this, then perhaps it will discover quite a different state, a state of silence which is not self-projected which is not the outcome of any desire, compulsion, or fear. In the silence there is no activity of the mind, and therefore there is no continuity. That which is continuous is the result of time, it is a process of time. Time is the mind, the mind that desires a continuity. Desiring continuity in experience, the mind is made continuous through memory and such a mind can never find anything new, it can never meet reality, the unknowable.

So the mind is the result of time,. it is the outcome of memory, of knowledge, of experience; and can such a mind, being aware of its own total process, cease to project, and remain silent? In that

silence, surely, great depths are known which the conscious mind can never experience and retain; because the moment the conscious mind interferes and takes pleasure in that experience, there is born the experiencer apart from the experienced, and so the division begins. There is then the conflict of the experiencer who is always pursuing that which is beyond himself. That is why it is very important, it seems to me, to understand this whole process of desire: the desire that is always creating the duality of the me who is the experiencer apart from the experienced, the thinker who is always dominating, controlling, shaping thought, pursuing the more pleasurable experience.

Seeing all this can thought which is a very complex process come to an end so that there is stillness of mind? In that stillness there are depths which the mind cannot possibly conceive; but a still mind knows those things. When the mind can experience without retaining, without storing up the experience as memory, only then is it capable of receiving that which is timeless, eternal; and without a glimpse of that, life is a series of empty struggles, an everlasting process of conflict and misery. Understanding does not come through escape, but through constant watchfulness in which there is no condemnation or comparison. Condemnation and comparison are of desire. When it is free of desire, watchfulness becomes clear, simple; there is immediate perception without analysis or judgment. Being choicelessly aware, the mind comes unknowingly to that state where there is stillness; and then it is possible for reality to be.

Question: What significance has physical death in the life of the individual? Is it not the great liberation from all our miseries?

Krishnamurti: Does death solve all our problems? And why is it that so many of us are afraid of death? The older we grow, the more anxious we become. Why? And does death, the coming to an end of the physical state, resolve our complex thoughts? Has not thought continuity? It may not continue in me, but thought is continuous; and thought which is continuous can never find release from its misery. So, being afraid of death, we have theories, hopes of a continuity; we say there must be reincarnation, that I must be born next life for a greater opportunity. I am not finished; and what is the value of all my accumulations, of the knowledge and experiences I have gathered, unless I can fulfil myself in the next life, or be resurrected in the future, or find a place in heaven? We are always afraid of the unknown, of the tomorrow, and so we set about finding ways and means of avoiding that finality. Or we reason logically, saying that everything comes to an end and is reborn: I die, I dissolve physically so that I can be born again in another form, or nourish another entity. Reasonably, logically, we pierce through the fear of death, and are satisfied. Or we are satisfied through belief in a future life, in something after death to which the mind can cling. So the mind is everlastingly seeking its own continuity; but that which is continuous is the known, and the known can never find the unknowable. That is our problem, is it not? In the midst of living we are dying, because we are the result of the known. We never for a moment put aside all the things that we know and become completely denuded of the past; we never allow the mind to be totally empty, consciously and unconsciously naked, inwardly stripped of all its experiences, of all its beliefs, of all its learning, so that the unknown can be.

After all, what is it that we know? Actually, what do you know? You know the way to your house; you have certain information, certain political or economic data; you know how to run a job. You know your name, your insurance, the make of your car; and you are a little bit aware of your own desires and appetites, of the experience and reactions which are the outcome of your conditioning. Beyond that, what else do you know? You know the everlasting struggle to be something: if you are conceited, proud, you try to be humble, and so on. That is all we know. We move within the field of the known, the known of pleasure and pain; and with that mind we try to convince ourselves that there is no death by inventing theories, the belief in reincarnation, in resurrection - all the innumerable illusions that the mind creates in order to escape from its own knowing quality. So while we are living, we are dying in the field of the known.

Surely, if you would find out what is immortal, what is beyond the mind, then the mind, which is the known, must come to an end; it must die to itself. You have read of all these things, or you have listened to me quite often; and yet the mind is continually seeking an answer, asking what lies beyond death. All the stupid societies thrive on your appetite to know what lies beyond; and when they tell you, you are satisfied, at least temporarily. But the real problem, which is fear of the unknown, is still there like a canker.

So, realizing that the mind can function only within the field of the known, cannot one remain completely and passively aware of the known without making a positive movement into the unknown? Which means, really, being open to death, to the unknown, the real. One carries on with the known as best one can and knows its

limitations completely; and knowing its limitations, there is no projection into the future into the tomorrow. Then there is no fear of the unknown; then death is not something to be afraid of - which does not mean you have a new theory, a new explanation, that you must form new groups to discuss what lies beyond, which is infantile. But when you see the limitations of the mind, of the known, when you see that you are limited and are totally aware of it, consciously as well as in the deeper layers of your consciousness, there is a complete cessation of the activity of the mind; the mind as thought, as "I know", ceases. Then there is a possibility of the unknown coming into being. But you cannot invite the unknown: you cannot invite God, truth, or what name you will. When you do, it is already the known. What is known is purgatory, hell; the unknown is heaven. But the unknowable has no relation with the known; it comes into being only when the mind is completely still. Mind as thought must come to an end, must die, and only then is it possible for that which is eternal to be.

POONA 1ST PUBLIC TALK 24TH JANUARY 1953

As there are going to be only four talks I think it is important to establish the relationship between the speaker and yourselves. The attitude an audience generally has towards a speaker is: the audience listening to certain ideas of the speaker and the speaker carrying on with his ideas which he wants to translate to the audience. But unfortunately, that is not so where I am concerned. I am not a lecturer. I am not giving you a speech for you to either confirm or to contradict.

What we are going to try today is to think out the problems together if we can, because it is your problem as well as mine; and if you merely listen, either to criticize or to accept or to deny, it will be utterly futile, because that is not my intention. What we shall do during these four talks is to find out the truth of the problem together. You are not going to listen to the truth of what I say, from me, but we are going to discover it together. We, you and I, shall discuss, shall talk it over, shall think out the problems together. I think it is very important to bear this in mind; otherwise, there will be a discussion only on the verbal level.

So, if I may suggest, please listen, not in order to confute or to conform, but really to go into the problems that confront us and which are multiplied everyday. Together we shall find out the true answer. Please bear this in mind - together. It is your problem as well as mine. We are going to discuss, to fathom the truth of the problem. So with that intention, please listen.

It is important to know how to listen, not only to me particularly, but to anybody. It is important to know how to listen,

because if we know how to listen truly, something extraordinary happens to us; because then without any bias, without any prejudice, we can go to the root of the matter immediately. But if we throw up a lot of arguments, concoct devices or contradictions to see who is correct and who is not correct and to carry on with our own particular idiosyncracies and ideas, then we will not discover the truth of the matter at all. We shall only be concerned with our own particular conclusions, with our own point of view. So if I may suggest, it is important that we should listen truly; because if we can know how to listen, the truth will reveal itself. We do not have to explore the problem; but if we know how to listen to the song of a bird, to the voice of another, if we can listen as to music without any interpretation or translation, it definitely clarifies the mind; so similarly, if it is possible, let us listen with that intention - not to confute or to conform, but to directly find out the truth for ourselves.

We see about us, in the world, innumerable problems created by society, by individuals; and in the solution of a particular problem we seem to find an increase of the problem, we introduce new problems. Immediately we solve any one particular problem like starvation or any other problem, economic or social or spiritual, we awaken, do we not?, to other innumerable problems. As we find that in the solution of one problem other problems come into being, the mind gets more and more involved in problems. There is never a solution, definite or final, of any particular problem but always the multiplication of problems. I do not know if you have noticed this in your daily life. You think you have solved something; but, in its very solution, you find half a dozen problems have come into

being.

Now, is it possible to solve any particular problem totally without increasing it and introducing other problems? That is one of our main concerns in life because we have got so many problems in the world - economic, social, religious - the destructive wars, the relationship of people with one another, the way of thought, whether there is God or not, and so on.

We want to be loved, and also we want to love; we want to have the capacity to discover, to find out what is truth - truth which is not merely the hearsay of another, which is not learnt from the book, whatever the book may be. We want to know Truth ourselves, to directly experience Truth without interpretation.

We have got many many problems; the whole day is full of problems - what kind of action we should do, what kind of job we should have, the desire for fulfilment and, without knowing it, the continuous chain of frustration. To solve these problems we generally turn to somebody, to a book, to a system, to a leader, to a guru, or to some direct experience which we have accumulated ourselves. The desire to find an answer through someone - through a guru, through a book, through a political panacea, through following another - only leads us, if we observe carefully, to frustration. Is that not in the lives of most of us? Politically you have followed, you have been to prison, you have been carried away by the enthusiasm of freedom or nationalism or what you will; at the end of it all, what have you? You have the word freedom; but the word is not freedom.

You have religious books, guides, philosophers; you do many rituals; and through all this there is fear, there is frustration, there is

the hope that can never be fulfilled, there is bitterness, there is anxiety. This is the lot of all of us.

And as we grow older with more and more experience, more and more living a life of frustration, we find, do we not?, that we are losing the essential thing in us, which is faith. What I mean by faith is not what you have been used to, namely the faith in the leader, faith in the guru, faith in the book, faith in your own particular experience. You may not believe in anything and it is quite right not to believe; if you do not believe, there is a possibility of discovering. But unfortunately, to be without faith leads to cynicism, leads to scepticism, to a life of superficial enjoyment, superficial activities, to doing good superficially. If we do not turn into cynics, we are active, doing good; but that fire which is so essential for creative thinking is denied, is destroyed. I think it is that thing, that fire, that we must find - not the answer to any particular problem, because answers to problems are comparatively easy.

If you are intelligent, if you have the capacity, if you have energy, then it is comparatively simple to study the problem. The perfect studying of the problem is the answer itself; the answer is not away from the problem. But to study, to find out the truth of the problem, you need energy, you need vitality; and that vitality and that energy is destroyed, when you are following somebody, when you are following your guru, when you are following your political leader or an economic system. All your creative energy is gone in following something; in disciplining your mind to a particular pattern of action. When the leader fails, when the leader dies, when something happens, you are left alone.

So it is possible to have that creative faith - if I can use that word - without identifying it with a particular pattern of thought? I am not referring here to the faith in a guru, in a book or in your experience, but to that faith that comes, that confidence which you have, through your own direct experiencing - not the experience of tradition, not the experience of your teachers, but your own direct understanding of the problem, your dealing with the problem energetically, and therefore having that extraordinary confidence, that capacity to discover the Truth of a particular problem. Surely that is the answer, is it not? Because without that we are not creative human beings. And that is what is necessary in the world at the present times - not leaders, not systems, not innumerable multiplication of gurus, but the capacity on the part of the individual to discover what is Truth for himself.

Truth is not yours or mine. It is not personal. It is something that comes into being when the mind is very clear, simple, direct and silent. It can only come in that state. You cannot pursue it. You try to pursue it when you are crippled with the anxiety to find an answer to a particular problem.

So, what we now need is the confidence or the faith in the discovery of what is Truth. We cannot discover what is Truth if our minds are conditioned. After all, the window through which we look at life is conditioned. We are conditioned as a Hindu, as a Mussulman, as a Christian, as a Buddhist - that is, we are conditioned to think in a particular way. The behaviour, the pattern of action, is already inculcated in us from childhood. So when we grow up, as we begin to experience, we experience through that screen of conditioning; this is an obvious psychological effect

whether we like it or not.

We are never free to discover. We have so far tried one particular form of conditioning - Capitalist or Socialist. We now say, 'That form is foolish; therefore, let us become Communists'. Becoming Communists is also another conditioning. Through any conditioning will you ever solve the problem? On the contrary, to solve any problem you must be free to think out, to experience directly that problem. And because we are so conditioned religiously economically, climatically, in every way, we are not free to look, to observe, to discover. We are bound, specially here in this country; we are incapable of thinking independently, freely for ourselves, without guides, books, leaders. Do please think about this, because that is what the problem is. Because we are image-worshippers, we have so many examples, so many heroes. Our minds are so crippled with imitation that we are incapable of putting aside all books and leaders, and of thinking out every problem for ourselves and discovering the Truth.

