

- Madras 1952 -

[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](#)

[11th Public Talk](#)

[12th Public Talk](#)

- London 1952 -

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 5TH JANUARY 1952

I have to make one or two announcements. These meetings on every Saturday and Sunday will go on till the 10th of February and there will be discussions every Wednesday at 5:30 p.m., the same time as usual.

I think most of us are aware of the extraordinarily complex and vast problems that surround each one of us. There is so much contradiction among the experts - political, social and religious. There are those who assert constantly that only a certain system must be valid. Religiously, there is a contradiction of belief. It seems to me that if you want to solve any of these problems you must all think anew and not rely on any one source, on any authority; and that seems most extraordinarily difficult for most of us. Either we turn to the past as a source of information or for purposes of imitation, or rely on some future promise - economic, political or religious. Either we turn back to the past as a means of solace by asserting that religious conformity is essential, or we rely on the economic authority of revolution and future promise of the ideal state. Until we very carefully and intelligently think out the problems for ourselves, I do not think there is any way of dissolving any of these confusing and contradictory problems.

What I propose to do during these discussions is to think out with each one of you this extraordinarily complex problem of living. You know this problem is not confined to a narrow area. All over the world it is the same. We are confused; we do not know what to do; and we do not know how to set about it or to discover

why each group is fighting the other. Ambition, corruption in the name of peace and other ideals are rampant throughout the world, not only parochially but all-extensively. Now if we want to really solve this problem, we have to think it out ourselves. We have to find the right answer. I believe there is an answer and I am completely convinced there is an answer. But the mere discovery of the answer is not a solution. So what you and I have to do is to find out, which means, you and I have to listen to each other to find out the right answer. Listening is an extraordinarily difficult art. That is because most of us are incapable of listening, because we have so much knowledge, so much information; we have read so much; our prejudices are so strong; our experiences are like the walls that surround us; and through these prejudices, looking over these walls, we try to listen. Can we listen to anything if our mind, at least temporarily, is not free of the prejudices, and is not always referring to some knowledge which we have all translated and interpreted? That is one of the greatest difficulties. Is it not?

Though we appear to be incapable of listening, it seems to me that it is one of the most necessary and essential things that we have to do, you and I have to do. You should not translate what I am saying, or interpret what I am saying, or understand it according to your background; because when you do that, you stop all thinking. Don't you? If you say 'that conforms to my understanding', you have stopped thinking, you have stopped listening; you do not open the door to see greater visions, greater depths of those words. To listen without interpretation requires extraordinary alertness of mind. Please try during these discussions and at home to really listen to each other without interpretation,

just to listen without translating according to your prejudices. After all, translations mean that you have previous knowledge which confines thought, prevents it from penetrating further and deeper. So it is essential that you and I should establish the right kind of relationship. I do not believe in authority of any kind; and if you treat what I am saying as authoritarian, then you stop listening. You will have to investigate and try to find out what is the answer, the right answer, what is the way out of this appalling mess of war and peace, of this contradiction between the rich and the poor, between those who are seeking authority in the name of every form of violence and peace. If we do not seek and understand the right answer, I think we have no business or responsibility of sitting and listening to each other and wasting our time. I feel very ardently that if we, even two or three of us, could sit down and go into this thoroughly, setting aside every thing to find out, then there is a possibility of starting on a little scale till it becomes a roaring storm; but that requires earnestness, that requires real exchange of thought and not mere assertion of prejudice and constancy of a particular experience.

So, how is it possible to find out the right answer? I am sure that is what most of us are trying to find out. Are we not? Any thoughtful person must be seeking the right solution, the lasting and permanent solution to all this appalling suffering, misery, this contradiction between the rich and the poor, between those who are seeking authority in the name of peace, between the powerful and the downtrodden, between those who have nothing and those who have everything, between those who are seeking power. Surely, there must be an answer to all this, must there not be? How are we

going to find it out? Surely, the first essential requirement to understand or to search out the answer must be the understanding that all search is conditioned by desire. Let us think about it for a while. If I seek an economic or other answer to this problem, without understanding the instrument that seeks, that very instrument is limited, confined, conditioned by the desire that is out seeking. If I am seeking the right answer, the right solution to any problem, is not the search conditioned by my desire? So before I can seek an answer, I must understand desire. Is that not so? If I want to know if there is God, if there is such a thing as Absolute Happiness, surely, before I can seek it, I must understand the mind that seeks it. Otherwise, the mind will condition the object of my search. That is fairly obvious. Is it not? Those who seek anything, will find what they seek; but what they find, will depend on their desire. If you seek comfort and security, you will find them; but that will not be real; on the contrary, that will produce more and more confusion, contradiction and misery. So, before we begin to seek, we must understand the whole process of desire. In the very search of understanding desire, you will find the answer. But to seek the answer without understanding desire, the centre of recognition, is futile. Those who are really earnest, those who really want to see a peaceful world, to have peaceful relationship with each other, to be friendly and compassionate, must surely solve this problem first.

If you really consider what is happening in the world you will see how man is dividing himself, bringing wars, confusion and utter misery. To all this confusion, to all this increasing and expanding misery, there must be an answer; that is possible only if

we understand the process of desire. Whenever we seek anything without understanding our desire, we are seeking an idea as a means of action; all our search ends in an idea - idea as a formulation, as a concept, or as an experience; we are seeking a conclusion, an idea, a concept. But an idea, a concept, a formulation can never produce action. I do not know if that is clear, or rather abstract and confusing. To us, idea is very important, idea in the shape of experience or in the shape of a conclusion. So, when we are seeking, we are seeking an idea which we will translate afterwards into action. First, I have an idea of what I should do, and then I act. We have the pattern of what a society should be, and then we conform to that pattern. So, there is always a contradiction, a competition, a struggle between action and idea.

Is this search for an idea truly an answer, or is the search to be independent of idea and be only action? This is not very complex if you really think about it. It is really very important to understand this before you proceed further. Because our search is intellectual, there is a contradiction between idea and action, a gap, an interval; and our constant endeavour is to bridge the two together, which is surely a waste of time, stupidity, call it what you will; because we do not understand that the search depends on desire, and that desire essentially breeds idea. Surely therefore, those of us who are really earnest, who are not carried away by emotional nonsense or by their own prejudices, by their own vanities, if they really want to find out a peaceful and lasting answer to this problem, have to search our and understand desire, which means action. The very understanding of desire is action and not idea.

The moment you have an idea, what happens? Watch your own

mind and see, discover what happens when you have an idea. You want to translate that idea into action. Don't you? You want to put it into a picture or to do something with it, convey, translate, communicate it with somebody. Idea is never action. Is it? If peace is based on an idea, then you are bound to have contradictions of how to carry it out, how to implement, and how to bring it about. But if you begin to understand the whole process of desire, then you will see that action is independent of thought, of idea. The mistake we make is that we first have the idea and then act. But if we begin to understand desire, which is a very complex and intricate problem, then you will see that action follows the understanding of each desire.

What do I mean by understanding desire? Desire is not static, is it? You cannot impose certain rules and regulations on desire if you would understand it. Would you? You have to follow it you have to observe you have to follow every movement of its intricate, conscious and unconscious whims and fancies. Have you not? You cannot say 'That is right desire. That is wrong desire. This is all right. This, I want to do', and so on. When you say so, you put an end to the understanding and subsequent following of that desire. This is not easy because we have been trained from childhood to repress, to control, to dominate and say 'This is right, that is wrong; and therefore, we put an end to investigation, to search and to all understanding. Do not begin to say immediately 'This is right desire or wrong desire'. Let us find out. It is like following a path on the map. That is, if you are earnest; but if you want to be flippant about it and want to play about it in the name of peace, obviously that has no meaning. Such people have no experience. If

you would really follow it out, then you will see that you have a centre which is always the process of recognition. There is no experience if there is no recognition. If I do not recognize, I have no experience. Have I? You only say 'I have an experience' when there is a process of recognition taking place. Our difficulty is to understand desire without this process of recognition.

Do you understand what I mean by recognition? By recognition, I mean something that happens when you meet or see somebody. You then have a subjective reaction, emotion, and you recognize; you give it a name; and that recognition only strengthens each experience; and each experience limits, conditions, and narrows down the self. So, if you would understand what is reality, what is God, that centre of recognition must completely end. Otherwise, what have you? The projection of your mind and memory, what you have learnt from the past, with which you recognize what is happening. And what is happening is your own experience projected. If I want to know what truth is, my mind must be in a state in which no recognition can ever take place. Is that possible? Do not please accept any of these things if you are not convinced. Have a balanced and sane scepticism about it all. You are not my pupils or my followers. You are dignified human beings trying to find out the right answer to all this appalling misery. To find out the right answer you must be extremely sharp, doubting, questioning, being balanced with scepticism. Is it possible? Do you have an experience which is not recognized? Do you understand what it means? Because that is after all God, that is the Truth, that is the Eternal or what you will. The moment you have a measure with which to measure, that is not Truth. Our Gods are measurable;

we know them previously. Our scriptures, our friends and our religious teachers have so conditioned us that we know what every thing is. All that we are doing is merely this process of recognition.

Is it possible to dissolve the centre of recognition? After all, it is the desire that gives strength to one's recognition. To say 'I know, I have had experience, it is so', indicates the strengthening of self. There is no higher self, no lower self; self is self. Now to find out if there is God, if there is truth, if there is such a thing as a state in which recognition is not possible, in which all measurement has ceased, surely, we must begin to understand desire. It is so absurd for the so-called religious people to say 'there is God', and for others to say 'There is no God'. That is not solving the problem, nor is the repeating of the Bible, or the Bhagavad Gita, or God knows what else. Surely that is not solving the problem. That is what everybody has been doing through centuries. Yet, we have not solved it. We are increasing our problems more and more, bringing greater and greater miseries upon us. So, to understand this problem of existence with all its confusion, its extraordinary trials, troubles, tribulations and misery, surely, we have to understand desire, to follow it. You can only follow it when the mind is aware of it self, when you are not looking at desire as something outside of you, when you are following it. Look here, sirs. I have a desire. What do I do? My instinctive reaction is to condemn it, to say how idiotic, how stupid it is; or to say how good, how noble it is. Then what happens? I have not really followed the desire; I have not gone into, I have not understood it; I have put an end to it. Please think it out, and you will see the extraordinary importance of it. Then I assure you, you will have

revolution, revolution of the greatest kind; because inward revolution is the only revolution, not economic revolution; because inward revolution will always conquer outward revolution, but outer revolution can never conquer inner. What is important is inward psychological revolution, regeneration; and that can only take place when we follow, understand the whole process, the complex process of psychological desire, motives, urges conscious as well as unconscious. That is not easy. It is no use saying `I have got it now, everything is all right; I am transformed; because to say so, is only to find yourself back into the whirl of action. If we can understand how to pursue desire, how to be acquainted with it, how not to translate it, then we shall solve all these problems.

How is it possible for an ordinary person like you and me, who has got so many problems - economic, family, religious, the mess we are all in - to pursue desire to the end, to go with it, to understand it? Is that not the question? How am I who is not intelligent, who has got so many formulations, prejudices, memories, how am I to follow desire? It would be easy if you had a companion who would stop you each time, and say: `Look, what are you doing? You are interpreting, translating, condemning desire. You are not really following it. You are really putting a cap on it'. If somebody could force you every instant and make you observe what you are doing, then perhaps it will be helpful. But you have no such companion; you too do not want such a companion, because it is too difficult, too irritating, too disturbing. But, you will have such a companion in your own mind if you are earnest and say `I want to understand it'. Don't create any intellectual difficulty by asking `When I say I want it, is that not a

desire'? That is only a quibbling of words, that is clever argumentation and has no validity. Then you and I will not understand it, because we must use words in order to convey; but if you merely put a stop at a certain point, and refuse to go beyond and understand the words in their connotation, then all action ceases. Take any desire, desire to be powerful, which most of us have; desire to dominate, which most of us have; clerk or president or any body rich or poor has the desire to be powerful. Do not condemn it, do not say 'It is right; it is wrong', but go into it; you will then see where it will lead you. You do not have to read any book. All the subconscious accumulations of desire for power through various means will be open to the conscious. There you have the book of knowledge; and if you do not know how to read it, you will never understand anything. You are following all the rubbish that has no meaning because, in your heart, in your mind, truth lies, and it is no good seeking it outside though it may be pleasing to you to do so. So we lead very complex and contradictory lives not only individually but collectively, Brahmin against non-Brahmin and so on. They are not only parochial problems but vast problems, world problems; and you cannot solve them through merely being confined to a narrow area. We must think of this thing as a tremendous whole, not as a little person investigating a little problem.

So, that is what we are going to discuss and talk about for the next six weeks, that is, how to understand desire and how, if possible, to go beyond recognition, that centre which recognizes, which cripples all creative action. Please do not come if you really are not earnest. It is very much better to have two or three who are

really earnest. It is sheer waste of time on your part because I feel I have talked for so many years and with what result? Do not have any sympathy for me, please. I feel there is something in that centre that can be grasped and understood; because, as you know, it is something much greater than physical or superficial existence. I would like to convey this to the two or three who are really serious and can go into it. But it is very difficult to find those two or three, because we have got all kinds of people with their self-importance, their ambitions, and their refusal to see beyond themselves. So, I beg of you most earnestly not to come if you are not serious, if you are not earnest; because if you are earnest, we can go very far and understand, not eventually but immediately. And that is where there is real transformation, to see a thing very clearly and to act upon it; and that requires enormous patience, observation and inward integrity.

Question: You have been in retreat for the past sixteen months and that, for the first time in your life. May we know if there is any significance in this?

Krishnamurti: Don't you also want to go away sometimes to quiet and take stock of things and not merely become a repetitive machine, a talker, explainer and expounder? Don't you want to do that some time, don't you want to be quiet, don't you want to know more of yourself? Some of you wish to do it, but economically you cannot. Some of you might want to do; but family responsibility and so on crowd in your way. All the same, it is good to retreat to quiet and to take stock of every thing that you have done. When you do that, you acquire experiences that are not recognized, not translated. Therefore, my retreat has no significance to you. I am

sorry. But your retreat, if you follow it rightly, will have significance to you. And I think it is essential sometimes to go to retreat, to stop everything that you have been doing, to stop your beliefs and experiences completely, and look at them anew, not keep on repeating like machines whether you believe or do not believe. You would then let in fresh air into your minds. Wouldn't you? That means you must be in secure, must you not? If you can do so, you would be open to the mysteries of nature and to things that are whispering about us, which you would not otherwise reach; you would reach the God that is waiting to come, the truth that cannot be invited but comes itself. But we are not open to love, and other finer processes that are taking place within us, because we are all too enclosed by our own ambitions, by our own achievements, by our own desires. Surely it is good to retreat from all that, is it not? Stop being a member of some society. Stop being a Brahmin, a Hindu, a Christian, a Mussulman. Stop your worship, rituals, take a complete retreat from all those and see what happens. In a retreat, do not plunge into something else, do not take some book and be absorbed in new knowledge and new acquisition. Have a complete break with the past and see what happens. Sirs, do it, and you will see delight. You will see vast expanses of love, understanding and freedom. When your heart is open, then reality can come. Then the whisperings of your own prejudices, your own noises, are not heard. That is why it is good to take a retreat, to go away and to stop the routine - not only the routine of out ward existence but the routine which the mind establishes for its own safety and convenience.

Try it sirs, those who have the opportunity. Then perhaps you

will know what is beyond recognition, what truth is which is not measured. Then you will find that God is not a thing to be experienced, to be recognized; but that God is something which comes to you without your invitation. But, that is only when your mind and your heart are absolutely still, not seeking, not probing, and when you have no ambitions to acquire. God can be found only when the mind is no longer seeking advancement. If we take a retreat from all that, then perhaps the whisperings of desire will cease to be heard, and the thing that is waiting will come directly and surely.

January 5, 1952

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 6TH JANUARY 1952

We were talking yesterday about the problem of desire and how to understand it. As it is a very important question, it should not be casually considered and discarded. One can put innumerable questions to find the right answer, but one must have the capacity to listen. Most of us are so eager to get an answer, to have a right response, to find the right solution, that in our eagerness we miss them all. So, as I suggested yesterday, we should have a great deal of patience, not lethargy but alertness with patience, alert passivity. What I would like to do this evening is to talk over the problems of belief and knowledge. Belief and knowledge are very intimately related to desire; and perhaps, if we can understand these two issues, then we can see how desire works, and understand its complexity.

May I suggest that you should listen and not take notes, because it is very difficult to take notes and to listen. What I would like to experiment with each one of you here in all my discussions and talks is that we should see the issue directly, understand it directly, and not to grope about after you have gone from here. Then you will see that these meetings are worthwhile. I feel most ardently that I am not talking to a large audience or to a small audience, but that I am talking to each individual; and I mean it. It is only the individual that can see, understand and create a new world, that can bring about an inward revolution and therefore an external revolution also. So, you as an individual and I are discussing the problem together and are going into it as deeply as possible to do

that, you have to listen; you have to be a little receptive, be capable of exposing yourself to what is being said, and find out your own reactions as we go along. So, may I suggest that, as you listen, you should see the thing without interpretation and understand it directly.

As I said, it is really a very interesting problem, this question of belief and knowledge. What an extraordinary part it plays in our life! How many beliefs we have! Surely the more intelligent, the more cultured, the more spiritual, if I can use that word, a person is, the less is his capacity to understand. The savages have innumerable superstitions, even in the modern world. The more thoughtful, the more awake, the more alert are perhaps the less believing. That is because belief binds, belief isolates; and we see that, throughout the world, the economic and the political world, and also in the so-called spiritual world. You believe there is God, and perhaps I believe that there is no God; or, you believe in the complete State control of everything and of every individual, and I believe in private enterprise and all the rest of it; you believe that there is only one Saviour and through him you can get your end, and I don't believe so. So, you with your belief and I with mine are asserting ourselves. Yet we both talk of love, of peace, of unity of mankind, of one life - which means absolutely nothing; because actually the very belief is a process of isolation. You are a Brahmin, I a non Brahmin; you are a Christian, I a Mussulman, and so on. But you talk of brotherhood and I also talk of the same brotherhood, love and peace. In actuality, we are separated, we are dividing ourselves. A man who would want peace and would want to create a new world, a happy world, surely cannot isolate himself

through any form of belief. Is that clear? It may be verbal; but, if you see the significance and validity and the truth of it, it will begin to act.

So, we see that where there is a process of desire at work, there must be the process of isolation through belief; because, obviously, you believe in order to be secure economically, spiritually, and also inwardly. I am not talking of those people who believe for economic reasons; because they are brought up to depend on their jobs and therefore they will be Catholics, Hindus - it does not matter what - as long as there is a job for them. We are not also discussing those people who cling to a belief for the sake of convenience. Perhaps, with most of you it is equally so. For convenience, we believe in certain things. Brushing aside these economic reasons, you must go more deeply into it. Take the people who believe strongly in anything, economic, social or spiritual; the process behind it is the psychological desire to be secure. Is it not? And then there is the desire to continue. We are not discussing here whether there is or there is not continuity; we are only discussing the urge, the constant impulse to believe. A man of peace, a man who would really understand the whole process of human existence, cannot be bound by a belief. Can he? It means, he sees his desire at work as a means to become secure. Please do not go to the other side and say "I am preaching non-religion". That is not my point at all. My point is that as long as we do not understand the process of desire in the form of belief, there must be contention, there must be conflict, there must be sorrow, and man will be against man, which is seen every day. So, if I perceive, if I am aware that this process takes the form of belief

which is an expression of the craving for inward security, then my problem is not that I should believe this or that but that I should free myself from the desire to be secure. Can the mind be free from it? That is the problem, not what to believe and how much to believe. These are merely expressions of inward craving to be secure psychologically, to be certain about some thing when everything is so uncertain in the world.

Can a mind, can a conscious mind, can a personality be free from this desire to be secure? We want to be secure and therefore need the aid of our estates, our property and our family. We want to be secure inwardly and also spiritually by erecting walls of belief, which are an indication of this craving to be certain. Can you as an individual be free from this urge, this craving to be secure, which expresses itself in the desire to believe in something? If we are not free of all that, we are a source of contention; we are not peacemaking; we have no love in our hearts. Belief destroys all that, and this is seen in our everyday life. So, can I see myself when I am caught in this process of desire, which expresses itself in clinging to a belief? Can the mind free itself from it? It should not find a substitute for belief but be entirely free from it. You cannot answer "yes or no" to this; but you can definitely give an answer if your intention is to become free from belief. You then inevitably come to the point when you are seeking the means to free yourself from the urge to be secure. Obviously, there is no security inwardly which, as you like to believe, would continue. You like to believe there is God who is carefully looking after your petty little things, whom you should see, what you should do and how you should do. Obviously, this is childish and immature

thinking. You think the Great Father is watching every one of us. That is a mere projection of your own personal liking. It is not obviously true. Truth must be something entirely different. To find out that truth which is not a projection of our liking, is our purpose in all these discussions and talks. So, if you are really earnest in your endeavour to find out what truth is, it would be obvious that a mind that is crippled, that is bound, that is trammelled by belief, cannot proceed any distance.

Our next problem is that of knowledge. Is knowledge necessary to the understanding of truth? When I say 'I know', the implication is that there is knowledge. Can such a mind be capable of investigation and search of what is reality? And besides, what is it we know, of which we are so proud? Actually what is it we know?, We know information; we are full of information and experience based on our condition, our memory and our capacities. When you say 'I know', what do you mean? Do please think it out, go along with me, don't merely listen to me. Either the acknowledgment that you know is the recognition of a fact or a certain information, or it is an experience that you have had. The constant accumulation of information, the acquisition of various forms of knowledge, information, all that, constitutes the assertion 'I know; and you start translating what you have read, according to your background your desire, your experience. Your knowledge is a thing in which a process similar to the process of desire is at work. Instead of belief we substitute knowledge. 'I know, I have had experience, it cannot be refuted; my experience is that, on that I completely rely; these are indications of that knowledge. But when you go behind it, analyse it, look at it more intelligently and carefully, you will find

that the very assertion 'I know' is another wall separating you and me. Behind that wall you take refuge, seeking comfort, security. Therefore, the more the knowledge a mind is burdened with, the less capable it is of understanding. Obviously! Surely, Sirs, the man who would seek peace, who would seek truth, must be free from all knowledge; because he that has knowledge, would interpret in his own way all that he observes and experiences. Therefore, the suppression of all knowledge is essential to experience reality - suppression in the sense not of subjugation, not enforcing it down.

It is a very interesting thing to watch how in our life these two, knowledge and belief, play an extraordinarily powerful part. Look how we worship those who have immense knowledge and erudition! Can you understand the meaning of it? Sirs, if you would find something new, experience something which is not a projection of your imagination, your mind must be free. Must it not be? It must be capable of seeing some thing new. But unfortunately, every time you see something new, you bring all the information known to you already, all your knowledge, all your past memories; obviously you become incapable of looking, incapable of receiving anything that is new and that is not of the old. Please don't immediately translate this into detail. If I do not know how to get back to Mylapore, I would be lost; If I do not know how to run a machine, I shall be of little use. That is quite a different thing. We are not discussing that here. We are discussing about knowledge that is used as a means to security, psychological and inward security, to be something. What do you get through knowledge? The authority of knowledge, the weight of knowledge,

the sense of importance, dignity, the sense of vitality and what not? A man who says 'I know', 'There is' or 'There is not', surely has stopped thinking, stopped pursuing this whole process of desire.

Our problem then, as I see it, is: "I am bound, weighed down by belief, with knowledge; and is it possible for a mind to be free from yesterday and the beliefs that have been acquired through the process of yesterday". Do you understand the question? Is it possible for me as an individual and you as an individual to live in this society and yet be free from the beliefs in which the mind has been brought up? Is it possible for the mind to be free of all that knowledge, all that authority? Please, sirs, do pay a little attention to this, because I think it is very important if you are at all earnest to really go into this problem of belief and knowledge. We read the various scriptures, religious books. There, they have very carefully described what to do, what not to do, how to attain the goal, what the goal is and what God is. You all know that by heart and you have pursued that. That is your knowledge, that is what you have acquired, that is what you have learnt; along that path you pursue. Obviously what you pursue and see, you will find. But is it reality? Is it not the projection of your own knowledge? It is not reality. Is it possible to realize that now - not tomorrow, but now - and say 'I see the truth of it', and let it go, so that your mind is not crippled by this process of imagination, of projection, of seeing what it must be.

Similarly, is the mind capable of becoming free from belief? You can only be free from it when you understand the inward nature of the causes that make you hold on to it, not only the conscious but the unconscious motives as well, that make you

believe. After all, we are not merely a superficial entity functioning on the conscious level. We can find out the deeper conscious and unconscious activities if you give the unconscious mind a chance, because it is much quicker in response than the conscious mind. If you listen, as I hope you are listening, to what I am saying, your unconscious mind must be responding. While your conscious mind is quietly thinking, listening and watching, the unconscious mind is much more active, much more alert and much more receptive; it must, therefore, have an answer. Can the mind which has been subjugated, intimidated, forced, compelled to believe, can such a mind be free to think? Can it look anew and remove the process of isolation between you and me? Please do not say belief brings people together. It does not. That is obvious. Is that not? No organized religion has. Look at our selves in this country. You are all believers, but are you all together? Are you all united? You yourselves know you are not. You are divided into so many petty little parties, castes; you know the innumerable divisions; similarly in the west. The process is the same right through the world - Christians destroying Christians, murdering each other for petty little things, driving people into camps, and so on, the whole horror of war. So, belief does not bind people. That is so clear. If that is clear and that is true, and if you see it, then it must be followed. But the difficulty is that most of us do not see, because we are not capable of facing that inward insecurity, that inward sense of being alone. We want something to lean on, whether it is the State, whether it is the caste, whether it is nationalism, whether it is a Master or a Saviour or any thing we want to hold on. And when we see the falseness of it, the mind is capable, it may be temporarily

for a second, of seeing the truth of it; and when it is too much, it goes back. But to see temporarily is sufficient; if you can see it for a fleeting second, it is enough; because you will then see an extraordinary thing taking place. The unconscious is at work though the conscious may reject. And it is not a progressive second; but that second is the only thing and it will have its own results even in spite of the conscious mind struggling against it.

So, our question is 'Is it possible for the mind to be free from knowledge and belief?' Is not the mind made up of knowledge and belief? Are you following all this? Is not the structure of the mind belief and knowledge? Belief and knowledge are the processes of recognition, the centre of the mind. The process is enclosing, the process is conscious. So can the mind be free of its own structure? You understand what I mean? The mind is not as we know the mind to be. It is so easy to ask questions without understanding. Probably, I shall receive many questions tomorrow such as 'How can the mind be like this or that?' Do not please ask such questions. Think it out, feel it out, go into it, do not accept what I am saying, but see the problem with which you are confronted everyday in your life.

Can the mind cease to be? That is the problem. Mind, as we know it, has belief behind it, has desire, urge to be secure, knowledge and accumulation of strength. And if, with all its power and superiority, one cannot think for oneself, there can be no peace in the world. You may talk about it, you may organize political parties, you may shout from the housetops; but you cannot have peace; because in the mind is the very basis which creates contradiction, which isolates and separates. We will discuss this as

we go along. Just leave it alone. You have heard it, let it simmer. If you have already discarded desire, finished with it, so much the better; if you have not, let it operate. And it will operate if you listen rightly because it is something vital, it is something that you have to solve. A man of peace, a man of earnestness, cannot isolate himself and yet talk of brotherhood and peace. It is just a game, political or religious, a sense of achievement and ambition. We shall discuss that later. A man who is really earnest about this, who wants to discover, has to face the problem of knowledge and belief; he has to go behind it, to discover the whole process of desire at work, desire to be secure, desire to be certain.

Question: You have condemned discipline as a means of spiritual or other attainment. How can anything be accomplished in life without discipline or at least self-discipline?

Krishnamurti: Again please let us listen. Let us listen to find the truth of the matter. It does not matter what I say or somebody else says; but we have to find the truth of the matter. First of all, there are many who say that discipline is necessary, or the whole social, economic, and political system would cease; that, in order to do this or that, in order to realize God, you must have discipline. You must follow a certain discipline; because without discipline, you cannot control the mind; without discipline, you will spill over.

But I want to know the truth of the matter, not what Sankara, Buddha or Patanjali or anybody else had said. I want to know what is the truth of it. I do not want to rely on authority to find it out. Would I discipline a child? I discipline a child when I have no time, when I am impatient, when I am angry, when I want to make him do something. But if I help the child to understand why he is

mischievous, why he is doing a certain thing, then discipline is not necessary. Is it? If I go and explain, take the trouble, have the patience to understand the whole problem of why the child is acting in such and such a way, surely, discipline is not necessary. What is necessary is to awaken intelligence, is it not? If intelligence be awakened in me, then obviously I shall not do certain things. Since we do not know how to awaken that intelligence, we build walls of control and resistance, and call that discipline. So discipline has nothing to do with intelligence; on the contrary, it destroys intelligence. So how am I to awaken intelligence? If I understand that to think in a certain manner - for instance, to think in terms of nationalism - is a wrong process, if I see the whole implication of it, the isolation, the sense of identification with something larger, and so on, if I see the whole implication of desire, of the activity of the mind, if I really understand and see the whole content of it, if my intelligence awakens to it, the desire drops away; I do not have to say 'It is a very bad desire'. This requires watchfulness, attention, alertness and examination. Does it not? And because we are not capable of it, we say we must discipline; it is a very immature way of thinking about a very complex problem. Even modern systems of education are discarding the whole idea of discipline. They are trying to find out the psychology of the child and why he is going in such and such a way; they are watching him, helping him.

Now, look at the process of discipline. What happens? Discipline is, surely, a process of compulsion, of repression. Is it not? I want to do something and I say, 'I must, because I want to get there' or 'That is bad'. Do I understand anything by

condemning it? And when I condemn a thing, do I look at it, do I go into it? I have not seen it. So, it is the sluggish mind that begins to discipline, without understanding what it is all about; and I am sure all religious rules have been laid down for the lazy. It is so much easier to follow than to investigate, than to enquire, than to understand. The more you are disciplined, the less your heart is open. Do you know all these things, Sirs? How can an empty heart understand something which is beyond the influence of the mind?

The problem of discipline is really very complex. The political parties use discipline in order to achieve a particular result, in order to make the individual conform to the ideal pattern of a future society, and for which we are only too willing to become slaves because that promises something marvellous. So a mind that is seeking a reward, an end, forces itself to conform to that end which is always a projection of a clever mind, of a superior mind, a more cunning mind. A disciplined mind can never understand what it is to be peaceful. How can a mind which is enclosed by regulations and restrictions, see anything beyond?

If you look at this process of discipline, you will observe that desire is at the back of it, the desire to be strong, the desire to achieve a result, the desire to become something, the desire to be powerful, to become more and not less. This constant urge of desire is at work, this urge to conform, to discipline, to suppress, to isolate. You may suppress, you may discipline. But the conscious cannot control and shape the unconscious mind. If you try to shape your unconscious mind, it is what you call discipline. Is it not? The more you suppress, the more you put the lid on your mind, the more the unconscious revolts till ultimately the mind either ends up

neurotically or does a crazy thing.

So what is important in this question is not whether I condemn discipline or you approve of it, but to see how to awaken the integrated intelligence, not departmentalized intelligence, but integrated intelligence, which brings its own understanding, and therefore avoids certain things naturally, automatically and freely. It is the intelligence that will guide, not discipline. Sir, this is really a very important and complex question. If we would really go into it, if we watch ourselves and understand the whole process of discipline, we will find that we are not really disciplined at all. Are you disciplined in your lives? Or are you merely suppressing the various cravings, resisting various forms of temptations? If you should resist through discipline, those temptations and those demands are still there. Are they not hidden deep down but still there, waiting for an opening to burst out? Have you not noticed as you grow older, that those feelings that are suppressed, are coming out again? So you cannot play tricks with your unconscious; it will pay you back thousandfold.

You have to understand this whole process, not that you are all for discipline, and I am against it. I assert that discipline will lead you nowhere; on the contrary, it is a blind process, unintelligent and thoughtless. But to awaken intelligence is quite a different problem. You cannot cultivate intelligence. Intelligence when awakened, brings its own mode of operation; it regulates its own life, observes various forms of temptations, inclinations, reactions and goes into it; it understands, not superficially but in an integrated, comprehensive manner. To do that, the mind must be constantly alert, watchful. Must it not? Surely, for a mind that

would understand, the restrictions imposed upon it by itself are of very little significance. To understand, there must be freedom; that freedom does not come through compulsion in any form; and freedom lies not at the end but at the beginning. Our difficulty is to awaken integrated intelligence, and that can only come about when we are capable of understanding the whole.

This complex problem of desire expresses itself through discipline, through conformity, through repression, through belief, through knowledge. When we see the vast structure of desire, then we will begin to understand. Then the mind will begin to see itself and be capable of receiving something which is not the projection of its own.

January 6, 1952

MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 12TH JANUARY 1952

I have been trying to find out, the last two times that we have met, the action that is not isolated, that is not fragmented, action that is not bound by idea; and I think it is important to go into that matter rather carefully because I feel that, without understanding the whole process of ideation, mere action will have very little significance. The conflict between idea and action will always be ever increasing and it can never be bridged. So, to find out action which is not fragmented, that is not broken up, not isolated, but comprehensive, we have to investigate the whole process of desire. Desire is not a thing that can be annihilated, that can be subjugated or twisted. That is because, as I explained, however much we may wish to abandon desire, it can never be done; for desire is a constant process of the conscious as well as the unconscious, and we may temporarily control the conscious desire but it is very difficult to subjugate or control the unconscious. I feel that utter confusion and chaos would result from any action which is isolated; and it also seems to me that most of us are occupied with such actions. Experts and specialists have separated action and idea; they have done this at different levels and in different patterns and have told you how to act. There are, as you know, the economists, the politicians, the religious persons and so on; they have given us fragmentary views of the whole comprehension of life. It seems to me that those who are really very earnest to understand this process of action which is not isolated and not fragmented or broken up, must be on their guard. It can only be

done when we understand the whole process of desire. That is more or less what we discussed last Saturday and Sunday.

To understand desire is not to condemn it. As most of us are conditioned, as most of us have fixed ideas and opinions with regard to desire, it is almost impossible for us to follow the movement of desire without condemning it, without having opinions. If I would understand something, I must observe it without any process of condemnatory attitude. Must I not? If I would understand you and if you would understand me, we must not judge each other, we must not condemn each other; we must be open and receptive to all the implications of each other's word, to the expression of our face; we must be completely receptive and open minded. That is not possible when there is condemnation. Is it possible to have action without idea? For most of us, ideas come first and action follows after. Ideas are always fragmentary, they are always isolated; and any action based on idea must be fragmentary, isolated. Is it possible to have an action that is not broken up, that is comprehensive, that is integrated? It seems to me that such an action is the only redemption for us. All other actions are bound to leave further confusion all further conflict. So, how is one to find action which is not based on idea?

What do we mean by idea? Surely idea is the process of thought. Is it not? Idea is a process of mentation, of thinking; and thinking is always a reaction either of the conscious or of the unconscious. Thinking is a process of verbalization which is the result of memory; thinking is a process of time. So, when action is based on the process of thinking, such action must inevitably be conditioned, isolated. Idea must oppose idea, idea must be

dominated by idea. There is a gap then between action and idea. What we are trying to find out is whether it is possible for action to be without idea. We see how idea separates people. As I have already explained, knowledge and belief are essentially separating qualities. Beliefs never bind people; they always separate people; when action is based on belief or an idea or an ideal, such an action must inevitably be isolated, fragmented. Is it possible to act without the process of thought, thought being a process of time, a process of calculation, a process of self-protection, a process of belief, denial, condemnation, justification. Surely, it must have occurred to you as it has to me, whether action is at all possible without idea. I see as well as you see that when I have an idea and I base my action on that idea, it must create opposition; idea must meet idea and must inevitably create suppression, opposition. I do not know if I am making myself clear. To me this is really a very important point. If you can understand that, not by the mind or sentimentally but intimately, I feel we shall have transcended all our difficulties. Our difficulties are of ideas, not of action. It is not what we should do, which is merely an idea; what is important is acting. Is action possible without the process of calculation, which is the result of self-protection, of memory, of relationship, personal, individual, collective and so on? I say it is possible. You can experiment with it when you are here. If we can follow without any condemnation the whole process of desire, then you will see that action is inevitable without idea. That no doubt requires an extraordinary alertness of mind; because our whole conditioning is to condemn, justify, to put into various categories - which are all a process of calculation, mentation. For most of us, idea and action

are two different things. There is idea first and action follows after. Our difficulty is to bridge action and idea. Let us look at it differently.

We know every form of greed is destructive. Envy leads to ambition - political, religious, collective or individual. Every form of ambition, if we are aware of it, is limited and destructive. We all know that; we do not have to be told; we have not got to think a great deal about it. Ambition produces envy. Ambition is the result of the desire for power and position, for personal advancement, political and religious - politically in the name of an idea of the future or of the present, and spiritually in the name of something equally good or equally bad. We have known such ambitions - to be somebody, to be dominating people in the name of peace, in the name of Master, in the name of God and Heaven knows what else. Where there is ambition, there must be exploitation, man against man, nation against nation; and the very people who are shouting peace, are the very ones who are doing things which are highly destructive, perhaps for themselves and for their country or for their idea. Such people do not bring peace. They only verbalize peace but they have not got peace in their hearts. Such people obviously cannot bring to the world peace or happiness; they must only bring contention, war.

Ambition is the result of greed, envy, desire for power. It is all based on an idea. Is it not? Idea is nothing but reaction. It is so, neurologically, psychologically or physically. Ambition is an idea to be something politically, religiously; 'I want to become a great person and want to work for the future'. What does it reflect? We also know political ambition in the name of the country and so on.

All this is based on an idea. It is an idea, a concept, a formulation of what I shall be or my party shall be. Having established the idea, then I pursue that idea in action. First of all, morally, an ambitious person is immoral. He is a source of contention; and yet we all encourage ambition. Otherwise, what can we do? There may be no achievement. So, when you look at it, you will see ambition is an idea, the pursuit of an idea in action, 'I am going to be some thing', in which is involved exploitation, ruthlessness, appalling brutality etc. After all the 'me' is an idea which has no actuality. It is a process of time. It is a process of memory, recognition, which are all essentially ideas.