In discovering the Truth of any thing there is the feeling of thinking together. Do you understand the implication of that? So far, we have followed someone and in the very following we have created division. It is no use saying we are together in following some leader, because basically we are separated and therefore there is never a creative feeling of building together - that this is our earth, that you cannot live without me and I cannot live without you. That is the feeling that we have to build together and not that one political or religious leader, or one dynamic personality has to lay down the plan; the feeling that this is our earth, the feeling that this crumbled civilization can be brought together, rebuilt; the

feeling that you and I together are building this civilization anew.

This feeling of 'ourness' cannot come into being if you and I are not free to discover the Truth - the Truth being not yours or mine. It is only in the discovery of what is Truth that there is a possibility of the feeling that we are creating together, that we are living together, that we beautify the earth together. Please think about what I am saying. Don't just discard it thinking that this is also one of those speeches we hear occasionally. Don't brush this aside; because, this is the vital necessity at the present time.

We are in a tremendous crisis, whether we know of it or not. And in this crisis you cannot follow the old-fashioned book, or leader; you have to find the Truth in your own heart and you can only find it when your mind is unconditioned. As long as there is conditioning that makes you pursue, follow, create ideologies, worship; as long as there is the conditioning of the mind either as a Hindu, a Communist, a Socialist or a Capitalist or what you will; you cannot find the Truth of any problem. And it is only when you and I discover the Truth which is not personal or individual, that there is a possibility of bringing about a revolution which is not a revolution of ideas but of Truth. That is what is needed in the present times.

It is also important to find out what your relationship is to that Creative Reality, God, or what you will - names are of no importance. You cannot find that Creative Reality if your mind is clotted with ideas, with words that have no meaning. You cannot find it or discover it if your mind is incapable of pulling itself away from traditional thought.

Truth is not something made up of the mind. The mind cannot

perceive Truth. Truth is not a product of the mind; on the contrary, as long as the mind is active, is trying to scheme out, to discover, to dig out, it will not find Truth. It can only find it when there is understanding that frees the mind, when only there is a possibility of the mind being very silent. A silent mind is essential, a mind that is very still, with a stillness that is not brought about by discipline, by coercion, by persuasion. A mind that is disciplined is not a free mind; it is a narrow mind, it is a conditioned mind; therefore, it is incapable of finding out what is Truth. But a mind that understands, that penetrates, that is capable of directly experiencing in action, in relationship, in everyday living, such a mind is capable of discovering the Truth; and it is that Truth that sets us free from our problems.

Here are some questions and I shall try to answer them. In answering them, I am not concerned with the problem, nor to find an answer to the problem. While listening to me, if you are looking for an answer, you will never find an answer. But if you know how to study the problem, how to look at the problem, then you will find the answer in the problem itself, not away from it.

Most of you, unfortunately, have got a schoolboy mentality, which is to find an answer. You are only concerned in finding the answer which is at the end of the book or the answer from a teacher, from a guru or from a system, from a newspaper, through a book; that is, you want to find an answer away from the problem, in a panacea, in a word, in a name, and you think you have solved the problem. So, in answering these questions, please bear in mind that we are not trying to find an answer. We are trying to understand the problem, and in the very understanding of the

problem we shall find an answer. Then the answer is not separate from the problem. Then you do not have the answer which you are trying to live up to. Then the answer is in your hands, to make what you like with it or to destroy it. Please follow this point carefully; otherwise you will miss what I am talking about.

Our mentality is, especially at meetings of this kind, to wait for an answer. But what we are going to do is to think out the problem together, to see the Truth of the problem together, because there is no answer to a problem. Problems are created by our thinking, by our life, by our actions, and we want an answer outside our thoughts, our daily activity, our daily relationship; and so we are everlastingly waiting for somebody to tell us what to do. And as people are only too willing to tell us what to do, we call them leaders; at the end of our search, there is frustration, there is despair, there is bitterness; all our life is wasted; then disintegration takes place in our very being. So it is only in studying the problem that it is possible to find a true answer?

Question: In an underdeveloped and economically backward country like India which has just attained political freedom, problems of material reconstruction are obviously primary. What is your contribution to the creation of a new social order here?

Krishnamurti: Now, what is the problem involved here? We want an economic way of life, a new pattern of action, a new relationship between human beings in the economic field - specially in a country which has recently attained freedom, in a so-called underdeveloped country where there is overpopulation, where there is not enough food for the whole of the people, where there is a superficial revolution but not a fundamental revolution,

where there is merely an exchange or rather substitution of leadership and not fundamental radical revolution in the ways of life or in the outlook. We say we want to create a new social, a new economic order, without radically transforming ourselves; we want a radical answer. Do you follow?

The questioner asks what my contribution is to this. He wants an answer, an economic panacea, a system for this country. Now, can you, as human beings living in this world of reality, be ideologically free and independent of any other country? Are not your economic relationships based on and related to other countries? So, there is no answer to the economic problem independently, apart from other countries.

So, the first fallacy is to want economic freedom, an economic solution for the people living in this country apart from other countries. The problem is rather confused, it is much deeper than the economic solution or reconstruction of this country. It is the problem of all human beings living together on this earth. Sirs, don't nod at me; that means absolutely nothing. What we need is a revolution - not an economic revolution, not a new economic order, not a revolution of ideas nor that of substituting one system for another, but a fundamental revolution in our thinking.

The questioner wants to know what contribution I have to solve the problem of food, as food is the primary, important thing. Now, at which level, from what point of view, are we, you and I, approaching the problem? We all admit that food is the primarily important thing; without food, you and I cannot sit here. The problem of food is primary and it must be tackled immediately. But, let us study and understand this problem. We said that food is

of primary importance. But is it really the primary necessity for the individual? Is there not something else much deeper?

You may have food, but have you solved the problem of human relationship, which is of primary importance? That is, you may have food, you may organize economic safety for every individual; but in bringing that about, you may lose yourself, you may no longer be free. That is what is happening in the world, Sirs.

In considering food as the primary important thing you hand over to a person or to a system your freedom, your capacity to think freely and independently and to discover what is Truth; and in that very process, you become slaves, and the capacity of creative being is destroyed. To put it differently, the primary necessity is not food. The primary necessity is for each individual to be creative. If the mind is assured of being creative, then nothing else very much matters. Then our emphasis is not on food, not on an economic plan or system, but on something else which will bring about the economic security of mankind.

Each one of us is ambitious. You want to be something in this world. If you are a clerk, you want to be the manager, the chief Executive, the Director; if you are a clerk in a court of law, you want to become the judge. You want to keep on climbing and climbing. So, as long as there is ambition, the desire to be somebody in this world, you are going to destroy any economic plan for the security of mankind. Therefore, so long as the urge to be somebody, to be great, to fulfil, to have a name, position, prestige, power, is the drive, then the primary necessity which is food will not come into being. Sirs, this is proved over and over again; it is not my own invention. When you observe this fact, you

do not lay emphasis on food as the primary necessity; but you realize that there must be a fundamental revolution in our thinking for this necessity to come into being. You must do away with your communal divisions, castes and all the narrow petty-mindedness of human beings; there must be no nationalism, no artificial distinction; it is only then that there is a possibility of the primary necessity of mankind being fulfilled.

Therefore, the revolution for economic well-being must be inward and not outward. Do you agree to all this? Yes? But you say you cannot have fundamental inward revolution, because you have not the vigour, you have not the self-reliance; because you are exhausted; because you have done so many foolish things in your lives, followed so many leaders, teachers; because mentally you say you are exhausted. This inward revolution in which the mind is not seeking fulfilment through any ambition, requires a great deal of inside research, inward understanding. This means the setting aside of any particular ambition to discover and to solve this primarily important issue - which is, that everyone on the earth can have food, clothing and shelter. That is only possible when there is a feeling that this is our earth, that we are responsible for the whole of mankind. That is only possible when everyone of us is not struggling, achieving to be someone. Sirs, this is the fundamental revolution which will produce your new social order.

Question: Scientific inventions have turned from a blessing to a curse to humanity. Can you not help mankind to escape from the criminal folly of its cleverest and most powerful men?

Krishnamurti: Sir, it is your responsibility, is it not? We know the world; if we are not very wise, it is going to destroy itself.

There is a super-hydrogen bomb which has been recently exploded and which in its explosion totally vapourised. Probably you have read about that terrible invention. War seems to be the perpetual occupation of civilized man. Now, how are we going to solve this? Inventions are necessary. Atomic energy may be used for producing the necessities of mankind; it may be the cheapest power and so on. But we must find out why men want to destroy each other, why we want to kill somebody else; that is the problem, not scientific inventions. Because the more we can discover about the scientific use of nature, the more we shall be free to enjoy. to look at the trees, the sky, the birds, the running waters, the sunset.

So it is not the fault of science. We must see why it is that you and I want to kill our next door neighbour - the Russian, the American, the English or the Mussulman. Why? That is our problem. Why do we hate, why do we create enmity, why have we no love? If we can really go into it, if we find out what it means to love someone, then probably we shall prevent wars.

One of the fundamental causes of war, we are told, is economic. But, much more than that, the fundamental cause is 'the belief in something.' When I believe in something, I want to convert you to my ideas; and if you do not agree with me, I am going to liquidate you. You have a panacea, you have a system, you have the Bible or a book of Marx with truths, high dogmas, disciplines; and if I do not agree with your way of thinking, if I do not believe in God as you believe, then you destroy me. It is that thing that we must understand, why we create enmity between each other.

Is not so-called religion one of the causes of enmity? Please do consider it. Do not brush it aside. You believe that you are a Hindu,

and I am told from childhood that I am a Mussulman. I do certain rituals and you don't do certain rituals. So belief, rituals, divide us, do they not? You are a Brahmin and I am not. You believe in the only saviour - in Marx or in Jesus or in Buddha; if I disagree with you, you are going to push me aside.

So you see, fundamentally, one of the causes of enmity between men is `belief', and belief projects. I want some kind of security in life; I have money; I have position; but I want deeper security. So I project out of my mind the desire, the urge which compels me to find security in some super-idea, some super-man, some super-convictions or super-conclusions. So out of my very desire, I create belief, the idea of security, the idea there being God or no God; and to that my mind clings. So it is my belief which gives me a sense of security, of certainty; and I say that it is `my' urge, that it is `mine', because you are isolated from me by your belief. Gradually, out of all this, division or antagonism comes into being; you are an Englishman and I am a Negro; you are a Capitalist, I am a Communist. So, belief, the desire of the mind to be secure in some conclusion, in some conviction, is one of the causes of enmity.

Love is not a thing of the mind. I wonder if you love your children! I doubt it very much, because if you did, there would be no war; because if you love, you would not create in the mind the division of Hindu and Mussulman; if you love, you would, have no division of clerks and managers and so on. If you love the child, you would help him to grow into an intelligent human being without any conditioning so that his intelligence can pierce through all the conditioning of life.

So the cause of war is not outside of us but in us. We preach

non-violence; we have ideals of brotherhood; we use so many words without much significance. The idealist is the worst warmonger. (Laughter). Sirs, please don't laugh. The man who preaches brotherhood is not brotherly; that is why he preaches brotherhood; the man who is brotherly does not talk of brotherhood. When a man has the ideal of brotherhood, it means he is not brotherly and he is going to be, some day, brotherly. We have developed a philosophy of postponement and an ideal; and the man who preached an ideal obviously is not that which he thinks he should be. It is only when we understand what we are in actual fact, not theoretically but actually, that there is a possibility of freeing ourselves from enmity.

We have to see the truth, how mankind is dividing itself by various theories, dogmas, principles, philosophies, beliefs; how each one is trying to fulfil, trying to become something in this world; and how this is the real cause of war, of destruction, of degeneration. But we do not want to face that; we want economic safety; we want outside conditions to be altered without radically, fundamentally bringing about a transformation in our own thinking, in our own feelings. It is only when we see this truth that there is a possibility of stopping wars, of seeing that the inventions which can be the means of appalling destruction do not bring greater misery and havoc to mankind.