Can ambition be completely put aside when I perceive that action, if based on an idea, must ultimately breed hatred, envy? Can I abandon completely ambition, and therefore act without the process of idea? I shall put it more simply. If we are ambitious, is it possible to abandon completely ambition - politically, religiously? Only then, I am a centre of peace. But to abandon completely ambition with all its meaning, significance, inward confusion, brutality, with the whole significance of the desire for power and condemnation, is not so easy. I can only drop it integrally, wholly and completely when I no longer pursue in the idea, the idea being the 'me'; then there is no problem of how I am not to be ambitious, or being ambitious, how I am to get rid of it. Is that not our problem? We are all greedy, we are envious; you have more and I have less; you have more power and I want that power, spiritually, secularly. Being caught in it, my problem then is how to get rid of it. How am I to abandon it? We then introduce the problem 'How?'. That is merely a postponement of action. If I see that action based

on an idea must introduce postponement, then I realize the necessity for action without ideation. I wonder if I am making myself clear. Is not ambition destructive? Ambitious nations, individuals after power, or persons immensely gloated with their self-importance are all dangers; you know what misery they cause to themselves and to those around them. How are they to be got rid of - not superficially but profoundly, both in the conscious as well as in the unconscious?

Idea introduced into action creates non-action. Action not based on idea will be immediate, not to morrow. If I am able to see without ideation the brutality, the implications of ambition, then there is immediate action. There is no question of how I am not to be ambitious. If we want action which is not separated, which is not fragmented, which is not isolated, we must think over. Have you not seen man against man, nation against nation, one sect against another, one group against another communally, one dogma against another, one Master against another? You know the whole game of division and brutality. Knowing it, seeing the fact of it clearly, can ambition be abandoned? We are aware of domination - spiritual, economic and political; and we have noticed the results - which are constant wars, starvation, fragmentation of man and so on. We know that any action without understanding the whole process of ideation and the course of ideas, will only further breed antagonism. So, a man who is earnest, who is really peaceful, not just politically peaceful, cannot prejudice this problem through idea; because idea is postponement, idea is fragmentary, and it is not integrated intelligence. Thought must always be limited by the thinker who is conditioned; the thinker is

always conditioned and is never free; if thought occurs, immediately idea follows. Idea in order to act is bound to create more confusion. Knowing all this, is it possible to act without idea? Yes, it is the way of love. Love is not an idea; it is not a sensation; it is not a memory; it is not a feeling of postponement, self protective device. We can only be aware of the way of love when we understand the whole process of idea. Now, is it possible to abandon the other ways and know the way of love which is the only redemption? No other way, political or religious, will solve the problem. This is not a theory which you will have to think over and adopt in your life; it must be actual; and it can only be actual when you see and realize that ambition is destructive and therefore should be pushed away from you.

We have never tried that way of love. We have tried every other way. Please do not shut your eyes and go to sleep over the word 'love'. It is not a process of thinking. Your immediate reaction is 'What is love? Can I know it? How am I to live according to that?' What is the way of love which is apart from the process of thinking and idea? When you love, is there idea? Do not accept it; just look at it, examine it, go into it profoundly; because every other way we have tried and there is no answer to misery. Politicians may promise it; the so-called religious organizations may promise future happiness; but we have not got it now, and the future is relatively unimportant when I am hungry. We have tried every other way; and we can only know the way of love if we know the way of idea and abandon idea, which is to act. It may sound absurd or foolish to the majority of you when you hear that action can be without idea; but if you go into it a little more deeply, without

pushing it aside as silly, if you go into it deeply with earnestness, you will see idea can never take the place of action. Action is always immediate. You see something like ambition or greed; there is no 'How to get rid of that? Can you do it'? Please think it out. We can discuss it. You will see that love is the only remedy; that is our only redemption in which man can live with man peacefully, happily, without exploiting, without dominating, without one person becoming greater and superior through ambition, through cunning. We do not know that way. Let us become aware of all this. When we have fully recognized the whole significance of action based on idea, the very recognition of it is to act away from it - which is the way of love.

Question: We are told that India is rapidly disintegrating. Is this your feeling too?

Krishnamurti: What do you think? What do you mean by disintegration? Surely, a nation, a group, an individual is disintegrating, when it or he is corrupt, is bound to tradition, when he is imitating, when he is following, when he is not independent in his thinking, when he is not free from the environment so that he, as an individual, cannot look, think and see clearly. Obviously, when one individual exploits another by his cunning, by his superior knowledge, by his capacities, surely such an individual is a factor of disintegration. Is he not? And are not we all in that same position? Are not we all imitating, following, exploiting, afraid, bound to the tradition of others' thoughts? Are we capable of thinking for ourselves without the imposition of others' ideas? Does not all this indicate the process of disintegration? When you worship somebody, however great, is that not a process of

disintegration? When you are pursuing an ambition, climbing its ladder, reaching the dung-heap, is that not disintegration? The dung-heap may be politically satisfying, economically gratifying; is that not also disintegration? Is not that disintegration when you are spiritually influenced by somebody, a special messenger? When you are building for the future, for tomorrow, or for the future of your own existence, next life and so on, is not that disintegration? You are always living in the future, sacrificing many for an idea. Surely, all this is an indication of disintegration, is it not? This is not only here, in India; this is taking place all over the world. Why are we doing this all the time? Is it very difficult to find out the "why"?

We all want to be secure, economically and psychologically. Our petty selves are so narrow and limited that we want to be secure. Therefore we worship authority. So long as we seek security inwardly, there must be disintegration. Outward security we must have. I must be sure of my next meal, shelter and clothing; but that is made impossible if each one of us seeks inward security either through property or nation, or desires to achieve the topmost rung of the ladder. That is, so long as I am seeking personal advancement in any form, which is an indication of the desire for inward security, there must be disintegration, because I am fighting my fellowman.

You listen to all this, and what is your action? Not what is your idea, or your opinion, because anybody can have an opinion; but what is your action? If you say 'How am I not to be ambitious, how am I not to be self-protective', then my question to you is merely an idea, is merely an exchange of thought, opinion. But if it

is genuine in the sense that it is a challenge for you to respond through action, then what will you do? That is, you are truly a factor of disintegration. It does not matter what society you belong to - Indian, Russia, American or English - you are sure to be a factor of destruction and disintegration, as long as you consciously pursue security, inwardly or outwardly. What is your action? Surely, that is the only response you can have, not 'I shall think over it; how am I to do it?', which is rather a response to an idea. But a man who sees it, acts immediately; and that man will know the way of love; to me, he is the regenerating factor in the world of corruption. That does not require great courage, great intelligence which are merely factors of the cunning mind; it requires perspective, direct perspective of what is. The man who sees clearly, inevitably must act. We do not want to see, and that is where our misery lies. We know all this. We are familiar with all this corruption, disintegration; and we cannot act because we are caught in ideation, in ideas, thought of how and what. So a man who sees corruption and is aware of it without the screen of idea, will act; and such a man knows the way of love.

Question: When the mind ceases to recognize, does it not come to a state of inactivity? What functions then?

Krishnamurti: To answer that question fully, you must understand what has been said previously. I said the process of mind is recognition. Thought, experience, the centre of me, is recognition. Without recognition, without knowing, there is no thought process. If I have an experience, I must be able to recognize it either verbally or without verbalization. I must know I have had experience; that is, I must recognize experience as

pleasurable, painful and so on. I must give it a name. There is the centre of recognition, which is the me, the self - not higher self or lower self, self is one; not superior or inferior, that is the invention of the clever mind. So, this centre of recognition is the self; and without recognition, can the mind exist, can the centre, the me, exist? Obviously, not.

The questioner asks if that recognition is not, if the centre is not, what is the state of activity of the mind. What is the activity there? What happens then? Have I explained the question? Now, why do you want to know? There is no pushing you back into yourselves. You want to know in order to be able to recognize, is it not? To be able to recognize from my experience when I verbalize it to you, so that you can say I have had it, so that you can recognize your experience as corresponding to mine. Your asking the question is a continuation of the process of the self. Is my experience the same as yours? You are asking the question in order to feel secure in your recognition. Please see how your own mind works. So, what you are interested in, is not what happens when the process of recognition is not; but, you want an assurance from me that your experience is the same as mine; which is, you want to recognize your experience in relation with mine. So your question has no answer. It is a wrong question.

Let us put it differently. We only know experience through recognition. And each recognition strengthens the mind, the self, gives emphasis, strengthens the security of the self. Each experience is recognized and you cannot have experience without saying 'Yes, I know what it is'. So your experience is only a projection of your own thought. Listen without being clever and

cunning; just watch it. Psychologically it is a fact. I want to see the Master and I see him, and I experience; but it has nothing to do with reality. It is my desire projected and recognized, which only strengthens my experience, my recognition; and so I say 'I believe, I know'. So, if I rely on my experience to see what truth is, then it is my projection of what truth should be. And is it possible for the centre, for the me, to have no recognition, not to aid experience through recognition? You try it. You try to see if your mind can be completely still without recognition, without recognizing things; when this happens, the mind is in a state of stillness. Soon afterwards, it wants to prolong that state thereby reducing that experience to the realm of memory and strengthening the process of thought, of recognition, which is the centre of the self; therefore, there is no possibility of experiencing anything anew; recognition persists; there is the desire to hold on to the experience done years ago, to continue it. Can the mind be still, without any of all this? Which means, can the mind be still without verbalization which is thought process? If the mind is still in that manner, activities that follow cannot be measured, cannot be verbalized, cannot be recognized.

God, Truth, is not recognizable. Therefore, to know Truth, there must be the understanding and putting away of all knowledge, of all beliefs; because when the mind is not in a state of knowledge, when recognition has ceased, Truth can come into it and be there.

Question: If I am myself unable to find Truth, how can I prevent my child from being the victim of my conditioning?

Krishnamurti: How would you set about it? Knowing that a parent is conditioned, that he has prejudices, has ambitions, has

absurdities, has pronouncements, has secularism, has beliefs, has traditions, has grand mother's opinions, what society will say and will not say; knowing all that, how will you help the child to grow to be a free and integrated human being? That is the problem. Is it not? How will you set about it? It requires a whole hour to answer it, because the question is how to educate the child. What are we doing for our children? Merely trying to fit them into the present state of society, to help them pass examinations! We have really no idea of what he should be; we want to try to help the child to understand what we have not understood. If I am blind, can I lead you across the road? But being blind, I do not say I am blind. I am not aware that I am blind. I say 'Yes, I am conditioned, it is so. But I want to help my child'. But if I am aware that I am deeply and fundamentally conditioned, I have problems, prejudices, ambitions, superstitions, beliefs, if I am aware of it, be cognizant of it, be in the know of it, then what happens? My action towards my child will be different. If I know I am poisoned, religiously poisoned, will I allow my child to come near me? I will reason with him, show him why he should not come to me; which means, I must love my child. But we do not love our children. We have no love in our hearts for the children; otherwise, if there was, we would prevent wars; we would prevent all this fragmentation of human beings into classes, nationalities, British, Indian, Brahmin and Non Brahmin, white and black, purple and blue. So being conditioned, I cannot help another if I am unaware of my conditioning. But to acknowledge I am conditioned is to break from it, and not 'I am conditioned, how am I to be free from the conditioning'? which is merely an idea which helps me to postpone action. If I am aware of

it, if I know I am conditioned, then I cannot but act and help the child. It is really very important to understand this question, not the question of conducting the child, how to help him.

We have to understand the whole problem of idea and action. We have always placed idea first and action afterwards. All our literature - religious, political, economic - are based on idea. Our knowledge is nothing more. A mind that is full of knowledge and ideas can never act. Therefore, belief and knowledge are an impediment to action. They may sound contradictory and absurd; but, if you will kindly go into it, you will see the reasonableness behind that statement. So what is important in these questions and talks, is not to find the cultivation of ideas; or to exchange opinions, dogmas and beliefs; or to substitute them for another; but to be free to act, without action being isolating. Action will always be isolating so long as it is based on knowledge and belief, which is idea, which is the process of thinking. When you have a problem as of ambition, you cannot have an idea about it; you can only act about it. Similarly, when I know I am conditioned, a mere thought process regarding it is postponement of the mind from that conditioning. I assure you, it ceases to be a problem only to a man who is earnest, whose function is peace, who is intent on finding love, the way of love, because he is not concerned with idea, because he is concerned with action which is not isolated.

January 12, 1952

MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 13TH JANUARY 1952

I have been trying to find out the solution of the problem of consciousness. It is very important to talk over what individuality or the problem of consciousness is. Being individuals, we strive to fit into the pattern of the community, the collective, the totalitarian. Before we can adequately and truly cover the subject, it is necessary, is it not?, to understand the whole question of individuality.

What is the individual? This problem is a question which must be talked over very constantly and wisely without any barriers and without any conclusions and comparisons. If you can listen to what I am going to talk about, not throw up barriers of your own conclusions which may be true or may not be true, barriers of what you have learnt from your environmental influence or what you have read from the books, then perhaps you will be able actually to co operate with me and with each other without dominating, without completely annihilating the individual through legislation, through compulsion, through concentration camps and so on. I do not know if you feel the importance of this question. If not, I suggest that you should try to, because it is really a vital problem. As it is a difficult question we should be able to talk it over like two friends, not like two antagonists in two opposite camps, you with your opinions and I perhaps with mine. I am not offering an opinion; I am not putting forward a belief, formulation, conception because I do not indulge in that form of stupidity; because to me it is stupid, when I am incapable of understanding what is, that I

should want to know what is.

We should not speculate about what is. I hope you see the difference between speculation of what is and to understand what is. Surely the two are entirely different. Most of us only speculate, have beliefs, have conclusions about what is; and with these conclusions, speculations, formulations, etc. we approach the question of the individual. Truly we must fail if we so approach it; whereas if we can look at it without formulation but merely look at it, then perhaps we should be able to understand the significance of the problems involved in individuality, and perhaps we should be able to go beyond that which we call the individual. That is to understand the whole question of the conscious and the unconscious, not only the barren uppermost consciousness of the mind, of the active mind, but also of the unconscious, the hidden.

So, what is the individual? What is the 'me'? You must examine what we think it is and what we hope it is, that is, look at ourselves without speculation if that is possible. If you say such things as 'I am the highest representative of God', that is mere speculation. We have to put aside such speculations. Obviously! Must we not? They are all words which you have learnt, which society has imposed upon you, one way, or the other. Politically, you might say that if you belong to the extreme left, you have nothing to bother about but only let the environmental influence operate; if you are religiously inclined, you have your own phraseology that you are this, you are that, and that some thing is manifest in you. You know the whole thing about the higher self and the lower self. With that back ground obviously you cannot look or examine the problem. Can you? You can only look at what is by observing very

carefully the whole process of the individual, what the individual is, etc. Can you tell me what you are? Please bear in mind what we are discussing, for what purpose. To understand the problem of the conscious and to look into it, if it is possible, not speculatively, not theoretically, but to go beyond the confines of the narrow area called the individual, that is what we are trying to do.

What is the individual? What are you, actually? Obviously, certain physiological responses, bodily responses and psychological responses of memory, of time, constitute the individual. We are all composed of frustrated hopes, depressions with an occasional joy, in which the self is, the 'me' with all its fears, hopes, degradations, memories. We are a repository of tradition, of knowledge, of belief, of what we would like to be, and of the desire for certainty, of continuity with a name and a form. That is what actually we are. We are the result of our father and mother, of environmental influences, climatically and psychologically. That is what is. Beyond that we do not know. We can only speculate; we can only assert; we can only say that we are the soul, immortal, imperishable; but, actually, that has no existence. That is merely a process of 'what is' translated into terms of security.

So, consciousness, as we know it, is a process of time. When are you conscious? When there is response, pleasant or unpleasant. Otherwise you are not conscious. Are you? When there is fear, you are conscious. When there is frustration, you are aware of yourself being frustrated. When there is joy, you are aware of it. When consciousness comes into action, when desire is thwarted, frustrated or when desire finds fulfilment, you are equally aware.

So, what we know is that consciousness is a process of time, confined, limited, narrowed down to the thought process. Surely, that is what is actually taking place in each one of us. Is it not? That process may be elevated to a high degree or taken down to a low degree; but that is what is actually taking place, what is actually going on.

Consciousness is a process of time in action. I want to do something and when I can do that without any hindrance, without any struggle, without any sense of fear or frustration, there is no effort involved. The moment effort is involved, consciousness as the 'me' comes into being. I hope you are following.

The individual is the product of time, and it is memory, consciousness, the 'me' narrowed down to a particular form and name. 'I' refers to both the conscious mind functioning as well as the unconscious. We all have fear of death, we have fear of innumerable things. You have various levels of frustrations and hopes, according to education, according to environmental influence, and of depression dependent on physiological condition, as well as psychological condition. So, we are all that; we are a bundle of all that. We are conscious only when the movement of consciousness is blocked. You are aware of yourself only when you are hindered. Are you aware of yourself in any other way? You are aware of yourself in fulfilling, in achieving, in arriving, in becoming. Otherwise, you are not conscious. are you? And as long as there is this process of time, there must be fear. Must there not be?

What is fear? Fear is in relation to something. Is it not? Fear does not exist by itself. Fear of death, of not being, not arriving,

not being elected, not achieving, not becoming successful and so on. There is fear at different levels. There is the fear to be secure economically, mentally. As long as there is fear, there must be struggle; there must be battle; there must be constant friction between being and not being, not only on the conscious level but also on the hidden level. So, being afraid, which is the state of most of us, we are trying to escape from it; and the escapes are many.

Please follow carefully and watch yourself as you follow. Then you and I can proceed further and discover much more than at mere verbal level. You must watch your self as I am talking, in the mirror of my words. If you merely stop at the verbal level, you will not be able to proceed further; and you can only proceed further, if you are relating what I am saying to yourself. I am not saying something which you have to examine and analyze. I am saying what is actually taking place. We are all afraid. We have a desire to be secure. You like to be with your husband, I with my wife, with my neighbour, with my society, with God, and so on. There are innumerable forms of desire. We have not solved the problem of fear. What we do is to escape from it through various forms. If we are so-called educated, so-called civilized, our escapes are refined. Sometimes these escapes take the form of superstition.

Now, is it possible to go beyond fear? I know I am afraid; you know you too are afraid, may not be outwardly; but, you are afraid inwardly. What is this fear? Obviously it can be only in relation to something. I am afraid of death; I am afraid because I do not know what is going to happen. I am afraid of losing my job; I am afraid of my neighbour; I am afraid of my wife; I am afraid of having a desire; I am afraid of not arriving at the spiritual height that is

expected of me and so on. What is this `me'? It is fear, consciousness in action, desire to be something or not to be something. Fear finds various escapes. The common variety is identification. Is it not? Identification with the country, with the society, with an idea. Haven't you noticed how you respond when you see a procession, a military procession or a religious procession, or when the country is in danger of being invaded? You then identify yourself with the country, with a belief, with an ideology. There are other times when you identify with your child, with your wife, with a particular form of action or inaction. So, identification is a process of self forgetfulness. As long as I am conscious of the `me', I know there is pain, there is struggle, there is constant fear. But if I can identify myself with something greater, with something worthwhile, with beauty, with life, with truth, with belief, with knowledge, at least temporarily, there is an escape from the `me'. Is there not? If I talk about my country I forget myself temporarily. Do I not? If I can say something about God, I forget myself. If I can identify my family with a group, with a particular party, with certain ideology, then there is a temporary escape.

Therefore, identification is a form of escape from the self in as much as virtue is a form of escape from the self. The man who pursues virtue is escaping from the self and he has a narrow mind. That is not a virtuous mind, for virtue is some thing which should not be pursued. You are not going to be virtuous; because the more you try to become virtuous, the more the strength, the security you give to the self, to the `me'. So, fear which is common to most of us in different forms, must always find a substitution, and must

therefore increase our struggle. The more you are identifying with a substitution, the greater the strength to hold on to that for which you are prepared to die, to struggle; because fear is at the back.

Do we now know what fear is? Is it not the non-acceptance of what is? We must understand the word 'acceptance'. I am not using that word as meaning the effort made to accept. There is no question of accepting when I am able to see what is and when I perceive what is? When I don't see clearly what is, then I bring the process of acceptance. So, fear is the non-acceptance of what is. How can I, who is a bundle of all these reactions, responses, memories, hopes, depressions, frustrations, who is the result of the movement of consciousness blocked, go beyond? That is, can the mind without this blocking and hindrance, be conscious? We know, when there is no hindrance, what extraordinary joy there is. Don't you know when the body is perfectly healthy, there is a certain joy, well being; and don't you know when the mind is completely free without any block, when the centre of recognition as the 'me' is not there, you experience a certain joy? Haven't you experienced this state when the self is absent? Surely we all have. Having experienced, we want to go back and recapture it. This is again the time process. Having experienced something, we want it; therefore we give consciousness a block. Surely to find out action which is not the result of isolation, there must be action without the self. That is what you are all seeking in one form or other in society, through religious speculation, through meditation, through identification, through belief, through knowledge, through activities of innumerable kinds. That is what each one of us is seeking, to escape from the narrow area called 'self', to get away

from it. Can you get away from it without understanding the whole process of what is? If I do not know the whole content of what is in front of me as the me, can I avoid it and run away?

There is understanding and freedom from the self, only when I can look at it completely and integrally as a whole; and I can do that only when I understand the whole process of all activity, of desire which is the very expression of thought - for thought is not different from desire - without justifying it, without condemning it, without suppressing it; if I can understand that, then I will know there is the possibility of going beyond the restrictions of the self. And then there can be action which is not isolated, action which is not based on idea. But so long as the mind is confined to the area called the 'self', there must be conflict between man and man; and a man who seeks truth or peace, must understand desire.

Understanding comes when desire is not blocked intellectually, through fear, through condemnation - which does not mean you must give fulfillment to desire; you must follow it, there must be movement without contradiction, without condemnation. Then you will see that the conscious, however active it may be, becomes the field in which the unconscious can flower.

Freedom which is really virtue, is necessary to discover what is truth; and a man who is bound to belief, knowledge and self, can never find what truth is. That discovery of truth is not the process of time. The process of time is the mind and the mind can never discover what is truth. Therefore it is necessary to understand the process of consciousness as limited to the me.

Question: What do you feel to be the cause of the great prevalence of mental derangement in the world today? Is it

insecurity? If so, what can we do to keep the millions who feel insecure from becoming unbalanced, neurotic and psychotic?

Krishnamurti: First of all, is there such a thing as inward security? Can there ever be security inwardly, psychologically? If you can find an answer to that, then physical security is possible; because that is what millions want, physical security, the next meal, shelter and clothing. Millions go to bed half-starved. To solve the problem of food, cloth and shelter for the many, not for the few, we must enquire why man seeks security, psychological security; because the answer is not in the rearrangement of things, the answer is not economic but psychological. Because each one of us is seeking inward security which prevents outward security for man, because each one of us wants to be something, we use physical substance as a means of psychological security. Are you not doing that? If you and I, if the world, were concerned in feeding man, clothing him and sheltering him, surely we will have to find ways. Is it not? Nobody is doing that. This is one cause of mental derangement. Is it not? If I feel outwardly insecure, I feel all kinds of things which bring about a mentally neurotic state.

So our problem is not wholly economic, as economists would like to think, but rather psychological; which is, that each one of us wants to be secure through belief, through superstition. We know the various forms of belief to which we cling in the hope of feeling secure. Don't you know that the man who believes, can never commit suicide? But the man who does not believe is ready to commit suicide, either to kill himself or kill somebody else. So belief is the means of security. And the more I believe in the future life, in God, the more I think of it, because it gives comfort and

security, and I am fairly balanced. But if I am enquiring, searching, doubting, skeptic, then I begin to lose my mooring and I lose my security, and mentally I cannot stand this. So there is the psychotic state of mind. Have you not noticed it in yourselves? The moment you have something to which you can cling, you feel peaceful, be it a person, or idea or party - does not matter what it is. As long as you can cling to something, you feel safe, and feel more or less balanced. But question that belief and enquire into it, you invite insecurity. That is why all clever and intellectual people end up in some form of belief; because they push their intellects as far as they go, and they see nothing; and then, they say 'Let us believe'. Surely our question is, is there security. Psychological and inward security? Obviously there is not. I can find security in belief; but that is merely a projection of my uncertainty in the form of belief, which becomes certain.

Can I find the truth of security and insecurity? Then only I am a sane being, not if I cling to some belief or some knowledge or some idea. If I can find out the truth of security, then I am an integrated, intelligent being. Is that your question? Obviously not, because you do not want to know if there is security. The moment you doubt it, where are you? The house of cards which you have so cleverly built up, comes crumbling down. If you cannot achieve security, you become psychotic. So until you find the truth of security, if there is such a thing as security, obviously you are an unbalanced being.

Is there security, psychological security, inward security? Obviously, there is not. We only like it to be; but there is not. Can you depend on anything? When you do, what happens? The very

dependence is an invitation to fear which breeds in dependence away from it, which is another form of fear. So until you find the truth of insecurity which means continuity, you are bound to have some blockages in the mind? which in action creates a neurotic state. There is no permanency, there is no certainty, but there is truth which can only take place if you understand the whole process of desire and insecurity.

Question: Is the regeneration of India possible solely through renaissance of arts and the dance?

Krishnamurti: The word `solely' is important. Is it not? Because, what each one of us is occupied with, becomes the means of renaissance. If I am an artist, that is the only way through which I can produce a creative world. If I am a religious person, that is the only way. To the economist, economics is the only way of regeneration. So what each one of us is occupied with, that particular gift, that particular tendency, becomes the means of producing a regenerated India.

Does regeneration come through outward organizations, through capacities, through rearrangement of facts, dance, or of arts? What do you mean by regeneration? Rebirth, something new, not continuity of the past in a new form. Surely we mean that. Don't we? A new state, a new world in which there is peace, happiness. You know the whole thing for which we are struggling. Is renaissance possible without inward revolution, inward freedom? You may be an expert in dancing, that may be your particular gift. Will that really regenerate India or the world because you are a marvellous dancer, or you are a marvellous chemist or politician? What will produce a fundamental and radical

revolution, so necessary, a complete revolution, not fragmentary revolution but integrated revolution, not a superficial rearrangement of the pattern? Surely that revolution must take place in each one of us. Must it not?

Don't be afraid of the word revolution. Either it is or it is not. We would rather like inward evolution, the whole process of becoming more and more worldly, more and more virtuous, which is only the strengthening of the me through time. As long as the me exists, there is no inward revolution. And the me cannot be dissolved through time or through identification with that which we want.

Inward revolution takes place only when you see what is and when there is action which is not the basis of idea. Because when you are confronted with what is, ideas have no value. Regeneration and renaissance can only take place, not through a particular gift or capacity, but only through inward understanding and revolution.

Question: Have I understood you aright when I say that the solution for all our ills is to put a stop to all recognition and to the vagaries of desire and go beyond it? I have experienced moments of ecstasy but they drop away soon afterwards, and desires rush in breaking from the past into the future. Is it possible to annihilate desire once and for all?

Krishnamurti: See, you want a result. You worship success, and you want to get rid of desire altogether, in order to achieve that ecstatic state. That is, I would like to be happy and ecstatic and I want to get rid of desire. So I am enquiring not how to understand desire, but how to get rid of desire in order to achieve that state. Please see the impossibility of this. I want a certain result which I

have experienced and that experience I want to continue; and I cannot continue that experience as long as desire exists; therefore, I must get rid of desire. You are not interested in understanding desire, but in modifying it at a particular stage; that is what is implied in this question. You want ecstasy, and you know you have experienced it; and you know desire prevents it, and so you have this problem of how to get rid of that. You desire that state of ecstasy, that is all. Only you have transformed your desire from secular, parochial, narrow walls to something which you have experienced. So what are you concerned with? With an experience which is past. Please follow this, if you would understand the whole process you are confronted with, the problem of recapturing a past experience like a boy who has had a moment of ecstasy, and who, when he has grown old, would want to re turn to that. You know it is fragmentary because he is incapable of experiencing anything new.

What do you mean by experience? You can only experience anything which we recognize. So what is happening; the 'me' recognizes some thing as ecstasy and wants to capture it. The very wanting is a process of desire. It is given a name. At the moment of experiencing, there is no naming. Please follow this. Watch yourself in operation; then what I say will have meaning. When some thing happens to you unexpected, a state of ecstasy develops; in that second, there is no recognition. You then say "I have had an experience", you give it a name. This is all the process of mind trying to give it a name so that it can remember, so that through that remembrance it can continue that experience. For most of us, that is our companion.

But to understand desire needs an alert mind and constant watching without condemnation, without justification, constant observation, constant following, because it is never still. It is a movement; and no opposition will be of any use, for it will only create greater resistance in it. When you have an experience which is never recognized, you will see that the so-called experience which you name, is not an experience at all but only a continuance of your own desire in a different form. When you understand desire, when you have really followed it, you have a state of being in which recognition is not present, in which there is no naming. That comes only when the mind is not inviting, when the mind is really silent, not made silent. The mind is silent because it understands, it pursues and becomes aware of the whole process of desire. When the mind is silent, it is no longer imaginative, no longer verbalizing; that very silence of the mind leads to the state of being which cannot be measured by the mind.

January 13, 1952

MADRAS 5TH PUBLIC TALK 19TH JANUARY 1952

We have been discussing the last few times that we have met, the importance of understanding the ways of the self; because, after all, the most thoughtful people must be aware that the self, the `me', the `I', is really the cause of all our mischief and all our misery. I think the most thoughtful people are aware of it. One can see that most religious organizations theorize and vaguely insist upon how essential it is that the `me', the self, should be completely abandoned. We have read in the books about the abandonment of the self. If we are at all religiously inclined, we have various phrases about it; we may repeat mantras and all the rest of it; but in spite of all this, our own perception and vague comprehension about the self still continue in a very subtle way or in the grossest manner. I think, if it were at all easy, we must be sure and must understand the various expressions of the self and see if we cannot completely eradicate it; because I feel that, without understanding the whole complexity of the self, we can't proceed further - whether the self is or is not divided into the high and the low, which is irrelevant and which is only a matter of the mind which eventually divides it as a means of its own security. Unless we understand this whole complex process, there is no possibility of peace in the world. We know this; we are aware of this fact consciously or unconsciously; but yet in our every day life, it does not play any part; we do not bring it into reality.

What we have been discussing is this: how are we to recognize the various activities of the self and its subtle forms behind which

the mind takes shelter? We see the self, its activity and its action based on an idea. Action based on an idea is a form of the self because it gives continuity to that action, a purpose to that action. So, idea in action becomes the means of continuing the self. If the idea was not there, action has a different meaning altogether, which is not born of the self. The search for power, position, authority, ambition and all the rest are the forms of the self in all its different ways. But what is important is to understand the self and I am sure you and I are convinced of it. If I may add here, let us be earnest about this matter; because I feel that if you and I as individuals, not as a group of people belonging to certain classes, certain societies, certain climatic divisions, can understand this and act upon this, then I think there will be real revolution. The moment it becomes universal and better organized, the self takes shelter in that; whereas, if you and I as individuals can love, can carry this out actually in every day life, then the revolution that is so essential will come into being, not because you organized it by the coming together of various groups, but because, individually, there is revolution taking place all the time.

I would like to discuss this evening how experience strengthens the self.

You know what I mean by the self? By that, I mean the idea, the memory, the conclusion, the experience, the various forms of nameable and unnameable intentions, the conscious endeavour to be or-not to be, the accumulated memory of the unconscious, the racial, the group, the individual, the clan, and the whole of it all, whether it is projected outwardly in action, or projected spiritually as virtue; the striving after all this, is the self. In it, is included the

competition, the desire to be. The whole process of that, is the self; and we know actually when we are faced with it, that it is an evil thing. I am using the word `evil' intentionally, because the self is dividing; the self is self-enclosing; its activities, however noble, are separated and isolated. We know all this. We also know that extraordinary are the moments when the self is not there, in which there is no sense of endeavour, of effort, and which happens when there is love.

It seems to me that it is important to understand how experience strengthens the self. If we are earnest, we should understand this problem of experience. Now, what do we mean by experience? We have experiences all the time, impressions; and we translate those impressions, and we are reacting to them; or we are acting according to those impressions; we are calculated, cunning, and so on. There is the constant interplay between what is seen objectively and our reacting to it, and the interplay between the unconscious and the memories of the unconscious.

Do not please, memorize all this. Watch, if I may suggest, watch your own minds and activities taking place as I am talking, and you will see. I have not memorized all this; I am just talking as it is happening.

According to my memories, I react to whatever I see, to whatever I feel. In this process of reacting to what I see, what I feel, what I know, what I believe, experience is taking place. Is it not? Reaction to the response of something seen is experience. When I see you, I react; the reaction is experience. The naming of that reaction is experience. If I do not name that reaction it is not an experience. Please do watch it. Watch your own responses and

what is taking place about you. There is no experience unless there is a naming process going on at the same time. If I do not recognize you, how can I have experience? It sounds simple and right. Is it not a fact? That is, if I do not react to you according to my memories, according to my condition, according to my prejudices, how can I know that I have had an experience? That is one type of it.

Then there is the projection of various desires. I desire to be protected, to have security inwardly; or I desire to have a Master, a guru, a teacher, a God; and I experience that which I have projected. That is, I have projected a desire which has taken a form, to which I have given a name; to that, I react. It is my projection. It is my naming. That desire which gives me an experience, makes me say: 'I have got', 'I have experienced', 'I have met the Master', or 'I have not met the Master'. You know the whole process of naming an experience. Desire is what you call experience. Is it not?

When I desire silence of the mind, what is taking place? What happens? I see the importance of having a silent mind, a quiet mind, for various reasons; because, Upanishads have said so, religious scriptures have said so, saints have said it, and also occasionally I myself feel how good it is to be quiet because my mind is so very chatty all the day. At times, I feel how nice, how pleasurable it is to have a peaceful mind, a silent mind. The desire to have a silent mind is to experience silence. I want to have a silent mind, and so I ask you 'How to get it?'. I know what this book or that book says about meditation and the various forms of discipline. I want a silent mind through discipline and I experience

silence. The self, the `me', has established itself in the experience of silence. Am I making myself clear?

I want to understand what is truth; that is my desire my longing; then there is my projection of what I consider to be the truth, because I have read lots about it; I have heard many people talk about it; religious scriptures have described it. I want all that. What happens? The very want, the very desire is projected and I experience because I recognize that state. If I do not recognize that state, that act, that truth, I would not call it truth. I recognize it and I experience it. That experience gives strength to the self, to the `me'. Does it not? So, the self becomes entrenched in experience. Then you say `I know', `the Master exists', `there is God', or `there is no God; you say that you want a particular political system to come, because that is right and all others are not.

So experience is always strengthening the `me'. The more you are strengthened, the more entrenched you are in your experience and the more does the self get strengthened. As a result of this, you have a certain strength of character, strength of knowledge, of belief, which you put over across to other people because you know they are not so clever as you are and because you have the gift of the pen and you are cunning. Because the self is still acting, your beliefs, your Masters, your castes, your economic system are all a process of isolation, and they therefore bring contention. You must, if you are at all serious or earnest in this, dissolve this completely and not justify it. That is why we must understand the process of experience.

Is it possible for the mind, for the self, not to project, not to desire, not to experience? We see all experiences of the self are a

negation, a destruction; and yet, we call the same a positive action. Don't we? That is what we call the positive way of life. To undo this whole process is what you call negation. Are you right in that? There is nothing positive. Can we, you and I as individuals, go to the root of it and understand the process of the self? Now what is the element that dissolves it? What brings about dissolution of the self? Religious and other groups have explained it by identification. Have they not? Identify yourself with a larger, and the self disappears; that is what they say. We say here that identification is still the process of the self; the larger is simply the projection of the `me', which I experience and which therefore strengthens the `me'. I wonder if you are following this. All the various forms of discipline, beliefs and knowledge only strengthen the self.

Can we find an element which would dissolve the self? Or, is that a wrong question? That is what we want basically. We want to find some thing which will dissolve the `me'. Is it not? We think there are various forms of finding that, namely, identification, belief, etc; but, all of them are at the same level; one is not superior to the other, because all of them are equally powerful in strengthening the self, `the me'. Now, I see `the me' wherever it functions, and I see its destructive forces and energy. Whatever name you may give to it, it is an isolating force, it is a destructive force; and I want to find a way of dissolving it. You must have asked this yourself - " I see the `I' functioning all the time and always bringing anxiety, fear, frustration, despair, misery, not only to myself but to all around me. Is it possible for that self to be dissolved, not partially but completely?" Can we go to the root of it

and destroy it? That is the only way of functioning. Is it not? I do not want to be partially intelligent, but intelligent in an integrated manner. Most of us are intelligent in layers, you probably in one way, and I in some other way. Some of you are intelligent in your business work, some others in your office work and so on; people are intelligent in different ways; but, we are not integrally intelligent. To be integrally intelligent means to be without the self. Is it possible? If I pursue that action, what is your response? This is not a discussion, and therefore please do not answer but be aware of that action. The implications which I have tried to point out, must produce a reaction in you. What is your response?

Is it possible for the self now to be completely absent? You know it is; possible. Now, how is it possible? What are the necessary ingredients, requirements? What is the element that brings it about? Can I find it? Are you following this, Sirs? When I put that question `Can I find it?', surely, I am convinced that it is possible. I have already created an experience in which the self is going to be strengthened. Is it not? Understanding of the self requires a great deal of intelligence, great deal of watchfulness, alertness, watching ceaselessly, so that it does not slip away. I who am very earnest, want to dissolve the self. When I say that, I know it is possible to dissolve the self. Please be patient. The moment I say `I want to dissolve this', and in the process I follow for the dissolution of that, there is the experiencing of the self; and so, the self is strengthened. So, how is it possible for the self not to experience? One can see that creation is not at all the experience of the self. Creation is when the self is not there; because, creation is not intellectual, is not of the mind, is not self-projected, is some

thing beyond all experiencing, as we know. Is it possible for the mind to be quite still, in a state of non-recognition, which is, non-experiencing, to be in a state in which creation can take place, which means, when the self is not there, when the self is absent? Am I making myself clear or not? Look, Sirs, the problem is this, is it not? Any movement of the mind, positive or negative, is an experience which actually strengthens the `me'. Is it possible for the mind not to recognize? That can only take place when there is complete silence, but not the silence which is an experience of the self and which therefore strengthens the self.