Question: Your denunciation of all discipline would only lead young people to the already rampant cult of body-worship. Until all desire is sublimated, is not some form of self-control absolutely essential?

Krishnamurti: Sir, let us go into this problem very carefully and

see the truth of the matter. First we must take things as they are: that the world has gone crazy about sensate values, that this so-called body worship, the cinemas and so on, is cultivated. And knowing that, you say we must discipline ourselves, we must control ourselves.

Now, what is meant by discipline? First let us understand the word, the implication of that word, and then we can approach the problem. What do we mean by discipline? Obviously, it is a process of resistance, is it not?, a process of controlling one desire by another desire, a process of conformity.

I think this is the only way and I must conform to it - to the social pattern or to my elders, or to the guru or to the political party. I must suppress what I think or what I feel, and I must conform to the system, to the plan laid down by the party. I must not deviate, I must not think differently, because what the system says is the absolute; the system may be changed by the leader tomorrow, but in the meantime I must conform to it. This is one attitude, which is conformity, resistance, either sublimation or substitution. We mean all these things when we talk about discipline.

What happens when we have disciplined? What has happened to you when you have followed a guru and disciplined your mind and heart to a pattern laid down by him? What has happened to your mind? You are no longer a living, vital entity; but you have a mind that is completely disciplined, controlled, remoulded; and behind that moulding, there is fear - fear of what the public will say; fear of not following the party, the leader; fear that you might lose your job; fear of going wrong. At the back of discipline which

is. to resist, to conform, there is fear - fear of what your parents will say, what your wife, or husband or guru will say; what will happen. So the basis of discipline is conformity, resistance or substitution; and behind that, there is fear.

Now, how can the mind understand the problem of conformity, which is imitation, as long as the urge is fear? Do you understand? What is vital is the understanding of the process of fear and thereby being intelligent - which does not mean to either conform, resist or find a substitute. It is an obvious fact that discipline destroys intelligence. Every teacher in a school disciplines. Because he has so many children to deal with, he must discipline, he must frighten them; and so he begins to discipline, to control; and thereby, he destroys intelligence - intelligence being the freedom to discover what is truth in every part of our life, from childhood upwards.

So discipline does not bring intelligence. You can only have intelligence when there is freedom, not fear. And a mind that is disciplined can never discover what is Truth - which means, a mind that is the outcome of fear can never find what is love. Please understand this, please see the Truth of it.

Do not say what will happen to me if I do not discipline myself. What has happened to you up till now? You are supposed to have disciplined yourself till now - at least you say you are disciplining yourself. Where are you? You are everlastingly struggling with what you should be and with what you are.

Why not put aside the ideological theory as to what you should be, which is not a fact, which has no truth in it. The fact is: what you are now. Why not understand what you are? The understanding of what you are does not demand discipline; on the

contrary, you can investigate, go into it, search out the truth of it. But you see, most of us do not want to understand what we are; we are always seeking what we are not; we are always running after what we should be, hoping thereby to escape from what we are. The understanding of what we are is the only fact, the only reality; and in that understanding you will find out the infinite truth that `what is' is, and that `what is' is never static. But that requires a mind which is not burdened by fear, which is not crippled by ideas of discipline or with what my father will say, what my mother, my guru, society is going to say.

Discipline prevents intelligence. Intelligence is the outcome of freedom from fear. But you see, you think you should not be free from fear. You think that fear keeps man on the true path and that therefore you must discipline your child not to rebel against you, and you teach him what you think is truth. So you begin to condition him through fear; you want him to conform to the social pattern of your society. So gradually you instil fear in him and thereby destroy his intelligence. That is what is happening to most of us, is that not so? Cleverness, erudition, being capable of argument, of quoting - those are not the signs of intelligence. A man who is intelligent is without fear. Fear is not to be dispelled by any compulsion or by any conformity. Fear is a venom that slowly works in your system, destroying clearness and clarity of perception.

So when you look at the problem of discipline, you will find that discipline is not important, and that what is important is to understand the process of the mind, the process of behaviour not only in yourself, but all about you. The understanding of yourself

is essential. The understanding of yourself is not the withdrawal from life, to become a hermit or a monk. You cannot understand yourself in isolation; you can only understand yourself in relationship with another, because to live is to be related; and to understand yourself, you have to use the mirror of relationship, and that requires an enormous competence, not fear, not the mind which says, 'This is wrong', or 'That is correct' - that is a schoolboy mentality; it is immature thought that is always condemning justifying.

So what is important in this question is what we mean by discipline. An intelligent mind does not need discipline; it is disciplining itself all the time - that is, it is observing, adjusting; it is never in the rigid frame of what you call discipline. Sir, a creative mind is the most disciplined mind - not with the discipline which is the outcome of fear, but that discipline which comes with the mind that understands, that is constantly aware of its actions and of the movements of its own desires. Such an awareness does not demand discipline. It is only the lazy, crippled, disintegrated mind that is afraid to grow; therefore it says, 'I must discipline, control; I must be this and I must be that or I must not be that; such a mind can never discover what is Truth. A disciplined mind can never discover what is Truth.

A disciplined mind can never know what is love. So we never know what love is. We only know the sensation of sex or of the vanity of being loved or of loving. We do not know what love is. Love is not a thing of the mind. Love is not the outcome of a cunning device which believes, which limits itself, or which is afraid. Love comes into being only when the mind understands the

ways of envy. When it understands the ways of its own fulfilment, when it understands its desire and the fear of frustration, when all these have ceased, then only that thing which is not merely a sensation but is the quality of love which will solve all our problems, comes into being.

January 24, 1953

POONA 2ND PUBLIC TALK 25TH JANUARY 1953

Perhaps in considering the problem of suffering and pain we shall be able to find out directly for ourselves the full problem of a conditioned mind. We are not discussing merely the various forms of suffering - physical, psychological or psycho-somatic - but the problem of suffering which is surely linked to the question of the conditioned mind, the mind that is incapable of comprehending the whole, the total, the mind that is only concerned with the particular, with the limited, with the part. Perhaps if we can understand that, not merely speculate on what the whole is and thereby project in words, but perhaps if we understand the whole, the total, there is a possibility of overcoming sorrow, of being free from sorrow.

Our outlook, our approach generally is through the part to the whole, and we hope to understand the all through the part ; that is, we hope that through the part - the part being the `me' - we can comprehend our suffering, our relationship to the world, our attitude, our pain, our frustration; through the part, the `me', we hope to comprehend the whole complex problem of living. After all, the `me', the mind, is the only instrument you and I have; and that mind is so conditioned, so specialized, that it is capable of only thinking in conditioned values, outlooks, actions; and we hope that through the understanding of the part, of the `me', we shall comprehend the whole. The whole is not a theory, not a speculation, not what some teacher says, not some idea of a state, not some idea of God or of a state of being. But the direct

experiencing of the whole, not speculatively but actually, may be the ultimate release from man's suffering.

Because we, you and I, are conditioned, totally conditioned by our thinking, our mind is incapable of comprehending 'the whole' of which we do not know. All thinking is conditioned; thought at whatever level you may place it, is conditioned. You do not want to admit that. You think there is a part within you, which is not conditioned, which is above all the influences that bring about conditioning - the climate, the religious, the social influences; the education; the memory; the experience. You think that that something is beyond all conditioning and that it is not 'the me'. But, when you think of that state which you say is unconditioned, that very thinking conditions; and also that thing which is beyond all conditioning is still conditioned if it is related to thought. This is not merely a speculation, a cunning argument.

If you can go into this question of the conditioned mind, you will find out that there is no part of thought, which is not controlled, conditioned. Perhaps that very conditioning is the source from which all suffering begins and ends. Perhaps if we can go into it, if we do not remain at the verbal level - you know what I mean by the verbal level: the mere thinking about it, the mere speculating whether the mind can ever be unconditioned - if we can understand it, then in that understanding we shall discover a great many things.

First if we are at all aware, if we are observant of the state of our own mind, we realize that thought is conditioned, that there is no thinking apart from conditioning. If we admit that, if we realize that, then there are different ways of approaching the problem.

That is, I admit that I am conditioned and that there is no possibility of unconditioning the mind at all; then I attempt to modify the conditioning, to change the condition by being no longer a believer of certain ideas or ideals; but in this process, I get conditioned to accept other ideas or ideals. So there is a progress in conditioning, and that is what most of us are concerned with. We want to progress socially, economically, or religiously, or in our relationship with one another, in being conditioned or better conditioned; and thereby, we admit that all suffering can never come to an end and that there can only be a modification of suffering, various forms of escapes from suffering.

But when we know, when we are completely totally aware that our whole thought is conditioned and there is no part of it unconditioned, then there is a possibility of finding out if there is anything beyond the mind, beyond the projections, beyond the fabrications of the mind. I think this is a very important point; if you can really go into this, if we can really, actually experience it as we talk, then there may be a real solution to all the innumerable problems that we may have, the chief of which is sorrow, pain - not only bodily pain, but the greater involvements of psychological pain, the inward struggle, the conflicts, the frustrations, the despair, the hope.

So what is important is to find out, to actually experience - if there is a state which is not conditioned - the total, the whole which is not conditioned, which is not controllable by the mind or projected by the mind. All our answers - social, economic, or religious - are sought by a mind that is conditioned and therefore, whatever it is, the answer will be progressively conditioned, never

beyond conditioning. That is, instead of worshipping the word 'God', we now worship the word 'State', and by using the word 'State', we think we have made tremendous progress. Or if we do not like the word 'State', we take the word 'Science' or the word 'Dialectical materialism' as though that is going to solve all our problems. That is, we are always approaching the solution of all our problems with a conditioned thought.

Thought is always conditioned, there is no thought which is not conditioned. As I said, you may comprehend the highest self, sublimely and at the highest level; but it is still conditioned. When once we realize it, not theoretically but actually, when we watch the operations of the mind, we see how the mind is constantly thinking always with the background and how there is no thought without memory, there is no experience without memory, without the process of recognition and therefore the contradiction of that. That is the state we know, and we approach our problems from that point of view. But, I do not think our problems can ever be solved in this way, by merely approaching the problem from a particular point of view. The problem can only be solved when we comprehend the whole, and the comprehension of the whole is not possible as long as thought, the idea, is functioning. Do please think about this, not when you go home, but actually as I am talking to you.

The difficulty is that most of us translate or interpret or compare what we hear. Do you follow? You say that is what the Upanishads said, that is what that phrase in the Bhagavad Gita meant; so, you are interpreting, you are not understanding; so, your knowledge becomes a hindrance to direct experience. Therefore there must be

suppression of knowledge, the putting aside of all knowledge - I am not talking of the knowledge of how to build a bridge, which is essential; I am not talking of becoming primitive, which would be absurd - the putting aside of all knowledge which is comparative, the knowledge that interprets what others say. This interpretation, this translation indicates a form of self-fulfilment, the desire to be always sure, always certain; therefore the mind is always comparing, saying, 'that is what the book says; and the very statement, the very translation has put an end to further experimentation, further study.

The mind must surely be in a state of complete uncertainty - that means, in a state of complete inaction, of not knowing; a mind which is not saying, 'I know', 'I have experience', 'It is so'. A mind which says, 'I know', is incapable of solving any complex problem of living, because life is moving because life is not stagnant. You may translate life, you may interpret it as a Socialist, as a Communist, as a dialectical Materialist, or what you will; you may translate it and thereby hold it in the words of explanation; but the Reality is a living thing, and that living thing cannot be approached through the particular which is thought. Please do see this, and Reality will reveal itself to you. If you are really listening to it, you will do an extraordinary thing: it will break down immediately the conditioning of the mind, and then the mind will be capable of being so alert, so watchful that 'the whole' is then not something miraculous, not something beyond the mind. That whole, that totality will be experienced only when this whole process of conditioning is understood and when you actually realize that through a conditioned thought there is no solution to any of our

problems. When you have an experience of that kind, when you have the perception or the experience of the whole, then there is a tremendous inward revolution which is the only revolution - not the economic revolution which is merely progressive thought, conditioned action.

And so we have to approach all our problems realizing that our thought is conditioned. Do what you will, gather psychological knowledge, read all the sacred books of the world; if with that knowledge you approach the problem of life which is ever living, never static, you will never find an answer. But if there is the experiencing of the whole with the comprehension of the whole, where the conditioned mind is realized, then with that understanding of the whole, every problem can be solved, not in terms of progressive conditioning but in the complete cessation of that particular problem.

As I said yesterday, there is in this world of so-called progress more and more sorrow, more and more destruction, misery, suffocation, frustration. You may not be aware of it because your nose is accustomed to the grinding stone of everyday routine; but if you are at all aware, you will see that this is the process of existence: everlasting frustration without any end; and the more you seek fulfilment the more there is frustration. In self-fulfilment, in the desire to fulfil, there is further desire, further misery; because the source of your action, the impetus of your action is self-fulfilment - fulfilment in your son, in your family, in the nation, or in the society - the desire to fulfil and the resulting action bring about frustration. When there is frustration, there is despair. So the mind is seeking a way of hope through the State, through God or

something else, through which it can fulfil; and so we are caught in that chain again.

So if there is to be an action which is not of a particular system, of a particular theory, if there has to be the action of togetherness, of you and me, which is not the action of fulfilment, there must be the understanding of how the mind is conditioned. The liberation of the mind from its conditioning is essential; then there is cooperation and there is action of 'ourness', not of yours or mine. That is Truth. All this requires naturally a great deal of observation. This you cannot buy in books. This is real meditation - not the meditation of controlled thoughts, not the meditation that is only the narrowing down of thought, but the meditation of extensive awareness. Extensive awareness is the awareness of all the processes of thinking, being aware of how the mind is operating, of every reaction, every experience, every infringement of life, being aware of how the mind works at every moment, being aware of every response without shaping it, controlling it, guiding it, disciplining it. In that state of extensive awareness, the mind becomes astonishingly still, the mind is no longer concerned with achievement, with self-fulfilment, with being or not being. That state of stillness is not compelled or disciplined. It is the state of being, which is not of the mind; and therefore the mind is quiet, still; and in that stillness, that which is 'the whole' is comprehended.

Question: Common men and women like me are mostly concerned with their immediate problems of famine, unemployment, illness and conflicts; how can I give my real attention to the deeper issues of life? All I seem to be seeking is

relief from the immediate calamities.

Krishnamurti: We all want immediate relief from our calamities. We are all common people, however high we may be placed - bureaucratically, socially or religiously. There are these little calamities of everyday life, the jealousy, the anger, the anguish of not being loved, and the great ecstasy of being loved; if you can understand these little things of life, you can see in them the workings of your mind; it does not matter if you are a housewife cooking three meals everlastingly through the rest of your life, being the slave to the husband, or if you are the husband being a slave to the wife. In that relationship of pain, of pleasure, of calamities, of despair, of hope, at the very superficial level, if you begin at that, then you will find - if you can observe, watch, wait, be aware, without condemning, without judging - that the mind goes deeper and deeper with the problems; but if you are only concerned with the aspect of getting away from the particular problem, then your mind remains at a superficial level.

Let us consider the problem of envy, because our society is based on envy. Envy is acquisitiveness, greed. You have, I have not; you are somebody, I am nobody and I am going to compete with you to become somebody; you have more knowledge, more money, more experience, I have not. There is this everlasting struggle: you always going on and on and I always falling back; you are the guru I am the disciple or the follower; and there is the vast gulf between us; you always ahead, I always behind. If we can see, there are immense implications in all these struggles, in all these efforts, in these sufferings, in the little illnesses and other little things of everyday life. You do not need to read all the Vedas,

all the books; you can put all of them aside, they have no importance; what is important is to see actually and directly, in these little things of life, things that are implied differently. After all, when you observe the beauty of a tree, the bird flying, the sunset on water, they tell you a great deal; and also when you see the ugly things of life - dirt, squalor, the despair, the oppression, the fear - they also reveal a fundamental process of thought. But we cannot be aware of all that, if the mind is merely concerned with escapes, with a panacea, with avoiding the discovery which exists in all relationships.

Unfortunately, we have not the patience, we want an immediate answer, our mind is so impatient with the problem. But if the mind is capable of observing the problem - not running away from it, but living with it - then that very problem begins to reveal its extraordinary quality. The mind gets to the depth of the problem and so the mind becomes not a thing pushed around by circumstances, by calamities. Then the mind is like a pool, like rich water, quiet; and it is only such a mind that is capable of stillness, of calmness, of peace.

Question: Faith in dialectical materialism has released a flood of creativity in New China. Faith in religion seems to make men smug and other-worldly. Can the kindness of a spiritual way be combined with the dynamic action of the materialists?

Krishnamurti: It is comparatively easy as you must have noticed, to create enthusiasm for the State, for freedom, for peace or for war, and to identify ourselves with the State, with God, with an idea. That is, to forget oneself - through the idea of the State, of God, or material dialectism - or rather to fulfil oneself, is

comparatively easy; that gives you an astonishing enthusiasm, a capacity. How do you think wars are fought - the wars that demand ruthless murder, that encourage enmity, endurance, sacrifice, the putting aside of all one's responsibility and going out to the front to kill? For that, you must have astonishing enthusiasm, energy, drive, hatred, and the so-called love of the country which makes one fulfil in that particular action. Therefore, there is no problem for such a man. He is living. Similarly, the identification with what we call God, the State, the identification with the idea which is considered bigger than 'the me' obviously gives one an astonishing energy and creativeness. And the same is the case with religion; if I am at all so-called religious, it also gives me great faith, capacity, drive. You have it all in this country. When you were struggling, fighting for freedom, you could do anything.

The struggle for freedom is self-fulfilment; the country with which you identify yourself is the means of escaping from yourself. The struggle, pain, suffering to create a new world, a new India, is an artificial means of self-forgetfulness. They are all fulfilment in various ways, of the 'me'. And they all give extraordinary temporary energy, a release of enthusiasm. But behind it, there is always the 'me', the 'I', seeking everlastingly to fulfil; and the fulfilment, the desire to fulfil brings conflict.

Religion, as you know it, as you practise it, is a dull routine, a dead thing, because it is bound by tradition, by what Sankara or Buddha said. So the mind creates what Sankara meant, what the Bhagavad Gita meant, and that meaning is the way through which you fulfil. So your interpretation, your commentaries become extraordinarily important. There is a false creativity which comes

into being when you are fulfilling; but that is not creative; that is merely progression in calamity, progression in conditioned thinking. But there is an activity which is far beyond and above this urge of self-fulfilment; and that activity comes only when the desire to fulfil in different ways has come to an end.

Do think about all this, Sirs. Don't just agree or disagree. The actual listening to experience is an essential thing. That will give you an untold energy, a life in which there is no hurt, in which there is no enforcement, no enforced slavery. That gives rise to a creativity in which there is not the `me' that is fulfilling.

The `me' identifying with the State or with a particular system brings calamity; that brings position, that brings enmity, that brings hatred. If you identify yourself with a particular caste, won't you feel astonishingly enthusiastic to maintain that caste and struggle and fight to destroy other castes? So, similarly, mere identification with the larger is not the problem, nor is it the solution to the problem. See how, again, our mind moves, hoping to understand the whole through the part. We think the whole is the State, the Community, the nation or an ideal. The whole is none of these things, because they are projections of thought, and thought is always conditioned. That is why, through religion or books, you cannot see the whole.

The discovery of the experience of the whole can only be understood and experienced when the mind is completely assured that it is conditioned. Then the mind which is the centre of the `me' everlastingly seeking fulfilment and therefore escaping through enthusiasm, realizes that it is incapable of movement in any direction, and becomes still; then in that stillness there is an

activity which is not merely producing, inventing, but which is creative. That creativity is essential in each of us to break the source of mischief, of misery and destructivity. You and I are ordinary human beings; but if we discover this creativity, then this world will be our world, you and I building it together, you and I acting together, creating a world in which sorrow, pain and starvation have come to an end. But without that Creative Reality, all other creation is merely progression in misery, progression of conditioned thought.

Question: As a man thinks so he becomes. Is it not essential to know how not to be at the mercy of one's own evil and wayward thoughts?

Krishnamurti: First, the questioner begins with the quotation, 'As a man thinks so he becomes'. Is it not very odd that we cannot think of any problem directly? We have innumerable quotations to support our theories - what the Bhagavad Gita, Marx, Sankara, Churchill or Mao Tse Tung have said. Our mind is incapable of looking at anything directly and experiencing a thing directly. Quotation-knowledge has destroyed our capacity to find out the truth for ourselves. (Laughter) Yes, Sirs, you laugh and you don't know the misery behind that laugh.

Now, your mind is crippled; and the mind that is crippled is not capable of being free. It is only free when it realizes it is crippled; then there is a possibility of doing something. A mind saying 'I am not crippled', 'I am full of knowledge', 'I am full of quotations of other peoples' ideas', is incapable of the discovery of what is Real. The man with such a mind is living at a level of 'second-hand'.

Now the next part of the question is, 'Is it not essential to know

how not to be at the mercy of one's own crazy, evil and wayward thoughts'? In this question, there are two things involved. He says, 'How can I remain, free from evil thoughts, evil and wayward thoughts'? Please follow this closely because it is very important, because if we can really see the significance of it, go behind the words you will discover something. Don't follow me merely verbally - which is, don't merely listen to the words and the vibrations of the words - but go into it.

Is there the thinker, the one apart from thought, apart from the evil, wayward thoughts? Please watch your own mind. We say, 'There is the 'I' who wants to remain apart from the evil, apart from thoughts which are vagrant, wandering'. That is to say, there is the 'I', the 'me' which says, 'This is a wayward thought', 'This is an evil action', 'This is good', 'This is bad', 'I must control this thought', 'I must keep to this thought'. That is what we know. Is the one, the 'I', the thinker, the judge, the one that judges, the censor, different from all this? Is the 'I' different from thought, different from envy, different from evil? The 'I' which says that it is different from this evil, is everlastingly trying to overcome me, trying to push me away, trying to become something. So you have this struggle, the effort to put away thoughts, not to be wayward.

We have, in the very process of thinking, created this problem of effort. Do you follow? Then you give birth to discipline, controlling thought - the 'I' controlling the thought which is not good: the 'I' which is trying to become non-envious, non-violent, to be this and to be that. So you have brought into being the very process of effort when there are the 'I' and the thing which it is controlling. That is the actual fact of our everyday existence.

Now, is the `I' who, is observing, the observer, the thinker, the actor, different from the action, from the thought, from the thing which it observes? We have so far said that the `I' is different from thought. So let us keep to one thing - that is, the thinker is different from thought. The thinker says, `My thoughts are vagrant, evil; therefore I must control them, shape them, discipline them'. In that process, that has been brought into being this whole problem of effort and the negative form `not to be'. Please listen to what I am saying, and don't interpret; if you will listen carefully, you will see something extraordinary coming out. As I said, you have brought into being the effort in different forms, the negation and assertion; that is our daily life.

But is there a difference between the thinker and the thought? Please find out. Is there? That is, if you don't think, would there be an `I'? If there was no thought, no idea, no memory, no experience, would there be the `I'? You say `I' is the higher self, the thing which is beyond thought, which is guiding you, which is controlling you. Now, if you say that, again examine it; don't accept it. If you say that, then the very entity that thinks about the Atman is still within the field of thought. The thing that is capable of being thought about is still within thought. That is, when I think about you, the particular name I know, when I recognise, you are already within the field of thought. Aren't you? So, my thinking is related to you. So the Atman or the higher self or whatever word you use, is still within the field of thought. So there is always a relationship between the thinker and the thought; they are not two separate states, they are one unitary process.