Is there an entity apart from the self, which looks at the self and dissolves the self? Are you following all this? Is there a spiritual entity which supercedes the self and destroys it, which puts it aside? We think there is. Don't we? Most religious people think there is such an element. The materialist says `It is impossible for the self to be destroyed; it can only be conditioned and restrained - politically, economically and socially; we can hold it firmly within a certain pattern and we can break it; and therefore it can be made to lead a high life, a moral life, and not to interfere with any thing but to follow the social pattern, and to function merely as a machine'. That, we know. There are other people, the so-called religious ones - they are not really religious, though we call them so - who say `Fundamentally, there is such an element. If we can get into touch with it, it will dissolve the self'.

Is there such an element to dissolve the self? Please see what we are doing. We are merely forcing the self into a corner. If you allow yourself to be forced into the corner, you will see what is going to happen. We would like that there should be an element

which is timeless, which is not of the self, which, we hope, will come and intercede and destroy, which we call God. Now is there such a thing which the mind can conceive? There may be or there may not be; that is not the point. When the mind seeks a timeless spiritual state which will go into action in order to destroy the self, is that not another form of experience which is strengthening 'the me'? When you believe, is that not what is actually taking place? When you believe that there is truth, God, timeless state, immortality, is that not the process of strengthening the self? The self has projected that thing which, you feel and believe, will come and destroy the self. So, having projected this idea of continuance in a timeless state as spiritual entity, you are going to experience; and all such experience will only strengthen the self; and therefore what have you done? You have not really destroyed the self but only given it a different name, a different quality; the self is still there, because you have experienced it. So, our action from the beginning to the end is the same action; only we think it is evolving, growing, becoming more and more beautiful; but, if you observe inwardly, it is the same action going on, the same 'me' functioning at different levels with different labels, with different names.

When you see the whole process, the cunning, extraordinary inventions, the intelligence of the self, how it covers itself up through identification, through virtue, through experience, through belief, through knowledge; when you see that you are moving in a circle, in a cage of its own make, what happens? When you are aware of it, fully cognizant of it, then, is not your mind extraordinarily quiet - not through compulsion, not through any

reward, not through any fear? When you recognize that every movement of the mind is merely a form of strengthening the self, when you observe it, see it, when you are completely aware of it in action, when you come to that point - not ideologically, verbally, not through experiencing, but when you are actually in that state - then you will see that the mind being utterly still, has no power of creating. What ever the mind creates, is in a circle, within the field of the self. When the mind is non-creating, there is creation, which is not a recognizable process.

Reality, truth, is not to be recognized. For truth to come, belief, knowledge, experiencing, virtue, pursuit of virtue - which is different from being virtuous - all this must go. The virtuous person who is conscious of pursuing virtue, can never find reality. He may be a very decent person; that is entirely different from the man of truth, from the man who understands. To the man of truth, truth has come into being. A virtuous man is a righteous man, and a righteous man can never understand what is truth; because virtue to him is the covering of the self, the strengthening of the self; because he is pursuing virtue. When he says 'I must be without greed', the state in which he is non-greedy and which he experiences, strengthens the self. That is why it is so important to be poor, not only in the things of the world, but also in belief and in knowledge. A rich man with worldly riches, or a man rich in knowledge and belief, will never know anything but darkness, and will be the centre of all mischief and misery. But if you and I, as individuals, can see this whole working of the self, then we shall know what love is. I assure you that is the only reformation which can possibly change the world. Love is not the self. Self cannot

recognize love. You say 'I love', but then, in the very saying of it, in the very experiencing of it, love is not. But, when you know love, self is not. When there is love, self is not.

Question: What is simplicity? Does it imply seeing very clearly the essentials and discarding everything else? Krishnamurti: Let us see what simplicity is not. Don't say 'that is negation'. You do not say anything positive; that is immature, thoughtless expression. Those people who say it, are exploiters; because, they have something to give you, which you want and through which to exploit you. We are doing nothing of that kind. We are trying to find out the truth of simplicity. Therefore you must discard, put things aside, and observe. The man who has much, is afraid of revolution, inwardly and outwardly. So let us find out what is not simplicity. A complicated mind is not simple, is it? A clever mind is not simple; a mind that has an end in view for which it is working as reward, as punishment, is not a simple mind, is it? Sirs, don't agree with me. It is not a question of agreement. It is your life. A mind that is burdened with knowledge, is not a simple mind; a mind that is crippled with beliefs, is not a simple mind, is it? A mind that has identified itself with something greater, and is striving to keep that identity, is not a simple mind, is it? But we think it is a simple life to have a loin cloth, one or two; we want outward show of simplicity, and we are easily deceived by that. That is why a man who is very rich, worships the man who has renounced.

What is simplicity? Can simplicity be the discarding of non-essentials and pursuing of essentials - which means choice? Please follow this. Does it not mean choice, choosing? I choose essentials

and discard non-essentials. What is this process of choosing? Think deeply. What is the that chooses? Mind; is it not? It does not matter what you call it. You say 'I will choose this essential'. How do you know what is the essential? Either you have a pattern of what other people have said, or your own experience says that is the essential. Can you rely on your experience? Because, when you choose, your choice is based on desire; what you call essential, is that which gives you satisfaction. So you are back again in the same process, are you not? Can a confused mind choose? If it does, the choice must also be confused.

Therefore, the choice between the essential and the non-essential is not simplicity. It is a conflict. A mind in conflict, in confusion, can never be simple. So when you discard, when you see all the false things and the tricks of the mind, when you observe it, look at it, are aware of it, then you will know what simplicity is. A mind which is bound by belief, is never a simple mind. A mind that is crippled with knowledge, is not simple. A mind that is distracted by God, by women, by music, is not a simple mind. A mind caught in the routine of the office, of the rituals, of the mantrams, such a mind is not simple. Simplicity is action without idea. But, that is a very rare thing; that means creation. As long as there is not creation, we are centres of mischief and misery and destruction. Simplicity is not a thing which you pursue and experience. Simplicity comes, as a flower opens, at the right moment when each one understands the whole process of existence and relationship. Because we have not thought about it or have not observed it, we are not aware of it; we value in a certain way all the outer forms of simplicity - such as shaving our

heads, having clothing or unclothing in a certain way. Those are not simplicity. Simplicity is not to be found. Simplicity does not lie between essential and non-essential. It comes into being when the self is not, when the self is not caught in speculations, in conclusions, in beliefs, in ideations. Such a mind only can find truth. Such a mind alone can receive that which is immeasurable, which is unnameable; and that is simplicity.

Question: Can I who am religiously inclined and desirous of acting wholly and integrally, express myself through politics? For, to me, it appears that a radical change is necessary in the political field?

Krishnamurti: What the questioner means is this: seeking wholly, seeking religiously the whole, entire, complete, can I politically function, that is, act partially? He says politics is obviously the path for him; when he seeks and follows that path which is not the whole, complete, he merely functions in fields which are partial, fragmentary. Is that not so? What is your answer, not your cunning answer, or immediate response? Can I see the whole thing of life, which means, can I love? Let us take love. I have compassion, I feel tremendously and for the whole; can I then act only politically? Can I, seeking the whole, be a Hindu or a Brahmin? Can I, having love in my heart, identify myself with a path, with a particular country, with a particular system, economic, or religious? Suppose I want to improve the particular, I want to bring about a radical change in the particular, in the country in which I live; the moment I identify myself with that particular, have I not shut out the whole? This is your problem just as mine. We are thinking about it together. You are not listening to me.

When we are trying to find an answer, your opinions and ideas are not the solution. What we are trying to find is, can a truly religious man - not a phoney one that consults others - a really sacred person seeking the whole, can he identify himself with a radical movement for a particular country? And will it do to have revolution - don't be afraid of that word - of one country, of one people, of one state, if I am seeking the whole, if I am trying to understand that which is not within the scope of the mind? Can I, using my mind, act politically? I see there must be political action; I see there must be real change, radical change in our relationship, in our economic system, in the distribution of land, and so on. I see there must be revolution; and yet at the same time, I am pursuing a path the political path; I am also trying to understand the whole. What is my action there? Is not that your problem, Sirs? Can you act politically - that is, partially - and understand the whole? Politics and economics are partial; they are not the whole, integrated life; they are partial, necessary, essential. Can I abandon the whole or leave the whole society, and tinker with the particular? Obviously, I cannot. But I can act upon it, not through it.

We want to bring about a certain change; we have certain ideas about it; we pursue so many groups and so on. We use means to achieve the result. And is the understanding of the whole contrary to that? Am I confusing you? I am only telling you what I think; do not accept it, but think it out for yourself and see. For me, political action, economic action, is of secondary importance, though they are essential. There must be radical change in the political field; but such a change will have no depth if I do not pursue the other. If

the other is not primary, if the other is only secondary, then my action towards the secondary will have tremendous significance. But, if I see a certain path and act politically, political action becomes important to me, and not acting integrally. But, if acting integrally is really important to me and if I pursue it, political action, religious action, economic action, will come rightly, deeply, fundamentally. If I do not pursue the other but merely confine myself to the political, the economic or the social change, then I create more misery.

So it all depends on what you lay emphasis on. Laying emphasis on the right thing - which is the whole - will produce its own action with regard to politics and so on. It all depends on you. In pursuing that whole thing without saying 'I am going to act politically or socially', you will bring about fundamental alterations politically, religiously and economically.

What is important in this question is 'What is it that you are seeking?'. What is the primary issue in your life? There is really no division between primary and secondary; but yet, in seeking, you will find that when you begin to understand the whole, there is no secondary or primary, then the whole is the path. But if you say that you must alter a particular part, then, you will not understand the whole. Any change in the particular, like the political field, cannot alter the whole thing; this has been shown historically. But if you know, if you are aware of the whole process of the self dissolve it, and if there is love, this will bring about a fundamental revolution in India.

January 19, 1952

MADRAS 6TH PUBLIC TALK 20TH JANUARY 1952

I think it is important to understand the relationship between the speaker and yourself, for one is apt to listen to these talks and discussions with either complete indifference, curiosity, a certain attitude of scepticism; or with a natural inclination to take up a pro or anti attitude, an attitude of addiction. To me, both these approaches seem utterly wrong. What is important is to understand that you and I are two individuals, not a collective group belonging to two sects or religions; that we are, as two individuals, trying to solve the problem. That is always my approach, and not the one where I sit on a platform advising what you should do, or laying down the law - which would be stupid. But if you and I as two individuals can look at the problem, understand it, go into the root of it, then perhaps we shall be able to help the many problems that confront each one of us, That is the only approach, I think, any intelligent person caught in the present confusion must adopt. We are so apt to believe, to accept; and that is because, in belief, in acceptance, there is a certain security, a certain escape, self-aggrandizement. If we can look at the problems with clarity and honesty of purpose, then we can solve the problems easily. But that is very difficult; because, most of us are so corrupt in our thinking, because we have so many vested interests - economic, religious and psychological. It is difficult for most of us to think apart from these backgrounds. If I may suggest, that is the only approach for solving any of the innumerable problems awaiting solution; you as an individual and I as an individual are resolving our problems in

our little world of relationship.

What we have been discussing for the last few weeks has been the question of the self and its ways. Can we see that the self is the root cause of all evils? The 'me' or the self with all its extraordinary deviations and subtle actions is responsible for all our ills. Every intelligent man must resolve this problem of 'self', not hedge it about, cover it about; he must understand how, in daily living, he gives sustenance, vitality and continuity to the self. If we would solve any of the world's problems, we must surely understand the whole process of the self with all its complexities, both the conscious and the unconscious. That is what we have been discussing, taking different aspects of it.

Organized religion, organized belief and totalitarian states are very similar, because they all want to destroy the individual through compulsion, through propaganda, through various forms of coercion. The organized religion does the same thing only in a different way. There, you must accept, you must believe, you are conditioned. The whole tendency both of the left and of the so-called spiritual organizations is to mould the mind to a particular pattern of conduct; because the individual left to himself becomes a rebel. So, the individual is destroyed through compulsion, through propaganda, and is controlled, dominated for the sake of the society, for the sake of the state and so on. The so-called religious organizations do the same, only a little more suspiciously, a little more subtly; because, there too, people must believe, must repress, must control and all the rest of it. The whole process is to dominate the self in one form or another. Through compulsion, collective action is sought. That is what most organizations want,

whether they be economic organizations or religious. They want collective action, which means that the individual should be destroyed. Ultimately, it can only mean that. You accept the Left, the Marxist theory or the Hindu, Buddhist or the Christian doctrines; and thereby you hope to bring about collective action. Surely cooperation is different from coercion.

How is collective action brought about, or how is it to be brought about? Up to now, it has been through belief, economic promise of a welfare state, promise of a bright future; or it has been through the so-called spiritual method, through fear, compulsion and various forms of reward. Does not cooperation come when there is intelligence which is not collective, which is neither collective nor individual? That is what I would like to discuss, talk over together, this evening.

To discuss that problem profitably, you must find out what is the function of the mind. What do we mean by the mind? As I have been pointing out, you are not merely listening to me; but you and I are together investigating this question, the function of the mind. By sheer accident, I happen for the moment to be sitting on a platform, talking it over with you; but really you and I are together tackling the problem, together investigating the whole question.

When you observe your own mind, you are observing not only the so called upper levels of the mind but also watching the unconscious, you are seeing what the mind actually does. Is it not? That is the only way you can investigate. You should not superimpose what it should do, how it should think or how it should act and so on; that would amount to making mere statements. That is, if you say the mind should be this or should not

be that, then you stop all investigation and all thinking; or, if you quote some high authority, then you equally stop thinking. Don't you? If you quote Sankara, Buddha, Christ or X Y Z, there is an end to all pursuit, to all thinking and all investigation. So, one has to guard against that. You must put aside all these subtleties of the mind and you must know you are investigating this problem of the 'me' together with me.

What is the function of the mind? To find that out, you must know what the mind is actually doing. What does your mind do? It is all a process of thinking. Is it not? Otherwise, the mind is not there. As long as the mind is not thinking consciously or unconsciously, without verbalizing, there is no consciousness. We have to find out what the mind that we use in our every day life, and also the mind of which most of us are unconscious, do in relation to our problems. We must look at the mind as it is and not as it should be.

Now what is mind as it is functioning? It is actually a process of isolation. Is it not? Fundamentally it is that. That is what the process of thought is, It is thinking in an isolated form, yet remaining collective. When you observe your own thinking, you will see it is an isolated, fragmentary process. You are thinking according to your reactions, the reactions of your memory, of your experience, of your knowledge, of your belief. You are reacting to all that. Aren't you? If I say that there must be a fundamental revolution, you immediately react. You will object to that word 'revolution', if you have got good investments, spiritual or otherwise. So, your reaction is dependent on your knowledge, on your belief on your experience. That is an obvious fact. There are

various forms of reaction. You say 'I must be brotherly', 'I must cooperate', 'I must be brotherly', 'I must cooperate', 'I must be friendly', 'I must be kind' and so on. What are these? These are all reactions; but the fundamental reaction of thinking is a process of isolation. Please do not readily accept it, for we are together investigating it. You are watching the process of your own mind, each one of you; which means, you are watching your own action, belief, knowledge, experience. All these give security. Do they not? They give security, give strength to the process of thinking. As we discussed yesterday, that process only strengthens the 'me,' the mind, the self whether that self is high or low. All our religions, all our social sanctions, all our laws are for the support of the individual, the individual self, the separative action; and in opposition to that, there is the totalitarian state. If you go deeper into the unconscious, there too, it is the same process that is at work. There, we are the collective influenced by the environment, by the climate, by the society, by the father, the mother, the grandfather; you know all that. There again, is the desire to assert, to dominate as an individual, as the 'me'.

So, is not the function of the mind, as we know it and as we function daily, a process of isolation? Aren't you seeking individual salvation? You are going to be somebody in the future; in this very life, you are going to be a great man, a great writer. Our whole tendency is to be separated. Can the mind do anything else but that? Is it possible for the mind not to think separatively, in a self-enclosed manner, fragmentarily? That is impossible. Because of this, we worship the mind; the mind is extraordinarily important. Don't you know, the moment you are a little bit cunning a little bit

alert and have a little accumulated information and know ledge, how important you become in society? You have seen how you worship those who are intellectually superior, the lawyers, the professors, the orators, the great writers, the explainers and the expounders! Haven't you? You have cultivated the intellect and the mind.

The function of the mind is to be separated; otherwise, your mind is not there. Having cultivated this process for centuries, we find we cannot cooperate; only we are urged, compelled, driven by authority, fear, either economic or religious. If that is the actual state, not only consciously but also at the deeper levels, in our motives, our intentions, our pursuits, how can there be cooperation? How can there be intelligent coming together to do something? As that is almost impossible, religions and organized social parties force the individual to certain forms of discipline. Discipline then becomes imperative in order to come together, to do things together.

So, until we understand how to transcend this separative thinking, this process of giving emphasis to the `me' and the mind whether in the collective form or in individual form, we shall not have peace; we shall have constant conflict and wars. Now, our problem is how to dissolve this, how to bring about an end to the separative process of thought? Can thought ever destroy the self, thought being the process of verbalization and of certain reactions? Thought is nothing else than reaction; thought is not creative; but it is only the expression of the creativeness in words, which we call thought. Can such thought put an end to itself? That is what we are trying to find out. Aren't we? I think along these lines: - `I must

discipline', 'I must identify', 'I must think more properly', 'I must be this or that'. Thought is compelling itself, urging itself, disciplining itself, to be something or not to be something. Is that not a process of isolation? Therefore, it is not the integrated intelligence which can function as a whole, from which alone there can be cooperation. Do you see the problem now? I am not proposing a problem myself. You must know that this is your problem, if you are not already aware of it. You may put it in different ways, but fundamentally, this is the problem.

How are you to come to the end of thought; or rather, how is thought to come to an end? I mean the thought which is isolated, fragmentary and partial. How do you set about it? Will discipline destroy it? Will your so-called discipline destroy it? Obviously, you have not succeeded all these long years; otherwise, you would not be here. You must examine the disciplining process which is solely a thought process, in which there is subjection, repression, control, domination - all affecting the unconscious. It asserts itself later as you grow older. Having tried discipline for such a long time to no purpose, you must have found that obviously discipline is not the process to destroy the self. Self cannot be destroyed through discipline, because discipline is a process of strengthening the self. Yet, all your religions support it; all your meditations, your assertions are based on this. Will knowledge destroy it? Will belief destroy it? In other words, will every thing that we are at present doing, all the activities in which we are at present engaged in order to get at the root of the self, will all that succeed? Is not all this a fundamental waste in a thought process which is a process of isolation, a process of reaction? What do you do when you realize

fundamentally or deeply that the thought cannot end itself? What happens? Watch yourselves, sirs, and tell me. When you are fully aware of this fact, what happens? You then understand that any reaction is conditioned, and that, through conditioning, there can be no freedom either at the beginning or at the end. Freedom is always at the beginning and not at the end.