So there is only the thought which divides itself into the thinker

and the thought, and brings the thinker into prominence. That thought creates the `I' which becomes permanent because, after all, that is what it is seeking - security, permanency, certainty in my relationship with my wife, with my children, with my society; always the desire to be ever certain. Thought is desire; so thought, the desire seeking certainty, creates the `I'. Then the `I' is enclosed in permanency. Then that says, `I must control my thoughts, I must push away this thought and take on that thought', as though that `I' is separate. If you observe, the `I' is not separate from thought. That is where the importance comes of really experiencing this thing, in which the thinker is the thought. That is real meditation, to find out how the mind is everlastingly operating in dividing the thinker and the thought.

The whole total process of thinking is what we are concerned with, not the `I' which wants to look, which is creating, dominating, subjecting, sublimating thought. There is only one process which is thinking. The thinking which says; `That is my house', has behind it the desire for security in that house. Similarly when you say `my wife', in that thought there is security. So the `I' is given prominence in certainty. There is only a process of thinking and not the `I' separate from thought.

So when you realize that, when this realization, this understanding comes, what happens to the thoughts which are vagrant, wandering going all over the place like a butterfly, like a monkey? When there is no censor any more, when there is no entity which says `I must control thought', then what happens? Please follow this, Sirs. Then, is there such a thing as a wandering thought? Do you follow? There is no entity which is operating,

which is judging; therefore every thought is a thought in itself, not to be compared as good and bad. So, there is no wandering or wavering.

The wandering thought exists when thought says, 'I am wandering, I must not do that, I must do this'. When there is no thinker, the entity which says that it will control thought, then we are only concerned with thought as it is, not as it should be. And then you will find the beauty of really observing every thought and its significance; because then there is no such thing as a wandering thought. You cut away the whole problem of effort, because you cannot come to Reality through effort; effort must come to an end for Reality to come. You must be capable of receiving. It is not a reward or a punishment. It is not a reward for good deeds. Society is concerned with your respectability but Truth is not.

For Truth to be, thought must be silent. Thought must not seek reward or punishment, it must not be concerned. Only in that state of mind in which there is no seeking, does Truth come into being. Truth that is seeking is not truth at all, it is only the self-projected voice of self-fulfilment. So, when you see all this, when you see this whole picture of how the mind operates, then there is no thought to be controlled, to be disciplined; then that very thought has significance; there is an observation of the thought as the observer watching thought, which is very difficult to experience, very arduous because that requires extraordinary perception and peace of mind. Every thought is the result of memory - memory which is but a name. After all, you think in words; your thought is the outcome of memory; memory is formed of images, symbols, words. So long as there is the 'projection' there must be thought. So

a man who is concerned with the understanding of thought understands the whole process of naming, terming, remembering, recognising. Then only is there a possibility of the mind becoming thoroughly still. This stillness comes with understanding. Then Truth may bless that individual, may come to him, may set him free from all problems; and then only is there the creative being, not the man who paints, writes a poem or works ten hours a day.

Question: Nama-Japam is the most effective means of quieting the incessant wanderings of the mind. Why do you object to these preliminary exercises which help the seeker to turn away from the fleeting shadows of existence?

Krishnamurti: What most of us want to be is to be hypnotized by words, by sound. We want to be quiet and so we invent words or take a drug that will temporarily quieten the nerves.

If you are only concerned with the superficial quietening of the mind, Nama-Japam does quieten the mind, the nerves, by the repetition of words. Instead of repeating Nama-Japam, just repeat 'two and two make four' several times, and your mind becomes very quiet (laughter).

Please follow this. The mind wants a vocation in which it cannot be disturbed. After all, that is what most of you want; you do not want to be disturbed in your job, in your relationship with your wife, with your neighbour; you want to be assured of your income; you want to be assured of your life; you want rest; you do not want to be disturbed politically, religiously. Only if you are hungry, if you are starving, then there is disturbance. The man who starves will somehow acquire a state of non-disturbance. After all, tyrannies and concentration camps are filled with those people who

are disturbed. So doubt becomes a hindrance to a man who is seeking. That is what your religion says; that is what your politicians, your leaders assert. So the mind does not want to be disturbed, and so it turns to various resorts to quieten the mind.

After all, contentment is the thing essential for quietness. There must be the watching of mind and heart, of what is truth - not the ultimate truth, but truth in the everyday movement of life, the truth of thinking. It is necessary to be watchful not just go to sleep by some repetition of words. Truth is not something ultimate; it is to be found every minute of the day. Truth is not something which is accumulative, which is tied up and thereby becomes time. That which is caught up in time is not the Truth; it is memory, and that memory says, 'I must not be disturbed; 'I had a most beautiful experience of reality, of God, of the sunset' or 'the joy of fulfilment; 'I had a certain desire', 'I must not be disturbed'.

So the mind is everlastingly seeking a way in which it can remain quiet, in which it can function in a habitual manner. After all, all your experiences are merely established habits, and in that habit the mind is quiet; and so you create Nama-Japam and repeat certain words, and your superficial mind is made quiet. But there is an urge going on inside, the becoming something, the urge for fulfilment, thoughts which are ambitious, struggling, striding, thoughts that are to be understood, that are to be apprehended. They are revealed in your daily relationship with your wife, with your children, in the job you are doing.

So life is a process of relationship in which there is disturbance. There must be disturbance, and that disturbance is the mirror in which you discover; you discover the state of your mind, of your

heart; you see how it moves, how it functions. But if you condemn it, then you put a hindrance to it. You cannot go beyond it. So again the entity that judges, that compares, that condemns, is still thought - the thought that is trying to become something, the thought that is ambitious; and such a thought will never find Reality. The ambitious man is the political man and the political world will never solve the problem of human existence. No parliament, no political leader will understand and bring about an inward revolution in the world.

The world is you; your world is the world in which you live with your people. It is in the heart that there must be revolution. And that revolution does not come about by putting yourself to sleep; it comes through something which is creative, which is dynamic, which is the ultimate Reality. That revolution is only possible when you understand the things of life. The understanding of the heart is the 'beginning to listen', and meditation is the understanding of the whole process of the mind.

January 25, 1953

POONA 3RD PUBLIC TALK 31ST JANUARY 1953

Many of us must have considered the problem of disintegration. Almost everything that we touch soon disintegrates. There is no creative worthwhile action which soon does not end in complexities, worries, miseries and confusion. It must have occurred to many of us why this should be so, and why at different levels of our human existence there is a darkened withering away and deterioration. We must have noticed this and found some kind of answer. We accept it is inevitable and find some worthwhile or merely verbal explanation; and we are satisfied because, whatever we do, we want some explanation, some satisfactory words that will sooth our active mind. So we soon get lost in the jungle of explanations.

We are going to discuss this evening the question of 'education.' It seems to me that one of the major factors of deterioration everywhere is the so-called education. We are going into that presently as succinctly as possible. But before I go into that very complex problem, I think it is very necessary that you and I should not merely either accept or refute anything I am going to suggest. Perhaps it may be new or it may be very old; but the mere rejection or acceptance of it without really understanding the whole complex problem is utterly valueless. So, may I suggest that, while you are listening, you do not say, 'That is impossible', 'It is not practical', 'It is not worthwhile', 'All that we know already'. All that indicates merely, does it not?, a very sluggish mind, a mind that does not want to penetrate and understand the problem. And our minds are dull, especially at the end of the day after doing some worthless

action of a routine stupid life; we come here generally for entertainment, for something to listen to or talk about afterwards. At this meeting, I suggest that we consider this problem of education and examine it together - but not that I am stating the problem and you are looking at it.

What do we mean by education? Why do we want to be educated? Why do you send your children to be educated? Is it the mere acquisition of some technical knowledge which will give you a certain capacity, with which to lead your life, so that you can apply that technique and get a profitable job? Is that what we mean by education, to pass certain examinations and then to become a clerk, and from a clerk to climb up the ladder of managerial efficiency? Or, do we educate our children or educate ourselves in order to understand the whole complex problem of living? With what intention actually do we send our children to be educated or do we get educated ourselves? Obviously, taking it factually as things are, you get educated in order to get a job and with that you are satisfied; and that is all you are concerned with, to be able to earn a livelihood by some means. So you go to a college or to a university, you soon marry and you have to earn a livelihood; and before you know where you are, you are a grandfather for the rest of your life. That is what most of us are doing with education; that is the fact. With that, most of us are satisfied.

But is that education? Is that an integrating process, in which there can be a comprehension of the whole total process of life? That is, do you want to educate your children to understand the whole of life and not merely a segment of life like the physical, emotional, mental, psychological, or spiritual, to have not the

compartmental divided outlook but a whole total integrated outlook on life in which, of course, there is the earning capacity? Now, which is it that we want - not theoretically but actually? What is our necessity? According to that, you will have universities, schools, examinations or no examinations. But to merely talk narrowly about linguistic divisions seems to me utterly infantile. What we will have to do as mature human beings - if there are such entities existing - is to go into this problem. Do you want your children to be educated to be glorified clerks, bureaucrats, leading utterly miserable useless, futile lives, functioning as machines in a system? Or, do you want integrated human beings who are intelligent, capable, fearless? We will find out probably what we mean by 'intelligence'. The mere acquisition of knowledge is not intelligence, and it does not make an intelligent human being. You may have all the technique, but that does not necessarily mean that you are an intelligent integrated human being.

So, what is this thing that brings about integration in life, that makes a human being intelligent? That is what we want; at least, that is what we intend to find out in our education, if we are at all intelligent and interested in education. That is what we are attempting to do. Are we not? Does this subject interest you, Sirs? You seem rather hesitant? Or do you want to discuss about the soul? Sirs, education is really one of our major problems, if not the most important problem in life; because, as I said, everything is deteriorating around us and in us. We are not creative human beings. We are merely technicians. And if we are creating a new world, a new culture, surely there must be a revolution in our outlook on life, and not merely the acceptance of things as they are

or the changing of things as they are.

Now is it possible through education, the right kind of education, to bring about this integrated human being - that is, a human being who is thinking in terms of the whole and not merely of the part; who is thinking as a total entity, as a total process, and not indulging in divided, broken up, fractional thinking? Is it possible for a human being to be intelligent - that is, to be without fear - through education, so that the mind is capable of thinking freely, not thinking in terms of a Hindu or a Mussulman or a Christian or a Communist? You can think freely only when your mind is unconditioned - that is, not conditioned as a Catholic or a Communist and so on - so that you are capable of looking at all the influences of life which are constantly conditioning you; so that you are capable of examining, observing and freeing yourself from these conditions and influences; so that you are an intelligent human being without fear.

Our problem is: how to bring about, through education, a human being who is creative, who is capable, who possesses that intelligence which is not burdened and which is not shaped in any particular direction but is total, who is not belonging to any particular society, caste or religion, so that, through that education and with that intelligence, he arrives at maturity and therefore is capable of making his life, not merely as a technician but as a human being.

Now, that is our problem, is it not? Because we see what is happening in the world and especially here in this industrially backward country, we are trying to, catch up industrially with the rest of the world; we think it will take ourselves and our children to

catch up with the rest of the world. So, we are concerned with that and not with the whole total problem of living in which there is suffering, pain, death, the problem of sex, the whole problem of thinking, to live happily and creatively; we brush all that aside and are only concerned with special capacities. But we have to create a different human being; so, obviously, our whole educational system must undergo a revolution, which means really there must be the education of the educator. That is, the educator must himself obviously be free or attempt to be free from all those qualities which are destructive in him, which are narrowing him down.

We must create a different human being who is creative. That is important, is it not? And it is not possible to do this in a class where there are a hundred children or thirty or forty children and only one teacher - which means really, every teacher must have very few children; which means again, the expense involved. So, seeing the complexities, the parents want to get their children educated somehow so that they may serve for the rest of their life in some office. But if you, as parents, really love your children - which I really question - if you are really concerned with your children, if you are really interested in their education, obviously you must understand this problem of 'what is education'. It must present itself to you, must it not?

As things are at present, and with this educational system and the so-called passing of examinations, is it possible to bring about an integrated human being, a human being who understands life or who is struggling to understand life - life being earning a livelihood, marriage and all the problems of relationship, love, kindness? This is only possible where there is no ambition.