When you realize that any reaction is a form of conditioning and there is a continuing continuity to the self in different ways, what actually takes place? You must be very clear in this matter. Belief, knowledge, discipline, experience, the whole process of achieving the result or the end, ambition, becoming something in this life or in the next one, future life - all these are a process of isolation, a process which brings destruction, misery, wars from which there is no escape through collective action, how ever much you might be threatened with concentration camps and all the rest of it. Are you aware of that fact? What is the state of the mind? What is the state of the mind which says 'It is so', 'That is my problem', 'That is exactly where I am', 'I have rejected', 'I see what knowledge and discipline can do, what ambition does'? Surely, there is a different process at work.

We see the ways of the intellect. We do not see the way of love; the way of love is not to be found through the intellect. The intellect with all its ramifications, with all its desires, ambitions, pursuits, must come to an end for real love to come into existence. Don't you know that when you love, you cooperate, you are not thinking of yourself? That is the highest form of intelligence - not when you are loved as a superior entity or when you are in good position, which is nothing but fear. When your vested interests are

there, there can be no love; there is only the process of exploitation culminating in fear. So, love can come into being only when the mind is not there. Therefore, you must understand the whole process of the mind, the function of the mind. Only then you can find out when deep revolution will take place.

This process of the mind is not understood in a couple of minutes, or by listening to one or two talks. It can only be understood when there is a big revolution in you, a deep interest to find out this discontent, this despair. But you are not in despair. You are well-fed intellectually and physically. You prevent yourself to come to that state in which you are in despair. You have always something to lean on. You can always escape, go to the temple, read books, listen to a talk, run away; and a man who escapes, cannot be in despair. If you are in despair, you are trying to find a way to be hopeful, to go away from despair. It is only a man who is really unconscious, who has discarded completely all these things, stands naked, who will find what love is; and without that, there is no transformation, there is no revolution, there is no renewal. There is nothing but imitation and ashes; and that is what our culture is at present. It is only when we know how to love each other, there can be cooperation, there can be intelligent functioning, coming together over any question. It is only then possible to find out what God is, what Truth is. Now, we are trying to find truth through intellect, through imitation - which is idolatry, whether it is made by hand or by mind. Only when you discard completely, through understanding, the whole structure of the self, that which is eternal, timeless, immeasurable, comes; you cannot go to it; it comes to you.

Question: Can the root of a problem like greed be completely eradicated by awareness? Are there various levels of awareness?

Krishnamurti: That is a problem to the questioner. Is it to each one of us a problem? Greed cannot be chipped away little by little. That which you chip away, set aside, grows into greed in another form; and you know what greed does in society, between two individuals' relationship; you know the whole process of greed, economic or spiritual, of greed to be. The questioner asks how greed can fundamentally be eradicated, because he feels there must be a way, a process which will go to the root of the thing. If you say, 'I wish to get rid of it slowly, gradually, till I become perfect', it is just a way of avoiding the issue. Is there a way of fundamentally eradicating it? Let us find out.

First of all, why do you want to get rid of greed? Is it not in order to get something else, in order to be something, because books say so or because you see results in society? What is the urge that makes you say 'I must do away with it?' That is very important to find out. You may be the root, when you say 'I do not want to be this, but I want to be that'. The want to be, positive or negative, may be the root. You are only saying 'I will do this and that; by chipping that, by becoming that, you have not understood the motive; have you? Can greed be destroyed by will, by denial, by repression, by control or by identifying with some thing which is not greed? Can you destroy it? If you have tried it, the very process of identifying with some thing, is that not also greed? Certainly, it is also greed, because you want to avoid the pains, conflicts, and sufferings of greed without really solving it. You are trying to be some thing else. The motive, the desire, is still to be

something. Is not desire to be something the very nature of greed? To be something is greed. Can you live in this world without being something? Can you live without being anything, without titles, degrees, positions, capacities? Until you are prepared to be nothing, you must be greedy in different forms.

Have you true awareness of this function of greed and its destructive pursuits? Can the mind - after all, mind is greed - can the mind be nothing, not seeking, not desiring to be, to become? Obviously it can. It is only then, you are full; only then, you do not ask, you do not demand to be fulfilled. But you do not want to be nothing. All your struggle is to be something; is it not? If you are a clerk, you want to be something higher, to have better pay, more position, higher prestige, more ambitions, to be near the Master, far away from the Master, promise of reward in the future. You don't throwaway all that, be simple, be nothing, be really naked. Surely, till you come to that state, there must be greed in different forms. And you cannot come to that state, without being nothing. Your experiencing of nothing is a projection of the self and therefore a strengthening of the self. So, you cannot experience the state of nothingness any more than you can experience the state of love. When you experience anything, love is not; because, as I explained yesterday, that which you call experience is only a projection of your own desire and therefore a strengthening of the self. So if you see all this, if you are aware of all this - not only at the superficial level, which is to have little, to possess only one or two suits - , if you are aware of the whole significance of the desire to transform yourself from this to that, when you are fully cognizant of the whole process of greed, then greed will drop

away.

Obviously, there are many layers of awareness. The spirit of marvel of what all is taking place, of the trees, the moonlight, the poor unfed child, the half-starved, the bloated tummies - they are all superficial awareness, observations. But if you can go a little deeper, there is awareness of how we are conditioned, not only at the conscious level but at a deeper level, awareness which comes through dreams, or movement when there is a little space between two thoughts, a certain unthought of, un-meditated observation. When you can go still deeper, that is, when the mind is absolutely without any reflection, recognition, when the mind is still, not experiencing, when the mind is not seeing what is stillness, there is intelligence.

Mind is always verbalizing experience and therefore giving strength to the memory and therefore to the self. Surely, the more we are conscious of all the ways of the self, the more we are aware of all our feelings; we understand every sorrow, every movement of thought; we not only observe it, but live with it without brushing it aside. That gives maturity; not age, not knowledge, not belief. That brings about integrated intelligence, which is not separative.

Question: We are all Theosophists interested fundamentally in truth and love, as you are. Could you not have remained in our society and helped us rather than separate yourself from us and denounce us? What have you achieved by this?

Krishnamurti: First of all, many of you are amused; others are a little bit agitated; there is apprehension. Don't you feel all this? Let us find out.

Fundamentally, are we, you and I, seeking the same thing? Can

you seek truth in any organization? Can you give yourself a label and seek truth? Can you be a Hindu and say 'I am seeking Truth'? Then, what you are seeking, is not Truth but fulfilment of belief. Can you belong to any organization, spiritual group, and seek Truth? Is Truth to be found collectively? Do you know love when you believe? Don't you know that, when you believe in something very strongly and I believe in something contrary, there is no love between us. When you believe in certain hierarchical principles and authorities, and I do not, do you think there is communion between us? When the whole structure of your thinking is the future, the becoming through virtue, when you are going to be somebody in the future, when the whole process of your thinking is based on authority and hierarchical principles, do you think there is love between us? You may use me for convenience, and I may use you for convenience. But that is not love. Let us be clear. Do not get agitated about these matters. You will not understand, if you get excited about it.

To find out whether you are really seeking truth and love, you must investigate, must you not? If you investigate, if you find out inwardly and therefore act outwardly, what would happen? You will be out side, wouldn't you? If you question your own beliefs, won't you find yourself outside? As long as there are societies and organizations - so called spiritual organizations who have vested interests in property, in belief, in knowledge - obviously, the people there are not seeking Truth. They may say so. So, you must find out if we are fundamentally seeking the same thing. Can you seek Truth through a Master, through a guru? Sirs, think it out. It is your problem. Can you find Truth through the process of time, in

becoming something? Can you find truth through the Master, through pupil, through gurus; what can they tell you fundamentally? They can only tell you to dissolve 'the me'. Are you doing that? If you are not, obviously you are not seeking Truth. It is not that I am saying that you are not seeking Truth; but the fact is that, if you are saying 'I am going to be somebody', if you occupy a position of spiritual authority, you can not be seeking Truth. I am very clear about these matters, and I am not trying to persuade you to accept or to denounce, which will be stupid. I cannot denounce you, as the questioner says.

Even though you have heard me for twenty years, you go on with your beliefs; because, it is very comforting to believe that you are being looked after, that you have special messengers for the future, that you are going to be something beautiful, now or eventually. You will go on because your vested interests are there, in property, in job, in belief, in knowledge. You do not question them. It is the same all the world over. It is not only this or that particular group of people, but all groups - catholics, protestants, communists, capitalists - are in the same position; they have all vested interests. The man who is really revolutionary, who is inwardly seeing the truth of all these things, will find Truth. He will know what love is, not in some future date which is of no value. When a man is hungry, he wants to be fed now, not tomorrow. But you have convenient theories of time, of eventuality, in which you are caught. Therefore, where is the connection, where is the relationship between you and me, or between yourself and that which you are attempting to find out? And yet, you all talk about love, brotherhood; and everything you

do, is contrary to that. It is obvious, sirs, that the moment you have organization, there must be intrigues for position, for authority; you know the whole game of it.

So, what we need is not whether I denounce you or whether you denounce or throw me out. That is not the problem. Obviously you must reject a man who says that what you believe or do is wrong; you have done so, or inwardly you should do so, because I say I am opposed to that which you want. If you would really seek, if you would find truth and love, there must be singleness of purpose, complete abandonment of all vested interests; which means, you must be inwardly empty, poor, not seeking, not acquiring positions of authority as displayers or bringers of messages from the Masters. You must be completely naked. Since you do not wish that, naturally, you acquire labels, beliefs and various forms of security. Sirs, do not reject; find out whether you are really, as you say, fundamentally seeking truth. I really question you, I really doubt you when you say 'I am seeking Truth'. You cannot seek truth, because your search is a projection of your own desires; your experiencing of that projection is an experience which you want. But when you do not seek, when the mind is quiet and tranquil without any want, without any motive, without any compulsion, then you will find that ecstasy comes. For that ecstasy to come, you must be completely naked, empty, alone. Most people join these societies because they are gregarious, because they are clubs, and joining clubs is very convenient socially. Do you think you are going to find Truth when you are seeking comfort, satisfaction, social security? No, sirs; you must stand alone without any support, without friends, without guru without hope, completely and

inwardly naked and empty. Then only, as the cup which is empty can be filled up, so the emptiness within can be filled up with that which is everlasting.

January 20, 1952

MADRAS 7TH PUBLIC TALK 26TH JANUARY 1952

Perhaps this evening we can discuss the problem and the full implication of what is suffering and what is sorrow. I think that before we enter into that subject, we should consider what we mean by the word 'understanding', because if we can understand the profound significance, the depth and the meaning of sorrow, perhaps then we shall be able to free the mind entirely from those reactions which we term, or to which we give the name 'sorrow' which is a feeling. So, it is important to find out what we mean by 'understanding'.

Is understanding reason or deduction? Is understanding merely the outcome of an intellectual or verbal process, or is it something entirely different from deduction, from comprehension? By careful analysis, do we solve a deep psychological problem? Is not understanding the comprehension, recognition, seeing the whole of the problem in its entirety? The mind can only reason, put several things together, deduce, analyze, compare, have knowledge about; but can the mind which is a process of thinking in which time is involved, which is memory and which is the accumulation of beliefs, knowledge, can such a mind understand the full significance of a problem? In other words, can the time process which is essentially a process of the mind, a process of thinking, solve a problem? That is particularly important to find out for most of us. For most of us, the instrument which we have cultivated so diligently is the mind, the intellect, with which we approach a problem hoping thereby to resolve it.

We are asking ourselves: 'Can the mind which is a process of time, which is the result of yesterday, to day and tomorrow, be the instrument of understanding?' Can the mind see the whole problem in its entirety? Does understanding come into being through time? Or is it irrespective of time? If we dissociate the process of understanding from reasoning, from deduction, from analysis which is a process of time, then we can probably comprehend fully a problem at one glance. That is very important. Is it not? If we are to understand the full significance of sorrow, we must eliminate the time process altogether. Time will not resolve the process of building up sorrow nor will it help in the resolution of sorrow. It can only help you to forget it, to evade it, to postpone it; but still the sense of sorrow is there.

So, please come forward this evening as two individuals, not as groups of people trying collectively to think about it; come forward as two individuals and look at this problem of sorrow without introducing the process of time as a means to understanding, to resolving. In other words, can we see this problem of entirety? It is only so when we see something completely, wholly integrally, there is a possibility of its dissolution, and not other wise. The possibility of this dissolution does not lie through the process of what we call the mind, the reason, the thought. That is why I said we must understand that word 'understanding'; we must grasp the significance of that word. I think if we can do that, perhaps we shall get to the root of the problem of sorrow.

If I would understand something, first I must love it. Must I not? I must have communion with it. I must have no barrier. There must be no resistance. There must be no apprehension, no fear,

which translate themselves into condemnation, justification or a process of identification. I hope you are following all this. Forget the words for the moment; the words I am using need not have any value for you; keep in contact, in communion with what I am saying, the spirit of it, which is not mere verbalization. To understand something, there must be love. If I would understand you, I must love you, I must have no prejudice. We know all these things. You say 'I have no prejudice'. But all of us are a bundle of prejudices, antagonisms; and we put on verbal screens. Let us remove this screen and see what the significance of sorrow is. I feel that, only through that way, we shall resolve this enormously complex problem of sorrow.

So, understanding requires communion; understanding requires a mind that is capable of perceiving the unknown, the unnameable; because a mind that wishes to understand something, must itself be quite still, which is not a state of recognition. If there is to be understanding there must be communion, which means love, not only at one particular level but at all levels. When we love somebody, it is a process of timeless quality. You can't name it. There is no barrier of fear, of reward, of condemnation; nor is there identification with somebody else - which is a mental process. If we can really see the significance of that word, then we can go into the problems of suffering. If there is that feeling of communion, of really loving that problem which we call sorrow, then we shall be able to understand it fully; otherwise we shall merely run away from it, find various escapes. So, let us, if we can, put ourselves in that position. Only then, we can understand what is called sorrow. There should be no mental barrier, no prejudice, no condemnation,

no justification through tradition. Then we can approach, you and I as individuals, this thing that is consuming most of us, sorrow.

Energy in movement, in action, is desire. Is it not? That desire when thwarted is pain, and that desire in fulfilment is pleasure. For most of us, action is a process of fulfilment of desire. "I want" and "I don't want" govern our attitude. That energy which is canalized, identified as the 'me' through desire, is ever seeking a fulfilment. Desire in its movement, in its action, is a process of fulfilment or denial. There are various forms of fulfilment and various forms of denial likewise, each binding, each bringing about different kinds of sorrow. When there is sorrow, there are various forms of resolution of it, various forms of escapes from it.

We know sorrow at different levels. Don't we? Physical sorrow, physical pain, sorrow of death, sorrow that comes when there is no fulfilment, sorrow resulting from a state of emptiness, sorrow that comes when ambition is not fulfilled, sorrow in not coming up to the standard or the good example, sorrow of the ideal and finally sorrow of identification. We know various forms of sorrow at different psychological and physiological levels; and also we know the various forms of escapes, drink, rituals, repetition of words, the turning to tradition, looking to the future, looking for better times, better hopes, better circumstances; we know all these forms of escapes - religious, psychological, physical and material. The more we escape, the greater and more complex the problems become. When we look at the problem, our whole structure is a series of escapes. You explain away sorrow; to you then, explanation has more significance than the depth, the meaning, the vitality of sorrow. After all, the explanations are merely words, however

subtle, however justified; and we are satisfied with words. This is another escape.

We have our whole mental process in approaching a problem like that of sorrow. We have our basis of a series of escapes, justifications, and condemnation. So, there is not direct and vital communion with the problem of sorrow. Then you are a different entity looking at sorrow. You are trying to dissolve, enquire into, analyze the problem of sorrow. You are different; and something else is suffering in this process of analysis, condemnation and justification.

There is no question of you as an entity that is in sorrow or that is sorrowful. Sorrow is not different from the thinker. The thinker, the feeler, the entity that desires, is itself sorrow. It is not as if he is different from sorrow and he is going to dissolve sorrow. The very process of desire which is energy in action, is a process of frustration, of suffering, of fulfilment, of pain. You are not different from sorrow. That is the whole picture. Is it not? We can enlarge it more verbally, paint it more in detail; but that is the problem. Is it not? You are not different from sorrow and therefore you cannot resolve sorrow. You can't analyze yourself as a separate entity looking at sorrow; nor can you go to the analyser to get it resolved; nor can you escape, put away direct sorrow by energy spent in social activities.

Most of our efforts, most of our intentions and our search are for saying 'I am different from that which I feel, and how am I to resolve that?'. This is really an important issue not to be easily brushed aside and cunningly replied. You have to look at it though your whole being revolts; because we have been brought up to

think that you can operate on it. You are not at all a different entity from your thought or from your desire or your ambition, from the ladder you are climbing, spiritually or sociologically. To understand this problem there must be communion with the whole, and you cannot commune with the whole if you are looking at it partially as you and the object. That is a partial comprehension, partial understanding - which is not at all understanding - if you think you are a different entity looking at the thing which you call sorrow.

So, you are the creator of sorrow; you are the entity that suffers; and you are not separate from sorrow, from pain. As long as there is a division between you and suffering, there is only a partial understanding, partial comprehension, partial view of the thing; which means really, that you must put aside all previous explanations; which means, you are face to face, not as two separate processes, but as a unitary process, with the thing that you call sorrow. When you really love there is no barrier; then there is communion. It is not an identification with another; identification does not exist in love. It is only a state of being. Can you look at this problem of sorrow, sorrow not only of the reaction of sympathy, a hope or failure, but also the sorrow that is so enveloping, so deep, so profound that no verbal description can cover it? Can you and I be in full communion with it? We must not make virtue of sorrow, as a means of understanding, a means of progress.

Actually what is this sorrow? When you suffer, when your son dies, there is one kind of sorrow; when you see the poor unfed children, that is another kind of sorrow; when you are struggling to

reach the top of the ladder and you don't succeed, that is a third kind of sorrow; when you are not fulfilling the ideal, you have sorrow. Surely, sorrow is a process of desire ever increasing, ever multiplying, self-enclosing. Can I understand that whole process of energy in movement as desire and put an end to desire, not to energy? What we know is that energy in action is desire - desire being the `me', the `me' advancing, the `me' fulfilling, the `me' postponing.

Can I understand this whole problem of sorrow and desire and thereby put an end to desire as a movement of the `me', and not come back but be in that state of energy which is pure intelligence? It is not a question to be answered `yes' and `no'. It is not a school boy's affair. This needs a great deal of meditation, meditation not in the sense of pitching up your thought to a certain level and holding it - that would be absurdity. We are not discussing meditation here. As I said, this requires a great deal of insight, and you can't have insight if there is any sort of distortion of desire.

Energy is pure intelligence; and when once we comprehend that, or let it come into being, then you will see that desire has very little significance. That is our whole problem, is it not?, how to shape the desire, how to mould it sociologically or spiritually. How is the `me' or desire to be shaped for collective use, to be shaped for individual use? How is all this done?

As long as desire is not fully comprehended, fully understood, there must be sorrow; because we cannot have the pure reason that will resolve it, the pure intelligence that is necessary for it. Reason can't dissolve sorrow; it can't dissolve desire. Therefore it is necessary to understand the whole problem not by deduction, not

by reasoning but by seeing the whole thing, which means, to really love the problem, to really love sorrow. You understand? There are people who love sorrow; but their hearts are empty; instead of loving a man, they love sorrow, which is an ideal. Haven't you seen people who love virtue? They love sorrow because they feel good in loving; they feel a certain enthusiastic response, a certain well-being. I do not mean that kind of love at all. When you love, there is no identification but there is communion; there is open receptivity between that and you. That is essential to understand this whole problem.

As I said, understanding is not a process of time; it is not of time. Don't say 'I will understand tomorrow; I will go', 'I will come', 'I will be aware more and more'. Understanding has nothing to do with time or process of time, which is thinking. So mind cannot solve the problem of sorrow. So, what can solve it? If you try to understand the problem with your mind, you justify, you condemn, or you identify yourself with it. The mind that can understand the problem fully, is the mind that is not in a state of agitation; the mind that would understand the problem is not seeking a result; it does not want to find an answer; it does not say 'I must be free from sorrow in order to experience, in order to have more'. There is no 'more'. 'More' is the sorrow, which means, the less. So if you can look at it completely, not as 'I' or 'me' looking observing shaping, destroying, but with a mind to which the observer and the observed are the same, then you will find there comes love that is not sensation, intelligence that is not of time or of thought process; and it is only that, that can resolve this immense and complex problem of sorrow.

Question: I have spent ten years of my best life in prison for my political activities which promised great things. Now there is disillusionment, and I feel completely burnt out. What am I to do?

Krishnamurti: You may not spend ten years in prison but you may spend a year or two in pursuit of false hope, in pursuit of false activity, in doing something to which you have given your whole being, your whole devotion or thought, and then find it empty. We have done that, have we not? You follow a certain path and action hoping it will bring great things, hoping it will help people, will free people, hoping there will be, at the end of it compassion, love; and you have given your life to it. And then one day, you find it is utterly empty, that is, the thing you have lived for has no meaning any more; you are emotionally burnt out. Don't you know such cases? Are you not one of the cases? Are you not in that position? Have you not had such experience, have you not known that you have followed the path of the Master, the initiator - political or religious, promising an ideal state through revolution - , and you have given out your zeal and energy and your life to it, and at the end you are disillusioned, burnt out emotionally? You work for it and then leave it. But there is another fellow, stupid and ignorant, who comes and fills your place. He carries on, he adds fuel to the useless fire. And if he is burnt out, he walks away and goes out of it. But there is another fellow to take up. And the movement of stupidity goes on in the name of religion, politics, God, peace - call it what you will. Another problem arises, how to prevent the stupid from falling into the useless fray that has no meaning.

Societies, organizations, are such empty things, specially the religious; so, what are you to do when you are burnt out? Your

elasticity is gone. You are getting old. All the things you are striving for, have no meaning. And either you turn cynical, bitter ; or you remain like a log of dead wood, secluded, in isolation. That is an obvious fact, is it not? All that, we know; there are hundreds of examples; perhaps you are yourself one of them. What is one to do when one is in that state? Can that which is dead, be revived? Can that which is hollow, false, give its life to the false? Can that suddenly come to life and see what it has done, pursue the real, and renew? That is the problem, is it not? Can I who have given the greater part of my life to something which has no meaning - no meaning in the sense that it has no deep, ever lasting significance - , can I who have lost that state, been burnt out, can I find life again, can I find the zeal again? I think I can.

When I am burnt out, when I realize I have wasted, instead of becoming bitter if I can see the whole significance of what I have done I have pursued the ideal and how ideal always destroys - because ideal has no meaning, ideal is only self-projection, ideal is only postponement, ideal prevents me from understanding that which is, ideal prevents me from comprehending the whole-; if I can sit quietly, not pulled off in another direction; if I recognize the whole process of what I have done, and see what had led me to false hopes, what awakened all kinds of ambitions in me; if I can see all that without any movement in the other direction, either of justification or condemnation; if I can remain with it, live with it, then there is the possibility of reviving. Is there not? Because, the mind has pursued some thing which, it hoped, would produce results, utopias, marvels, etc. If the mind realizes what it has done, there is renewal; is there not? If I know I have done a grievous

thing, false thing, if I am aware of it, understand it, then surely, that very understanding is light, is the new.

But most of us have no patience or wisdom or silent acceptance of that which we have done, without bitterness. All I know is I have wasted my life and I want a new life. I am eager to grasp the new thing. When I am eager to grasp, then I am again lost. Then there is the guru, the political leader, the promise of utopia carrying me away. So, I am back again at the same process as before. But recognizing this process is to be patient, to be aware, to know what I have done, not to attempt anything more. That requires great wisdom. That requires great affection, to know I am not going to participate in any of those things. It does not matter where it will lead me, but I am not going to do that. When we do that, when we are in that state, I assure you there is renewal, new beginning. But I must see that my mind does not create new illusion, new hope.

Question: What is meant by 'accepting what is'? How does it differ from resignation?

Krishnamurti: What is acceptance? What is the process of acceptance? I accept sorrow. What does it mean? I suffer through loss of a friend, brother or son; and there is suffering. The acceptance of that suffering through explanation is resignation, is it not? I say it is inevitable, and the suffering dies; I rationalize, or I turn to Karma, or reincarnation, and I accept. Acceptance is the process of recognition, is it not? Don't define the word but see thy meaning. That is, I accept, in order to be peaceful. I resign myself to an event, to the circumstance, to the incident. I accept them because they pacify me, they put me out of the state of conflict. There is an ulterior motive in resignation, of which I may not be

conscious. Deep down, unconsciously, I want to have peace, I want to have satisfaction, I do not want to be disturbed. But loss causes disturbance which we call suffering. And in order to escape from suffering, I explain, I justify and then say 'I am resigned to the inevitable, to Karma'. That is the most stupid way, is it not?, of living. But that will not bring about understanding, will it?

If I am capable of looking at what is - that is, what has taken place, the death of someone, an incident - , without any mental process, if I can observe it, be aware of it, follow it, be in communion with it, love it, there is no resignation, no acceptance. I shall have to accept the fact. Fact is fact. But, if you can prevent yourself from translating it, interpreting it, giving it justification, putting it in a place that will be suitable for you, if you are aware of that and therefore put it aside naturally, without any effort, then you will see that which is quite different, which is significant. Then it begins to narrowly unfold, begins superficially; but as it begins to unfold, it is more and more; it is like reading a book. But if you have already concluded what the book is about, know the end, you are not reading.

Understanding of 'what is' can not come about through any justification, condemnation, or identifying yourself with 'what is'. We have lost the way of love. That is why all this superficial process exists. Don't ask what love is. You talk all the time of love. What do you mean by it? You can only find out what love is, by negation. As the life we lead is negation, there can be no love. As our life is mostly destructive, the way of our life, the way of our communion is self-enclosing. That which is all embracing can be understood only when the negation has ceased to be. The

understanding of 'what is' can come when there is complete communion with that which is.

Question: For Truth to come, you advocate action without idea. Is it possible to act at all times without idea, that is, without a purpose in view.

Krishnamurti: I am not advocating anything. I am not a propagandist, political or religious. I am not inviting you to any new experience. All that we are doing is trying to find out what action is. You are not following me to find out. If you do, then you will never find out. You are only following me verbally. But if you want to find out, if you as an individual want to find out what idea and action are, you have to enquire into it, and not accept my definition or my experience which may be utterly false. As you have to find out, you have to put aside the whole idea of following, pursuing, advocating propagandist, leader or example.

Let us therefore find out together what we mean by action without idea. Please give your thought to it. Don't say 'I do not understand what you are talking about'. Let us find out together. It may be difficult, but let us go into it.

What is our action at present? What do you mean by action? Doing something, to be, to do; our action is based on idea, is it not? That is all we know; you have idea, ideal, promise, various formulas about what you are and what you are not. That is the basis of our action, reward in future, or fear of punishment, or seeking self-enclosing ideas upon which we can base our action. We know that. Don't we? Such activity is isolating. Watch yourselves in action. Don't go to sleep over my words. You have an idea of virtue and according to that idea you live - that is, you act in

relationship. That is, to you, relationship is action which is towards ideal, towards virtue, towards self-achievement, so on and so on, collective or individual.

When my action is based on ideal which is idea, that idea shapes my action, guides my action - such as, I must be brave, I must follow the example, I must be charitable, I must be socially conscious, and so on. So I say, you say, we all say 'There is an example of virtue, I must follow; which means again, 'I must live according to that'. So action is based on that idea. So between action and idea, there is a gulf, there is a time process, there is division of time. That is so, is it not? That is, 'I am not charitable, I am not loving, there is no forgiveness in my heart; but I must be charitable. There is time between what I am and what I should be, and we are all the time trying to bridge between what I am and what I should be. That is our activity, is it not?

Now what would happen if the idea did not exist? At one stroke, you would have removed the gap, would you not? You would be what you are. Have I frightened you all? You say 'I am ugly, I must become beautiful; what am I to do?' which is action based on idea. You say 'I am not compassionate, I must become compassionate'. So you introduce idea separate from action. Therefore there is never action, but always an ideal of what you will be; never of what you are. The stupid man always says he is going to become clever. He sits working, struggling to become; he never stops, he never says 'I am stupid'. So his action which is based on idea, is not action at all.

Action means doing, moving. But when you have idea, it is merely ideation going on, thought process going on, in relation to

action. And if there is no idea, what would happen? Please follow it through. You are that 'Which is'. You are uncharitable, you are unforgiving, you are cruel, stupid, thoughtless. Can you remain with that? If you do, see then what happens. Please follow this. Don't be impatient, don't push it away - now, not tomorrow, actually now when you are facing it - then, what happens? When I recognize I am uncharitable, stupid, what happens, when I am aware it is so? Is there not charity, is there not intelligence, when I recognize uncharitableness completely, not verbally, not artificially, when I realize I am uncharitable and am loving? In that very seeing of 'what is', is there not love? Don't I immediately become charitable? Please let us not have your acceptance. Look at it. Go into it. If I see the necessity of being clean, it is very simple; I go and wash. But if it is an ideal that I should be clean, then what happens? Don't you know the answer? Cleanliness is then very superficial.

So action based on idea is very superficial, which is not action at all, Which is merely ideation, which is a different kind of action; but we are not discussing that kind of action which is merely thought process going on.

But the action which transforms human beings, which brings regeneration, redemption, transformation - call what you will - , such action is not based on idea. It is action irrespective of sequence, reward or punishment. Then you will see such action is timeless, because mind does not enter into it; and mind is time process, calculating process, dividing process, isolating process.

This question is not so easily solved. Most of you put questions and expect an answer 'yes or no'. It is easy to ask questions like

‘What do you mean?’, and then sit back and let me explain; but it is much more arduous to find out the answer for yourselves, go into the problem so profoundly, so clearly and without any corruption, that the problem ceases to be. And that can only happen when the mind is really silent in the face of the problem. The problem is as beautiful as sunset, if you love the problem. If you are antagonistic to the problem, you will never understand. And most of us are antagonistic because we are frightened of the result, of what may happen if we proceed; so we lose the significance and purview of the problem.

January 26, 1952

MADRAS 8TH PUBLIC TALK 27TH JANUARY 1952

It must have occurred to many of us how quickly every thing deteriorates. Great revolutions slaughtering millions with good promises soon deteriorate. They fall into the hands of bad people. Great movements, political and religious, soon wither away. It must have occurred to many of us why it is that this constant process of renewal and decay takes place. Why is it that some thing that has been started by a few people with good intentions, with right motives, is soon usurped by bad people and destroyed?

What is this process of withering, this decay? I think if we can answer this question and find out the truth of the matter, then perhaps we as individuals can set about an action which will not utterly wither away. I think we should look to the cause of it, not merely at the superficial level but at the deeper level as well. I think there is a deeper and more fundamental reason why this deterioration takes place so rapidly, and I hope that is one of your problems too. Don't think I am trying to introduce a new problem or I am taking up something to talk about. This must have occurred to you, as it has occurred to me. If you are at all alert, aware of the process in history, in everyday life, you must have observed that some thing is behind this process of deterioration; having observed it, probably you have brushed it aside; or having sacrificed yourself to a cause which soon withers away, you do not know what to do.

You must find out what exactly is that which is behind this process of deterioration, this renewal which soon withers away. It seems to me that we should enquire into this whole question; and

perhaps there lies the true answer to our problem.

In our every day life, we make effort to become. Don't we? All our effort is to be something, to be come, positively or negatively. We see that there is sociological conflict in `becoming', in the individual becoming more and more; and the force behind that `becoming' is ever directed that way. To control individual effort which is self-enclosing, there are social laws; and in order to control the individual religiously, there are religious sanctions; but in spite of these laws and sanctions, deteriorations exist in our effort to be good, to be noble, to be beautiful, to seek truth. Until we really discover for ourselves - not imitatively, not through tradition, not through mere verbal rationalization - that which is behind this process of decay and deterioration, which is apart from our being, there is no end to the world's turmoil.

The state of creativeness is very important. I am afraid we shall not be in that state which is so essential to bring about or to maintain a constant state in which there is no deterioration of any kind.

Now to go into this matter fully, you must enquire into this process of the experiencer and the experience, because whatever we do contains this dual process. The effort or the will to experience, to acquire, to be or not to be, is always there. The will is the factor of our deterioration; the will to become - individually, collectively, nationally or in different levels of our societies - , the will to be is the important factor. If we observe, we shall find that, in this will, there are the actor and the thing he acts upon. That is, I exert my will to transform or change some thing; I am greedy, and I exert my will not to be greedy; I am provincial, nationalistic, and

I exert my will not to be so. I act; that is, I use my will to transform that which I consider evil, or I try to become or keep that which is good. So, there is this dualistic action in will, which is the experiencer and the experience. think that, therein, is the root of our deterioration.

As long as I am experiencing, as long as I am becoming, there must be this dualistic action; there must be the thinker and the thought, two separate processes at work; there is no integration, there is always a centre which is operating through the will, of action to be or not to be - collectively, individually, nationally and so on. Universally, this is the process. As long as effort is divided into the experiencer and the experience, there must be deterioration. Integration is only possible when the thinker is no longer the observer. That is, we know at present there are the thinker and the thought, the observer and the observed, the experiencer and the experienced; there are two different states. Our effort is to bridge the two.

The will or action is always dualistic. Is it possible to go beyond this will which is separative, and discover a state in which this dualistic action is not? That can only be found when we directly experience the state in which the thinker is the thought. We now think the thought is separate from the thinker, but is that so? We would like to think it is, Sirs, because then, a thinker can explain matters through his thought. The effort of the thinker is to become more or become less; and therefore, in that struggle, in that action of the will, in 'becoming', there is always the deteriorating factor, we are pursuing a false process and not a true process.

Is there a division between the thinker and the thought? As long

as they are separate, divided, our effort is wasted; we are pursuing a false process which is destructive and which is the deteriorating factor. We think the thinker is separate from the thought. When I find that I am greedy, possessive, brutal, I think I should not be all this. The thinker then tries to alter his thoughts, and therefore effort is made to `become; and in that process of effort, he pursues the false illusions that there are two separate processes whereas there is only one process. I think therein lies the fundamental factor of deterioration.

Is it possible to experience that state when there is only one entity and not two separate processes, the experiencer and the experience? Then perhaps we shall find out what it is to be creative, and what the state is in which there is no deterioration at any time, in whatever relationship man may be.

In all our experiences, there is the experiencer, the observer; and the experiences; or the observer is gathering to himself more and more, or denying himself. Is that not a wrong process and is that not a pursuit which does not bring about the creative state? If it is a wrong process, can we wipe it out completely and put it aside? That can come about only when I experience, not as a thinker experiences, but when I am aware of the false process and see that there is only a state in which the thinker is the thought.

I am greedy. I and greed are not two different states; there is only one thing and that is greed. If I am aware that I am greedy, what happens? Then, I make an effort not to be greedy, either for sociological reasons or for religious reasons; that effort will always be in a small limited circle; I may extend the circle, but it is always limited. Therefore the deteriorating factor is there. But when I look

a little more deeply and closely, I see that the maker of effort is the cause of greed and he is greed itself; and I also see that there is no 'me' and greed, separately existing, but that there is only greed. If I realize that I am greedy, that there is not the observer who is greedy but I am myself greed, then our whole question is entirely different; our response to it is entirely different; then our effort is not destructive.

What will you do when your whole being is greed, when whatever action you do is greed? But unfortunately, we don't think along those lines. There is the 'me', the superior entity, the soldier who is controlling dominating. To me that process is destructive. It is an illusion and we know why we do that. I divide my self into the high and the low, in order to continue the desire to be secure. If there is only greed, completely, not 'I' operating greed, but I am entirely greed, then what happens? Surely then, there is a different process at work altogether, a different problem comes into being. It is that problem which is creative, in which there is no sense of 'I' dominating, 'I becoming' positively or negatively. We must come to that state if we would be creative. In that state, there is no maker of effort. I think it is not an action of verbalizing or of trying to find out what that state is; if you set about that way, you will lose and you will never find. What is important is to see that the maker of effort and the object towards which he is making effort are the same. That requires enormously great understanding, watchfulness, to see how the mind divides itself into the high and the low - the high being the security, the permanent entity - but still remaining a process of thought and therefore of time. If we can understand this as directly experiencing, then you will see that quite a different

factor comes into being.

The Unknown can't be understood by the maker of effort, the will of action. To understand, mind must be completely silent, which ultimately means complete self abnegation; the self which is the maker of effort to 'become' positively or negatively, is not there.

Question: What makes something I say to another, gossip? Is speaking the truth or speaking good or bad about another, gossip? Can it be gossip so long as what is said, is true?

Krishnamurti: Behind this question, there lie many things. First of all, why do you want to speak about another? What is the motive, what is the urge? That is more important to find out. You must know if what you say about another is true. Why do you want to talk about another? If you are antagonistic, your motives are based on violence, hatred; and then, it is bound to be evil; your intention is to give pain to another through your words or through your expression. Why do you talk about another, good or bad, and what is the necessity that urges you to talk about somebody else? First of all, does it not indicate a very shallow and petty mind? If you are really concerned, interested in anything, you should know the time for it, the time to talk about another, however good, noble that another may be, or however stupid or irresponsible he may be. A stupid or shallow mind always wants to have something to talk about, chat or be agitated about. It must either read, acquire, or believe. You know the whole process of being occupied with something. Then the problem arises, how am I to stop gossiping.

Both the gossipier and the subject of the gossip, good or bad, about an other, have a kind of relationship to one another; and both

he and the man to whom he gossips, have a kind of mutual pleasure, the one to tell and the other to listen. I think it is very important to find out the motives, and not how to stop gossiping. If you can discover the motive and rather keep looking at it directly without any condemnation or justification, then perhaps your mind will begin to discover a deeper level, which consequently makes you put away this gossip, this talking about another. But to discover that motive, that urge, is quite an arduous task. Is it not?

First of all, the man or woman who is occupied with gossiping, is so interested in telling about somebody good or bad, that he or she has no time to think. After all, gossip is one of the ways of self-knowledge. Is it not? If you talk about another cruelly, it indicates antagonism, hatred. As you do not want to face your own antagonisms and hatreds, you escape through talk; and if you talk and gossip about another, it is another form of escape from your self.

The man who would really understand this whole process of life, must have profound self-knowledge, - not the knowledge which acquire from a book or a psychologist, but direct knowledge we comes through relationship, the relationship which comes as a mirror in which you see yourself constantly, both the pleasant and unpleasant. But that requires earnestness. Very few are earnest and many are petty and stupid.