Because, an ambitious man is not an intelligent man, he is a ruthless man; he may be ambitious spiritually, but he is equally ruthless. Is it possible to have a human being without ambition? Can there be the right education which will produce such a human being - which means, really a spiritual human being? I rather hesitate to use the word because you will immediately translate it in terms of some religious pursuit, some superstition. But if you are really concerned with education, is not that our problem?

Your immediate reaction to that is: what is the method? You want to know what the method is, how this can be brought about. Now, is there a method? Do please listen to this; don't brush it aside. Is there a method - a system - for the educator, which will bring about that state of integration in a human being? Or, is there no method at all? Our educator must be much concerned, very watchful, very alert with each individual. As each individual is a living entity, the educator has to observe him, study him and encourage in him that extraordinary quality of intelligence which will help him to become free, intelligent and fearless. Can there be a method to do that? Does not method imply immediately conditioning a student to a particular pattern which you, as educator, think is important? You think you are helping him to grow into an intelligent human being, by inflicting on him a pattern which you already have of what an intelligent human being should be. And you call that education, and feel as though you have created a marvellous world, a world in which you are all kind, happy, creative.

We have not created a beautiful world; but perhaps, if we know how to help the child to grow intelligently, he might create a

different world in which there will be no war, no antagonism between man and man. If you are interested in this, is it not the obvious responsibility of each grown-up individual to see that this kind of education does come about - which means really, the educator can have only a very few students with him; there may be no examinations but there will be the observation of each student and his capacities. This means really that there will be no so-called mass education, that is, educating thousands in two or three classes. That is not education.

So if you are interested in this, you will create a right kind of educator and help the child to be free to create a new world. It is not a one man's job; it is the responsibility of the educator, of the parent and of the student. It is not just the teacher alone that is responsible for creating a human being, intelligent and fearless; because, the teacher may attempt it, but when the child goes back home the people there will begin to corrupt him, they will begin to influence him, his grandmother will begin to condition his mind. So it is a constant struggle. And unless you as parents cooperate with the teacher and produce the right kind of education, obviously there is going to be greater and greater deterioration. That is what intelligent human beings are concerned with, how to approach this problem. But, most of you say you do not want to think of these problems at all, you want to be told what to do, to follow certain systems and put other things aside. All that you are concerned with is the begetting of children and passing them on to teachers.

But if you were really concerned with the right type of education, surely, it is your responsibility as grown up people to see that through education there is right livelihood, not any old

livelihood. Right livelihood implies, obviously, not joining the army, not becoming a policeman, not becoming a lawyer. Obviously, those three professions are out, if you are really concerned with the right kind of education. I know, Sirs, you laugh at it, because it is a joke to you, it is an amazing thing; but if you really take it seriously, you would not laugh. The world is destroying itself; more and more means of vast destruction of human beings is there; those who laugh are not really concerned with the shadow of death which is constantly accompanying man. Obviously one of the deteriorating factors for man, is the wrong kind of education as we have at present.

To create an intelligent human being, there must be a complete revolution in our thinking. An intelligent human being means a fearless human being who is not bound by tradition, which does not mean he is immoral. You have to help your child to be free to find out, to create a new society - not a society according to some pattern such as Marx, Catholic or Capitalist. That requires a great deal of thought, concern and love - not mere discussions about love. If we really loved our children, we would see that there would be right education. Question: Even after the end of the British rule, there is no radical change in the system of our education. The stress as well as the demand is for specialization, technical and professional training. How best can education become the means to the realization of true freedom?

Krishnamurti: Sir, what do we mean by true freedom? Political freedom? Or is it freedom to think what you like? Can you think what you like? And does thinking bring about freedom? Is not all thinking conditioned thinking? So, what do we mean by true

freedom?

So far as we know, education is conditioned thinking, is it not? All that we are concerned with is to acquire a job or use that knowledge for self-satisfaction, for self-aggrandizement, to get on in the world. Is it not important to see what we mean by true freedom? Perhaps if we understand that, then the training in some technique for professional specialization may have its value. But merely to cultivate technical capacity without understanding what is true freedom leads to destruction, to greater wars; and that is actually what is happening in the world now. So let us find out what we mean by true freedom.

Obviously the first necessity for freedom is that there should be no fear - not only the fear imposed by society but also the psychological fear of insecurity. You may have a very good job and you may be climbing up the ladder of success; but if there is ambition, if there is the struggle to be somebody, does that not entail fear? And does that not imply that he who is very successful is not truly free? So fear imposed by tradition, by the so-called responsibility of the edicts of society, or your own fear of death, of insecurity, of disease - all this prevents the true freedom of being, does it not?

So freedom is not possible if there is any form of outward or inward compulsion. Compulsion comes into being when there is the urge to conform to the pattern of society, or to the pattern which you have created for yourself, as being good or not good. The pattern is created by thought which is the outcome of the past, of your tradition, of your education, of your whole experience based on the past. So, as long as there is any form of compulsion -

governmental, religious or your own pattern which you have created for yourself through your desire to fulfil, to become great - there will be no true freedom. It is not an easy thing to do, nor an easy thing to understand what we mean by true freedom. But we can see that as long as there is fear in any form we cannot know what true freedom is. Individually or collectively, if there is fear, compulsion, there can be no freedom. We may speculate about true freedom, but the actual freedom is different from the speculative ideas about freedom.

So, as long as the mind is seeking any form of security - and that is what most of us want - as long as the mind is seeking permanency in any form, there can be no freedom. As long as individually or collectively we seek security, there must be war, which is an obvious fact; and that is what is happening in the world today. So there can be true freedom only when the mind understands this whole process of the desire for security, for permanency. After all, that is what you want in your Gods, in your gurus. In your social relationships, your governments, you want security; so you invest your God with the ultimate security, which is above you; you clothe that image with the idea that you as an entity are such a transient being, and that there at least you have permanency. So you begin with the desire to be religiously permanent; and all your political, religious and social activities, whatever they are, are based on that desire for permanency - to be certain, to perpetuate yourselves through the family or through the nation or through an idea, through your son. How can such a mind which is seeking constantly, consciously or unconsciously, permanency, security, how can such a mind ever have freedom?

We really do not seek true freedom. We seek something different from freedom, we seek better conditions, a better state. We do not want freedom; we want better, superior, nobler conditions; and that we call education. Can this education produce peace in the world? Certainly, no. On the contrary, it is going to produce greater wars and misery. As long as you are a Hindu, Mussulman, or God knows what else, you are going to create strife, for yourself, for your neighbour and nation. Do we realize this? Look at what is happening in India! I do not have to tell you because you already know it.

Instead of being integrated human beings, you are thinking separatively; your activities are fractioned, broken up, disintegrated - your Maharashtra, your Gujurat, your Andhra, your Tamil - you are all fighting; that is the result of this so-called freedom and so-called education. You say that you have unity religiously; but actually you are fighting, destroying each other, because you do not see the whole process of living, because you are only concerned with tomorrow or to have better jobs. You will go out after listening and do exactly the same thing. You will be a Maharashtrian forgetting the rest of the world. As long as you are thinking in those terms you are going to have wars, miseries, destruction. You will never be safe, neither you nor your children, though you want to be safe and therefore you are thinking in this narrow regional way. As long as you have these ways, you have got to have wars.

Your present way of living indicates that you really do not want to have freedom; what you want is merely a better way of living, more safety, more contentment, to be assured of a job, to be

assured of your position, religiously, politically. Such people cannot create a new world. They are not religious people. They are not intelligent people. They are thinking in terms of immediate results like all politicians. And you know that as long as you leave the world to politicians, you are going to have destruction, wars, misery. Sirs, please don't smile. It is your responsibility, not your leaders' responsibility; it is your own individual responsibility.

Freedom is something entirely different. Freedom comes into being; it cannot be sought after. It comes into being when there is no fear, when there is love in your heart. You cannot have love and think in terms of a Hindu, a Christian, a Mussulman, a Parsi, or God knows what else. Freedom comes into being only when the mind is no longer seeking security for itself, either in tradition or in knowledge. A mind that is crippled with knowledge or burdened with knowledge is not a free mind. The mind is only free when it is capable of meeting life at every moment, meeting the Reality which every incident, which every thought, which every experience reveals; and that revelation is not possible when the mind is crippled by the past.

It is the responsibility of the educator to create a new human being to bring about a different human being, fearless, self-reliant, who will create his own society - a society totally unlike ours; because ours is based on fear, envy, ambition, corruption. True freedom can only come when intelligence comes into being - that is, the understanding of the whole total process of existence.

Question: Modern life has become abjectly dependent on highly trained persons; what are your views on university education? How can we prevent the misuse of higher technical knowledge?

Krishnamurti: Sir, surely it all depends on for what you are being educated. If you are merely being educated to a particular specialized job through university education in which there is no consideration of the total process of existence - which is, love, concern for your neighbour, the problem of what is Truth, death, envy, the whole problem of life - if you are only concerned with the acquisition of a particular type of knowledge and not with the problem of life, then obviously you are creating a world of confusion, of darkness, of misery; and then you ask how that can be prevented.

Now, how are you going to prevent it, Sirs? How are you and I going to prevent it? Sirs, is it not your responsibility? Or do you say, 'It is our Karma, we do what we can to live; but life is too much for us', and leave it at that? Do you not feel this is your responsibility? As parents, do you not feel that the darkness is closing in, deterioration is setting in fast in every human being? Do you not feel that we have ceased to be really creative? Merely painting pictures or being trained to paint them, or writing a poem occasionally, is not what I mean by creativity. Creativity is something entirely different, and it comes into being when there is no concern or fear of oneself clothed in the form of virtue, or concern for oneself socially, economically, politically. When that concern, that fear ceases, there is creativity.

The understanding of the whole process of thought which builds the 'I', the 'me', and the dissolution of that - is not that true education? And if it is, should not Universities help towards that end and at the same time give students the right opportunity to cultivate capacities? But now, we are concerned with the

cultivation of capacities, gifts, tendencies to become more and more efficient; and we deny the whole of life which is much deeper, truer, more complex. So it is your responsibility, is it not? Sirs, the individual problem is the world problem. Your problem is the problem of the world. Those problems are not separate from your daily problems.

How you live, how you think, what you do, will create the world, or destroy the world. We do not realize this. We do not see this responsibility, and so we say, 'Technical knowledge is bringing about the destruction of man; how can that be prevented?' I will give you the explanation, the manner of doing it; and you will listen and go away, and carry on as usual. So explanations no longer matter; description of theories have no value any more; what is of importance now is that you, as an individual, understand and become responsible for your actions. You are responsible. You and others can with equal enthusiasm and interest create a new world. You are to think of the problem anew, not create a new pattern - Communist or another religious form.

Real revolution does not come merely at the superficial level, at the economic level. Real revolution lies in our hearts and minds, and it can only come when we understand the whole total process of our being from day to day, in every relationship. And then only is there a possibility of preventing technical knowledge being used for the destruction of man.

Question: Educationalists all over the world are troubled by the question of moral education. How can education evoke the deeper core of human decency and goodness in oneself and in others?

Krishnamurti: The good is not the 'respectable'. The respectable

man can never know what is good. Most of us are respectable and therefore we do not know what it is to be good. Moral education can only come, not with the cultivation of respectability, but with the awakening of love. But we do not know what love is. Is love something to be cultivated? Can you learn it in colleges, in schools, from teachers, from technicians, from the following of your gurus? Is devotion love? And if it is, can the man who is respectable, who is devoted, know love? Do you know what I mean by respectability? Respectability is when the mind is cultivating, when the mind is becoming virtuous. The respectable man is the man who is struggling consciously not to be envious, the man who is following tradition, he who says, 'What will people say'? Respectability will obviously never know what Truth is, what good is, because the respectable man is only concerned with himself.

It is love which brings morality. Without love there is no morality. You may be a great man, a moral man; you may be very good; you may not be envious; you may have no ambition; but if you have no love, you are not moral, you are not good, fundamentally, deeply, profoundly. You may have all the outer trimmings of goodness; but if you have no love in the heart, there can be no moral, ethical being. Is love something to be taught in a school? Please follow all this. What is it that prevents us from loving? - If you can be taught in the school and in the house, to love, how simple it would be, would it not? Many books are written on it. You learn them and you repeat them; and you know all the symptoms of love without having love.

Can love be taught? Please, Sirs, this is really an important

question; please do follow it. If love cannot be taught, what are the things that are preventing love? The things of the mind, the thoughts, the jealousy, the anguish, the ideas, the pursuits, their suppressions, the motives of the mind - these may be the things that prevent love. And as we have cultivated the mind for several centuries, it may be that the mind is preventing us from loving. So perhaps the things that you are teaching your children and the things that you are learning be the things which are at the root of the destruction of love; because you are only developing one side - the intellectual side, the so-called technical side - and that is becoming more and more important in an industrial world; other things become less and less valuable, they fade away. If love can be taught in school through books, shown on the screen in cinemas, then it would be possible to cultivate morality. If morality is a thing of tradition, then it is quite simple; then you condition the student to be moral, to be a Communist, to be a Socialist, to think along a particular line, and say that that line is the good line, the true line; any deviation from it is immoral, ending up in concentration camps.

Is morality something to be taught - which means, can the mind be conditioned to be moral? Or is morality something that springs spontaneously, joyously, creatively? This is only possible when there is love. That love cannot exist when you cultivate your mind which is the very centre of the 'me', the 'I', the thing that is uppermost in most of us day in and day out - the 'me' that is so important, the 'I' that is everlastingly trying to fulfil, trying to be something. And as long as that 'I' exists, do what you will, all your morality has no meaning; it is merely conformity to a pattern based

on security, for your being something some day, so that you can live without any fear. Such a state is not a moral state, it is merely an imitation. The more a society is imitative, following tradition, the more deteriorating it is. It is important to see this, to find out for oneself how the self, the `me' is perpetuating itself, how the `me' is everlastingly thinking about virtue and trying to become virtuous and establishing laws of morality for itself and for others. So the good man who is following the pattern of good is the respectable man; and the respectable man is not the man who knows what love is. Only the man who knows what love is, is the moral man.

January 31, 1953

POONA 4TH PUBLIC TALK 1ST FEBRAURY 1953

As this is the last talk here and as it is not possible to enter into more detailed thinking out of certain ideas, may I suggest that you do not reject or accept what I have been saying, that you do not say, `This is not for me, or this is only for the few; do not compare what I have said to what you already know.

Our problems are very complex because we have, I feel, fundamentally lost or perhaps we never had, freedom, self-reliance, and vigour to search out happiness and to find out the truth of any problem. We are not happy beings just normally, healthily happy; we have too many burdens, too many worries; our security, physical as well as psychological, is being threatened all the time; there is no faith in anything any longer, no hope; the faith that we had has evaporated. The leaders have led us to more confusion, to more misery, to more strife; and out of this confusion we have chosen our gurus, our political leaders; naturally, when we choose a leader or a guru out of confusion, out of misery, out of strife, that which you choose will invariably be confused, will also be striving, struggling. So, when we follow somebody, we invariably follow those who represent our state, not something entirely different; those who represent us may perhaps be a little more glorified, a little more polished, but they are never the contrary of what we are.

I think it is very important, specially when we are facing a crisis. to be very clear in ourselves, because no one is going to represent us any more. I think there is nothing extraordinary in that, if we realize that there are no more leaders, no more gurus,

because we have lost complete faith in them; we cannot turn to any political panacea for a solution; so we are invariably forced. to think out the problem by ourselves and for ourselves, to see for ourselves the truth of the problem we are faced with now, to think out for ourselves, if we can, individually and perhaps later collectively, every problem that confronts us.

Truth or happiness or what you will, cannot come through choice; it is not a matter of choice. But our minds are only capable of choosing, differentiating and therefore not having insight into the problem. Our minds are petty, small, narrow, shallow. It does not matter if the mind is a most learned, most experienced mind: such a mind is still shallow, still petty. So if you think over the problem of what I am saying, what I am suggesting, do not reject it, don't say, 'It is not for me, it is too much for me', but investigate it, think it out for yourself.

As long as we are choosing between what is good and what is bad, between the noble and the ignoble, between this guru and that guru, between that political leader and this political leader, as long as there is choice, there can be no Truth. Choice is only the capacity of the mind to differentiate, and the process of differentiation springs from a confused mind; and however much you may choose, analytically, subjectively or by investigation of all the circumstances, still that choice will invariably produce conflict. What is necessary now is not choice between this and that, but to understand each problem in itself, completely, without comparing, without judging, but by going into it from every aspect, deeply, by putting aside one's own inclinations and prejudices and by really investigating. Our minds have been made petty through

choice, through the capacity to differentiate. Please think over it, don't reject it.

Our minds at present are so cunning, so confused, so distorted, that we are incapable of seeing directly, immediately, in an experience, the thing that is true. We want confirmation, and a man who is really seeking confirmation can never find or experience that which is truth. But it is very difficult for us whose minds are shallow, who are thinking in terms of tomorrow or of immediate results, to bring about a fundamental revolution in our thinking. This fundamental revolution is essential if we have to create a different world which is not based on communistic or capitalistic or religious ideas.

There must be a transformation in our thinking; and that can only come about if we really investigate into the question of choice - which does not mean that we should become obstinate. The mind that is analytical, that has the capacity to see what is worthwhile and what is not worthwhile, that is choosing, will invariably build a society based on results, on past memories, on immediate necessity. Therefore, such a mind will be utterly incapable of creating a world in which there is this sense of an integrated outlook on the total process of life.

So, if I may suggest, if you are really serious and earnest, please follow what I am saying. Our problems are so complex that there can be only a simple and direct approach to them. You cannot approach them through any book, nor through a philosophy, nor through a system, nor through any leader. You can approach them only through the understanding of yourselves, by seeing yourselves in your daily relationships exactly as you are and not what you

should be. This 'should be' is always the choice, is always away from 'what is'. 'What I am' actually is important, not what 'I should be'. 'What I should be' is theoretical and ideological and has no value; it is only an escape from 'what I am'. Our society, our religious and moral structure is based on 'what should be, which is an escape from 'what I am'. What is important is to find out 'what I am' actually from moment to moment, in which there is no choice whatsoever. As long as the mind is incapable of choosing what should be, then it will deal with 'what is'. The 'what is' is important, not only in the world of action but psychologically, inwardly. There can only be direct action if I understand 'what is', not 'what I want to be'.

As long as we introduce choice in our action, the choice is based on our conditioned thought and therefore there is no release from fear; therefore, there is always struggle, there is always pain; and if we can understand 'what is' which is constantly changing, which is never static, that very understanding is dynamic and therefore it is creative; and, in that, there is release. We must really observe our relationships from day to day, from moment to moment, the exact state of what we are, and not try to transform it into something noble. You cannot transform stupidity into intelligence; all that you can do is to understand stupidity; and the very understanding of that stupidity is intelligence. Please see the importance of this and we will create a new world. As long as you are striving to be something other than what you are, there will be destruction, there will be misery, there will be confusion. It is only when I understand the thing which I am from moment to moment, that the understanding leads me to the various unconscious depths

of my being; therefore, through that, there will be release from fear; and the release from fear is the state of happiness.

Question: You seem to imply that all action, thought and ideals are forms of self-fulfilment. You confuse us further by asserting that 'to be is to be related' and that 'not to be related is death'. In one breath you uphold renunciation; in another you are refuting that view. What do you mean by self-fulfilment? Can one live at all without fulfilling oneself in one form or another?

Krishnamurti: Is not everyone trying to fulfil in something? The mountaineer climbing the great heights, to him that is the action of fulfillment; through marriage and children, through your son, you try to fulfil; and the politician with a huge crowd in front of him, getting the thrill of the crowd, is fulfilling himself through the crowd. If you reject these outward expressions of action and activities which are self-fulfilling, then you turn to inward psychological, spiritual actions; you want to fulfil in an idea, in God, in virtue. So each one of us is trying to fulfil in different ways - that is, to be something through identification. You want to fulfil through identification with a political party; you deny yourself and say the party is all-important. The party represents what you believe is true; so the party is a means through which you fulfil. The mountaineer fulfills in the delight of climbing great heights, and the ambitious man fulfills himself in attaining his ambition. So this is what you are doing; are you not?

The desire to fulfil, the desire to become, the desire to achieve, to gain, that is our relationship, is it not? I want something from you and therefore I treat you very nicely and very politely. I give you garlands, but I treat contemptuously those from whom I

receive nothing. And this is the constant process of our being. Sirs, is there such a thing actually as 'self-fulfilment'? Do you follow? 'To be' is to be related, that is an obvious fact. I cannot live without being related to something, and that something is that through which I try to fulfil - my wife, my child, my house, my property, my painting, my poem, or the talk which I am giving now. If I am doing that, obviously it is a form of self-expansion; I am important, not you, not what I am talking about. So the means of self-fulfilment becomes much more important to me and to you, than the truth of finding out whether there is ever such a thing as fulfilment.

All action, as it is now, is based on self-fulfilment; that is what we know. We may try to cover it up, camouflage it, we may use any words, any nice sounding words, phrases; but essentially every action is the outcome of the desire to fulfil through that action. When I say India, I identify myself with India, and India then becomes the means for my fulfilment. These are the obvious facts. Let us go a little bit further into that. Is there such a thing as fulfilling? From childhood to maturity and till death, we are always seeking fulfilment in different forms, are we not?, and there is always frustration. The moment you are fulfilled, there is some other higher fulfilment, and you are everlastingly struggling. So behind our fulfilment, behind our urge to self-fulfilment, there is the fear of frustration. Watch your own minds and hearts, and you will see whether what I am saying is true or not. You do not have to accept what I am saying.

Where there is desire, the unconscious or conscious desire to fulfil, there must be the fear of frustration. So our actions

invariably lead us to frustration. Being frustrated, we seek further fulfilment to escape from that frustration. So we are caught in this everlasting prison of fulfilment and frustration. And is it not important to free the mind from this desire to fulfil itself in action, in idea, in something? When I am seeking to fulfil myself through my wife and children, is it love? When I am trying to fulfil myself in speaking to large or small audiences, am I really concerned with the truth, with the fundamental-desire to free men, or, am I fulfilling myself through you?

Sirs, this is not a discussion meeting. So, is it not important to find out if there is not a different way of thinking out this problem, a different approach which is not based on self-fulfilment, an action which is not seeking a result? Don't say, 'Yes, that is what the Bhagavad Gita says, what the Upanishads say', and so brush it aside. When you say that, you are actually not listening to another person. And what is important is to listen. Really if you know how to listen, the miracle takes place. If you can listen to the pure sound, to the silence between two notes, then perhaps you will find out the truth of anything. But as long as you are comparing, rejecting, accepting with the constant activity of explanation and rejection, you are not actually listening.

I am suggesting that perhaps there can be a different way of acting in which there is no longer self-fulfilment, which is not preserved for the few. If I can understand, if I can watch myself in my daily activity, how I am fulfilling myself all the time and therefore living with frustration and fear, when I actually realize that - not merely accept it - then I see that there is no fulfilment of myself in anything. When you actually see, from moment to

moment in your daily activity, how every action is the prompting of self-fulfilment and that self-fulfilment invariably brings frustration, if you realize the whole thing, if you are awake to that without argumentation, without disputation, without trying to compare - you know all that juggling that the mind does - then from that, there must be a new action, an action not of self-fulfilment but of something else.

Obviously, when each one of us is trying to fulfil, there is chaos in society; and in order to overcome that chaos our minds turn to a particular pattern or condition. If you can realize all that, if you are really listening to what I am saying, you will see the truth of this, that there is no self-fulfilment. Do what you will, climb to whatever heights, there is no such thing as self-fulfilment. If one really, actually sees that, inwardly feels it out, then there is a possibility of action which is not the outcome, the result, of compulsion of fear of frustration.

Question: You seem to stress the importance of the individual exclusively. Is not collective action necessary to be effective? Why do you denounce all organizations - social, political or religious?

Krishnamurti: 'You seem to stress the importance of the individual exclusively. Is not collective action necessary to be effective? Why do you denounce all organizations, social, political or religious?' Sirs, this is the question.

Now, let us go into the question of what we mean by collective action. Can there be ever such a thing as collective action? I know that is the popular phrase - mass action, collective action, doing things with a spirit of co-operation. But, what does collective action mean? Can we all paint a picture, together? Please follow

this. Can we all write a poem together? Can we plough a field together or work in a factory? Surely, we do not mean collective action there! We mean collective thinking, not action; we mean action born of collective thinking. So, we are concerned with collective thought, not collective action. Now, action may come out of collective thinking - that is, if you can all agree together as to what is good for India or for a country, if the authorities can so condition your thinking, then there will be collective action, action presenting a collective form, carried out by you as an individual; and if you do not carry it out, there are always ways of making you do it - such as, compulsion, liquidation, punishment, reward and so on.

Essentially the nature of collective action is collective thinking. Now, what do we mean by collective thinking? Can you and I and millions together think out a problem - economic, social, political, religious, or what you will? Can we independently think out the problem or are we persuaded by punishments, rewards, traditions, conditioning influences? Can there be collective thinking? Please find out, observe yourselves, think. Are you not the result of collective thought? When you call yourself a Hindu, Brahmin, Christian, is it not a result of collective thinking? You are conditioned by collective thought to be a Hindu, to be a Buddhist, a Christian or a Roman Catholic, or a Communist; and every group, every society, every religion, conditions, impinges its ideas on the mind. Is it possible to think collectively when we are together, conditioned in a certain way? We are collective; we cannot think independently. There is no thought which is independent because thought is the outcome of a conditioned mind, thought is the

symbol of the reaction to memory; so all thinking - conscious or unconscious - must be collective. You cannot think independently because your mind is already conditioned, as a Communist, as a Catholic, and so on. Sirs, there is no freedom of thought. Collective action is collective thinking.

When we say we try to make man think differently, not in the old pattern but in the new way of thinking, it is still a continuance of the old modified. That is all we are concerned with, and that is what we mean by collective thinking. When we have that kind of collective thinking, we must have propaganda to urge us to think in a certain way, we must have newspapers. Then we become slaves to authority, to the compulsions of subtle minds putting various forms of impressions on us constantly. So collective thinking may produce individual action, but it will be in a field of conditioned thought, and therefore there is no freedom. Freedom is only possible when we realize this and admit that we are conditioned completely. Then there is a possibility of breaking through and finding out a state of mind in which there is no conditioning; and when you and I perceive the truth of that, in that there can be action which is truly collective and which is not the conditioned collective thought.

When you and I say that all our thinking is conditioned - whether as a Catholic, a Communist, or a Hindu, a Buddhist, or a Mussalman - when we realize that, when you do not want me to become a Communist or I do not want you to become a Catholic - because that is the modified continuance of the old, in which is implied fear, threat, compulsion, liquidation, concentration camps and all the various forms of propaganda to make you do things -

when you and I realize that all our thinking is conditioned and therefore there can be no fundamental revolution, no fundamental transformation in society, then perhaps we shall, you and I, come to the realization of that Truth which is not the outcome of a conditioned thought. When you and I realize that, then there can be truly collective action.

Is that not our vocation, yours and mine, to find that Truth which is beyond the conditioned mind, so that you and I can work together, create a new world which is ours, yours and mine, our world - not Communist, not Capitalist, not Socialist, nor Hindu. But perhaps you will say that this is an impossible state, and very few of us can realize this, and so, brush it aside. Sirs, it is our world. We can transform the world, we can bring it about for ourselves and our fellow beings; but we must give care and thought to all this. True collective action, not the collective action of a conditioned mind, can only be possible, can only come about when you as an individual can understand the total process. That is why organizations - political, religious or social - will not lead man to happiness.

Man may have all the clothes he wants, all the food he wants, all the shelter he wants; but there is something much more significant in life than the mere acquisition of things. This does not mean that you should become a saint, a sannyasi and withdraw into a cave which is the ultimate escape. But when we do realize the implications of the mind that is unconditioned and when therefore all actions can take place from that, that is the true revolution.

Question: What do you mean by 'the whole'? Is it only a new term to define the absolute or God? And can we at all shift our

outlook from the part to the whole, except through image, idea or aspiration?

Krishnamurti: I am not substituting the word `whole' for God or for Truth. It is what you do, I am not doing that. What I am trying to point out is that through the part we cannot understand the whole. Wait a minute, Sir; we will go into what the whole is.

Through studying part of a picture, of a particular painting, taking a part, one corner of it, you don't see the whole picture. Perhaps if we saw all the picture and understand what the painter intends to convey, then we could study the part, the corner; but if we begin to study the corner, the angle, instead of the whole of the picture, then we will never have the comprehension of the whole. It is a very simple fact; that is, if we emphasize only the economic side of our total living and give all our thought, all our considerations, all our experiences to the economic solution of man, we will miss the whole struggle of man, the whole existence of man, his different states - the psychological, physical, inward, outward. And will this study of the part lead you to the comprehension of the whole totality of man? As most of us - the specialists, the experienced ones, the learned ones, the great ones - are all concerned with the part and legislating for the part, perhaps we miss something - the whole of man, the whole of the being of man - which if we understand, we may find a different solution, a different answer, a quicker way of approach to our economic problems. That approach is after all the totality of my being or your being: it is made up of all these parts, is it not? I am the body, the clothes I put on, the hunger, the thirst, outwardly; and inwardly, I am all the desires, all the ambitions, psychological struggles,

frustrations, urges, the compulsion to fulfil, to seek something beyond the mind; I am the total process of all that, as you are.

Is it not important to help each other to understand the total process of you and me, and not just legislate for one part of me, of one layer of me? Sir, I need food, clothes and shelter, so do you; and we also need something much more fundamental. We want to fulfil, we want to be painters, we want to be writers, we want to be saints, we want to be helpers, we want to be evil beings; there is the feeling of hatred, ambition, envy; how can you leave all that aside and just concern yourself with a particular part - it may be a glorified part - and talk about that particular part and bring about a revolution? Is not my existence a total process, is it not the whole process of my being at different levels, the conscious as well as the unconscious? Have you not to take all that into consideration, have you not to have the vision of the whole of me - not of some extraordinary God? The `me' is related to the whole that is the `me' of everyone, I do not exist independently of it. I cannot. The total process of the whole of me and of you, has to be understood. If I can understand as you can, the total process of the whole being, and regard and concern myself with the whole and not with the part then we shall find a different answer to all our problems. But the enrichment and the glorification of the part is not going to solve the problem of the whole.

It is so much easier to occupy ourselves with the part. We are concerned with the part - which indicates our shallowness, the pettiness of our minds. It is only when we can understand the total process of our being from day to day, in all our relationships, then there is a possibility of discovering something which is beyond the

mind. But we cannot find that which is beyond the mind through the emphasis of the part. And without discovering what is beyond the mind, we shall have no happiness, we shall have no peace for mankind; our lives will be a constant struggle and misery. These are obvious facts; you don't have to study them in innumerable psychological books; you don't have to pass an examination, you don't have to know a technique to discover what is in your mind and heart from time to time, from moment to moment, everyday. All that it needs is watchfulness, and not the following of a guru or leader. It needs no discipline but the mere observing of simple things - anger, jealousy, the desire to fulfil, the desire to acquire, the desire to be powerful. You observe these things in your relationships in your everyday life, and you will see how the totality of your being works, whether you are the centre, whether without the alteration at the centre, fundamentally, radically, you can bring about a revolution at the periphery. As long as we are polishing the outer - not that the outer should not be bright - such an approach will not solve our problems. But if we can understand the total process of our being, and then perhaps be able to go beyond and, from there, approach all our problems, then we shall find the true answer. The answer will not then be productive of further problems, further misery, further sorrow.

Question: I am troubled by my dreams night after night. Can one not free oneself from this exhausting process?

Krishnamurti: Let us find out together what is the right answer to this problem - together, you and I. Don't listen to me merely as if I am the talker and you the listener; but together we shall find the truth of this because it is your problem.

What do you mean by waking and dreaming? When are you awake? At least, when do we think we are awake? And when do we think we are dreaming? Please, this is not a psychological question. Just follow it step by step, simply. Do not translate it and say, 'Yes, Sankara, Buddha, said so', and then wander away. I am talking very simply what is the actual fact. When do we think we are awake? When our conscious mind is functioning, is it not? That is, there is the mind that is operating every day, and when that is functioning, we are awake. You are awake when you have a job, when you are studying, when you are getting into the tramcar or into the bus, when you are following, when you are scolding someone, when you are ambitious or sexual or what you will. That is, during the day we think we are awake and when we sleep we think we are in a state when the mind has gone to sleep - rather, has been put to sleep.

Now, is the mind ever asleep? Is it ever at rest? The mind is both the conscious as well as the unconscious. The consciousness shows very little; that which we call the conscious is very superficial; but there is a dreaded part, undiscovered, hidden, below this conscious part, which is the unconscious; and our mind is both the conscious as well as the unconscious. The conscious mind is urged, propelled, driven, or held back by the unconscious. You may think you are outwardly a very peaceful person, that outwardly you are not ambitious; but below, hidden deep down, there is the bellowing going on in your heart - your urges, compulsions, desires, motives. The unconscious is the reservoir of all the past of humanity - not the past of your being only, but of your father, of your fore-fathers, of your nation, of human beings -

the racial traditions, the caste prejudices; all that is held in the unconscious.

The conscious mind is occupied during the day with trivial things, and the occupation with those trivial things we call the waking state. When we go to sleep the mind goes on being active, it is still thinking out the problems of the day in relation to and coloured by the unconscious; and when the unconscious wants to put some idea, some impression on the conscious mind which it is not capable of doing during the day, then you have dreams. That is, your conscious mind is occupied throughout the day; it cannot receive new impressions, new promptings, new hints, because it is too occupied; and then you go to sleep, and the unconscious projects into that semi-active conscious mind, its impressions. When you wake up, you say you have had a dream. Then begins the translation of that dream by the conscious mind, and you say you have had a marvellous experience.

So, as long as you are not consciously aware at the time - throughout the waking time, throughout the waking period - of the promptings of the unconscious, as long as you are not open to every impression or every hint, from the unconscious, you must continue to dream; there must be a conflict between the conscious and the unconscious. Sirs, these are all very simple facts. If you observe your own being, your own thoughts, your daily activities, if you are aware of them, you will see that this is the actual process going on. There is nothing mysterious about it.

The whole process - the unconscious, the conscious, the promptings, the hints, the impressions and the translating of all those impulses by the conscious - all that is your being; that is what

you are. If you are not open, if the mind is not open to the total process but is only occupied with the part, naturally there must be dreams - dreams being the impressions and the projections of the unconscious. So there is this constant struggle going on between the conscious and the unconscious, because the conscious can never compete completely with the unconscious, because the conscious is trying to translate every impression according to certain demands, activities and results.

Sirs, it is only when we begin to understand this total process of our being, the actual state in which we are that then there is a possibility of an integrated human being. Surely that is the beginning of meditation, is it not? Meditation is not merely concentration on some idea, on some picture, or the desire to be something - that is just immature, childish; it is not meditation. Meditation is this understanding of the total process, the observation, the awareness of the responses of the conditioned thought to every challenge, so that the mind remains aware of its content, its activity, its pursuits, its hidden motives; so that, through that constant awareness without choice, there is freedom,' there is an integration - this whole process is meditation. A mind that is capable of observing without choice, seeing things as they are without trying to interpret them, without translating them, without twisting them, without distorting them - such a mind, through awareness, shall know what peace is, such a mind is capable then of being truly silent. Then only, in that silence, that 'which is' comes into being. But the mind that is seeking a result can never find Truth.

February 1, 1953