Question: How can individual regeneration alone possibly bring about, in the immediate, the collective well-being of the greatest number, which is the need everywhere?

Krishnamurti: We think that individual regeneration is opposed to collective regeneration. We are not thinking in terms of

regeneration, but only of individual regeneration. Regeneration is anonymous. It is not 'I have redeemed myself'. As long as you think of individual regeneration as being opposed to the collective, then there is no relationship between the two. But if you are concerned with regeneration, not of the individual but regeneration, then you will see there is quite a different force, intelligence, at work; because after all, what are we concerned with? What is the question with which we are concerned, profoundly and deeply? One might see the necessity for united action of man to save man. He sees that collective action is necessary in order to produce food, clothing and shelter. That requires intelligence; and intelligence is not individual, is not of this party or that party, this country or that country. If the individual seeks intelligence it will be collective. But unfortunately, we are not seeking intelligence, we are not seeking the solution of this problem. We have theories of our problems, ways of how to solve them; and the ways become individual and collective. If you and I seek an intelligent way to the problem, then we are not collective or individual; then we are concerned with intelligence that will solve the problem.

What is collective, what is mass? You in relationship with another. Is it not? This is not oversimplification; because, in my relationship with you, I form a society; you and I together create a society in our relationship. Without that relationship, there is no intelligence, there is no cooperation on your side or on my side, that is wholly individual. If I seek my regeneration and you seek your regeneration, what happens? We both of us are pursuing opposite directions.

If both of us are concerned with the intelligent solution of the

whole problem, because that problem is our main concern, then our concern is not how I look at it or you look at it, not my path or your path; we are not concerned with frontiers or economic bias, with vested interests and stupidity which come into being with those vested interests. Then you and I are not collective, are not individual; this brings about collective integration which is anonymous.

But the questioner wants to know how to act immediately, what to do the next moment, so that man's needs can be solved. I am afraid there is no such answer. There is no immediate moral remedy, whatever politicians may promise. The immediate solution is the regeneration of the individual, not for himself but regeneration which is the awakening of intelligence. Intelligence is not yours or mine, it is intelligence. I think it is important to see this deeply. Then our political and individual action, collective or otherwise, will be quite different. We shall lose our identity; we shall not identify our selves with something - our country, our race, our group, our collective traditions, our prejudices. We shall lose all those things because the problem demands that we shall lose our identity in order to solve it. But that requires great, comprehensive understanding of the whole problem.

Our problem is not the bread and butter problem alone. Our problem is not feeding, clothing and shelter alone; but it is more profound than that. It is a psychological problem, why man identifies himself. And it is this identification with a party, with a religion, with knowledge, that is dividing us. And that identity can be resolved only when, psychologically, the whole process of identifying, the desire, the motive, is clearly understood.

So the problem of the collective or of the individual is non-existent when you are pursuing the solution of a particular problem. If you and I are both interested in something, is vitally interested in the solution of the problem, we shall not identify ourselves with something else. But unfortunately, as we are not vitally interested, we have identified our selves, and it is that identity that is preventing us from resolving this complex and vast problem.

Question: Although you have used the word `Truth' often, I do not recall that you have ever defined it. What do you mean by it?

Krishnamurti: You and I as two individuals are going to find this out, not tomorrow but perhaps this evening. If you are very quiet, let us discover it. Definitions are not valuable. Definitions have no meaning to a man who is seeking Truth. The word is not the thing; the word `tree' is not the tree; but we are satisfied with words. please follow this closely. To us, definitions, explanations are very satisfactory because we can live within them. We can pursue words, and words have certain effects on us physically and psychologically. The word `God' awakens all kinds of neurological and psychological reactions, and we are satisfied.

So to us, definition is very important. Is that not so? Definition we call knowledge, and knowledge we think is Truth. The more we read about it, the nearer we think we are to it. But the explanation of the word is not the thing. So we have to realize, to understand; we must not be caught by definitions by words. Therefore, we must put aside the word. And how difficult it is, is it not?, because the word is the process of thought! There is no thinking without verbalizing, without using words, images, concepts, formulas.

Please follow all this, meditate with me now, to find this out.

When the mind perceives that it is caught in words, that the very process of its thinking is word which is memory, how can such a mind - which is memory, which is time, which is caught in definitions and conclusions - , understand what is Truth, what is unknowable. If I would know the unknowable, the mind must be completely silent, must it not? That is, all verbalization, all imagination, all projection must cease. You all know how difficult it is for the mind to be still, not compelled, not disciplined to be still; which means, the mind is no longer verbalizing, no longer recognizing, no longer the centre of recognition of any experience.

When the mind recognizes the experience, that experience is projected. When I experience the Master, Truth, God, that experience is self-projected, because I recognize. There is the centre of me which recognizes that experience; that recognition is the process of memory. Then I say 'I have seen the Master, I know He exists, I know there is God.' That is, the mind is the centre of recognition, and recognition is the process of memory. When I experience something as God, as Truth, it is my projection, it is recognition, it is not Truth, it is not God.

The mind is quite still only when it is incapable of experiencing, that is, when there is no centre of recognition. But that does not come about through any form of action of will. That does not come about through discipline. That comes about when the mind observes its own activities, which I hope you are doing now. And when you observe, you will see how every minute there is the process of recognition going on, and how when you recognize, there is nothing new.

Truth is something that is timeless, that is not measurable by words. Since truth is measureless, timeless, mind cannot recognize it. Therefore, for Truth to be, it is imperative that the mind should be in a state of non-experiencing. Truth must come to you, the mind, you cannot go to it. If you go to it, you will experience it. You cannot invite Truth. When you invite when you experience, you are in the position of recognizing it; when you recognize it, it is not Truth; it is only your own process of memory, of thought that says 'It is so, I have read, I have experienced'. Therefore, knowledge is not the way to Truth. Knowledge must be understood and put away for Truth to be. If your mind is quiet, not asleep, not drugged by words, but actually pursuing, observing the process of the mind, then you will see that quietness comes into being darkly, mysteriously; and in that state of stillness, you will see that which is eternal, immeasurable.

Question: There is an urge in every one of us to see God, Reality, Truth. Is not the search for beauty the same as the search for reality? Is ugliness evil?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, do realize you cannot seek God. You cannot seek Truth. Because, if you seek, what you will find is not Truth. Your search is the desire to find that which you want. How can you seek something of which you do not know? You seek something of which you have read, which you call Truth; or you are seeking something which inwardly you have a feeling for. Therefore, you must understand the motive of your search, which is far more important than the search for Truth.

Why are you seeking, and what are you seeking? You would not seek if you are happy, if there was joy in your heart. Because

we are empty we are seeking. We are frustrated, miserable, violent, full of antagonism; that is why we want to go away from that and seek some thing which would be more. Do watch yourselves and realize what I am saying to you, not merely listening to words. In order to escape from your present psychological conflicts, miseries, antagonisms, you say 'I am seeking Truth'. You will not find Truth because Truth does not come when you are escaping from reality, from that which is. You have to understand that. To understand that, you must not go to seek the answer outside. So you cannot seek Truth. It must come to you. You cannot beckon God, you cannot go to Him. Your worship, devotion, is utterly valueless because you want something, you put up the begging bowl for Him to fill. So, you are seeking someone to fill your emptiness. And you are interested more in the word than in the thing. But if you are content with that extraordinary state of loneliness without any deviation or distraction, then only that which is eternal comes into being.

Most of us are so conditioned, so trained, that we want to escape; and the thing to which we escape, we call beauty. We are seeking beauty through something - through dance, through rituals, through prayer, through discipline, through various forms of formulations, through painting, through sensation. Are we not? So as long as we are seeking beauty through something, through man, woman or child, through some sensation, we shall never have beauty because the thing through which we seek, becomes all important. Not beauty, but the object through which we seek it, becomes all important, and then we cling to that. Beauty is not found through something; that would be merely a sensation which

is exploited by the cunning. Beauty comes into being through inward regeneration, when there is complete, radical transformation of the mind. For that, you require an extraordinary state of sensitivity.

Ugliness is an evil only when there is no sensitivity. If you are sensitive to the beautiful, denying the ugly, then you are not sensitive to the beautiful. What is important is not ugliness or beauty, but that there should be sensitivity which sees, which reacts to the so-called ugly as well as to the beautiful. But if you are only aware of the beautiful and deny the ugly, then it is like cutting off one arm; then your whole existence is unbalanced. Don't you shut out the evil, deny it, call it ugly, fight it, be violent about it? You are only concerned with the beautiful, you want it. In that process, you lose the sensitivity.

The man that is sensitive to both the ugly and the beautiful, goes beyond, far away from the things through which he seeks Truth. But, we are not sensitive to either beauty or ugliness; we are so enclosed by our own thoughts, by our own prejudices, by our own ambitions, greed's, envies. How can a mind be sensitive, that is ambitious spiritually or in any other direction? There can be sensitivity only when the whole process of desire is completely understood; for, desire is a self-enclosing process, and through enclosing, you cannot see the horizon. The mind then is stifled by its own 'becoming'. Such a mind can only appreciate beauty through something. Such a mind is not a beautiful mind. Such a mind is not a good mind, it is an ugly mind which is enclosed and is seeking its own perpetuation. Such a mind can never find beauty. Only when the mind ceases to enclose itself by its own ideals and

pursuits and ambitions, such a mind is beautiful.

January 27, 1952

MADRAS 9TH PUBLIC TALK 2ND FEBRUARY 1952

As I was saying last Saturday the problem of deterioration of the mind is a grave one. It not only affects the older generation but also the young people. This deterioration is a common factor throughout the world.

This deterioration is bound to come when there is the exercise of the will in action, the will being the choice between two opposites, the essential and the non-essential, the desire to be or to become. Obviously, the will is a deteriorating factor in our life and most of us would not admit it because we have been brought up through our educational and psychological systems, through our religion and so on, to use the will as a means of achieving, of acquiring, of gaining an end in which is involved the whole process of choosing. Is it not one of the major factors in our life which brings about deterioration, repetition, imitation, conformity of idea?

What I would like this evening, if we can experiment, is to go into this whole problem of the mind, mind as a repetitive machine, as a store house of memory, guiding, shaping controlling and therefore producing no creative action, mind as a process of consciousness which when thwarted becomes the 'I', the 'me'. The self-conscious individual seeks fulfilment and therefore, in the very desire for fulfilment, there is frustration, from which arises sorrow.

One of the major factors of deterioration is the process of thought which is repetitive, imitative, conforming; because, we know what happens when we are repetitive, conforming and

imitative; the mind becomes merely a machine automatically responding, functioning, reacting according to circumstances, according to memory like a physical machine put together. All that, we know. We do not know any other process. Our thinking is purely repetitive; though we think it is a new idea, a new reaction, it is a process of the past in conjunction with the present. You can only meet the present with the screen, the limitation of the past. So, if you watch your mind, you will see it is conforming, it is repetitive, it is imitating.

Here arises the problem of how you listen. Are you listening to me at the verbal level or are you watching what I am saying with what is actually happening in your mental process? Are you merely responding to the verbal vibration or are you watching, which is a stimulation of what I am saying? It is a very important thing that you should go slowly into this matter and as you have got a full hour before you, you can go into it very carefully. If you are watching your own mind using me, using what I am saying, as a mirror and therefore observing, then what I am saying will be of extraordinary significance. But if you are merely listening, then you are imitating; you are merely responding to the words; words create an image and the pursuit of that image is referred to as thinking, which is 'I', the 'me' stimulating you to observe. Therefore that stimulation becomes weary, dull; but whereas if you observe your own thinking in relation to what I am saying, then you will discover whether your mind is merely repetitive or it is something beyond the mechanical quality of a machine. I hope you have understood the point. Have I made myself clear?

The question we are discussing is the deteriorating factor of the

mind, whether in the old or in the young. This deteriorating factor is observed as we grow older; old age is to most of us a problem, because we see the mind obviously deteriorating. You may not be conscious of it; but others may be conscious of the deterioration in you.

The application of the ideal as a means of action is an imitative, repetitive, conforming process like tradition. You may throw off the outward tradition, being forced by the modern economic pressure; but inwardly, you are still following tradition which is repetitive, conforming. So, the problem is: 'Is the mind merely a machine incapable of going beyond this mechanical quality, or can the mind be made to be non-mechanical?' That is, we have so far used the mind as a machine to achieve a result, to be something, to gain something, in which process conformity or repetition is essential. If I want to be successful, I must conform, I must repeat, I must imitate. So, we have used the machinery of the mind which is a thought process, as a way of bringing about the desired end. That is, we want to produce a certain end, and we use the thought process as the machine like the one we find in a factory. The machine is the mind; and when we want a result, we use it. In this process, the mind becomes merely repetitive.

Is not repetition, imitation, a sign of disintegration, which is observable as we grow older. You can see how old people talk, the same thing over and over again, the same beliefs, the continuity, crystallized, stabilized and held firmly. All these are signs of deterioration. Are they not? Don't ask what would happen to society or what would happen to our relationship if there was no repetition or conformity. We will find that out. A mind that thinks

about what will happen if one is not mechanical, is obviously a mind already in the process of deterioration.

It is very important for us to go into this matter very carefully and with intelligence, because we see more and more how the old people govern the young - not that the young are very much more intelligent, but we are observing the fact. All the government places, all the religious positions and all other high offices are filled by people who are in their sixties and seventies. The perfect bureaucratic machine which the average citizen worships, is made up of these old people. Don't apply this to any particular person, please. I see several of you smiling at the idea of your old leaders or some other particular person being referred to as repetitive. Well, aren't you yourself repetitive? We are discussing, not any individual, but this whole process of repetition and deterioration.

Is the mind which is the only instrument we have, merely to be used as a machine, routine-ridden, repeating and conforming? How is the mind to be made non-mechanical? That is, how to remove the factor or factors that bring about deterioration? Surely, this is an important question. Is it not? This seems to me to be one of the gravest issues in the present crisis of our culture - the world culture and not the Madras culture, the whole cultural process - because every sensation, every experience, every problem becomes repetitive.

Is it possible for the mind to free itself from this mechanical process? What do we mean by the mechanical process? Is not thought itself, please follow this, a factor of deterioration? We mean by thought a verbalizing reaction to experience. I am not defining, so don't learn the definitions. Is not thought the

verbalizing process of memory, the memory being the past in conjunction with the present? Please watch your own mind. Don't listen to me verbally, but watch the process of your thinking. That is what we are discussing. It is not my problem; it is a problem which you and I must solve. Unless we are creative in a wholly different sense, all our education, religious system, political system, civilization, ideas are utterly useless because they contain deteriorating factors. So, it is a problem which you and I must solve; to solve it, we must consider this question of thought. That is the only instrument we have, or that is the only instrument which we are using. If that instrument is not valid in the process of bringing about integrated society, integrated beings, there must be some other means. That is what we are out to discover.

As I was saying, is not thought a process which is the continuation of the past modified by the present response? What is our thinking? It is memory in action. Please do not ask what we would do if we had no memory. That is not the problem. If you have no memory, you will be locked up for suffering from amnesia. Our problem is this. Thought is repetitive; the thought process is the result of continued response according to a certain background, which can only produce mechanical results; and therefore it is merely a process of repetition. Can thought be any other factor than deterioration? We think thought will produce a new sensation, a new way of living, a new culture and so on. That is, we think intellect which is thought, is the way of creation. If that is not, then what have we?

The mind which is so accustomed to the thought process, the mind which is thought itself, which is accumulated memory,

responding to every experience, observable and non-observable, conscious and unconscious, is certainly repetitive. The whole content of consciousness as we function now, is thus repetitive. I think that is fairly clear. Is it not? When you seek to go beyond the repetitive, you will find that the projection of that thought, that image, is all the outcome of the past, and that which you pursue as the ideal, is the outcome of the past. Therefore, the whole content of consciousness, whether we are conscious of it or not, is a mechanical process. I mean by mechanical process a response of the past conditioned by the present, which is nothing but repetitive.

Please do not learn the definition, because definitions are not going to solve the problem. What we have to do is to find out how the mind, how the whole machinery of the mind can be changed so that it is not repetitive. After all, creation at any level, truth, is non-repetitive. So the mind, to recognize the truth, must be non-repetitive.

Take a very simple example. You have an experience of the beauty of a flower, or of the sunset, or of the shade of a tree. At the moment of experiencing, there is no recognition; there is only a state of being. As that moment slips away, you begin to give it a name; you say 'How beautiful that was!' That is, a process of recognition comes into being, and there is the desire for repetition of that sensation. This is simple and not complicated; just follow it and you will see. I see the tree lit by the evening sun; at that moment there is perception, experience and there is nothing more; it is a state of being which is not describable. Then, as the state of being moves forward, I give it a name and thereby recognize it; and that creates a sensation in me. Then I say 'How beautiful, how

marvellous that feeling was. I want to repeat that sensation. So, I begin next evening to look at the tree in the evening light, and there is a certain vague sensation that I want it. So, I have set the repetitive machinery going.

You watch your own process of mind and you will see the truth of this. You have a beautiful statue in your room, or a picture. The first moment, it gives a great delight; you see something extraordinary and the mind captures it. You then say 'I want more of it'. So you sit down in front of the picture or image, and repeat; you hope to repeat that sensation. You have therefore set the mechanical process of the mind going; it is not only at the conscious level, but more profoundly; it brings about conflict, struggle.

Our mind is used to routine, repetition, imitation, conformity; and it knows nothing else. If it perceives something, it immediately wants to make it a daily affair. That is clear, is it not? Nobody denies this. This is a psychological, observable fact of our daily existence.

Now, how can the mind which is the only instrument we have, not be mechanical? First of all, how few of us have asked this question? Or, how few of us are aware of this whole problem? Now that I put it in front of you and that you are aware of it, what is your response? I observe this whole process, and do I know anything else? I do not, obviously. That is, if I said there was something else, it would still be a process of thought, which is a projection of the past into the present. This is a very complex problem because in this is involved the whole process of naming the giving of symbols and the importance of words, not only

neurologically but psychologically, not only at the conscious level but at the deeper level. That is the deteriorating factor.

Can the mind which is so much used to function mechanically, stop? This machinery has to be stopped before you can find an answer. If you project the answer either according to Marx or Bhagavad Gita, then you are repetitive and destructive. Can the mind which has been going on for centuries, stop? The `me' is the result of the whole human being, rather, of the whole humankind, and the mind involves the `me'. Can that process of the mind, can that machinery which is so cunning, so devouring, so urgently demanding, so mighty, stop? That is, can it come to an end? If it cannot, you cannot find out the answer.

If you use the mind, then you are only continuing thought as a means of achieving something. Please watch it. If you are tired, do not listen. If you are not tired, just watch it. Can the machinery which has been functioning for generations, centuries, can that come voluntarily to an end - not forced, cornered or compelled? If you are compelled, then your response will be one of continuance and there fore of thought.

How will the mind come to an end? That is an important question but you do not know how to solve it. The mind must be stopped so that it can jump to the other state. You cannot let it function mechanically and jump. In speculation, it is the past responding, and there is nothing new. A mind that is mechanical, can never find anything new. It must come to an end. Now how is this to be done? Is that the right question? The `how' is important. You are following all this? We know the mind is mechanical. Then the next response is: How am I to stop it? In putting this question,

the mind has become mechanical. Do you follow? That is, I want a result, the means is there, and I follow it. What has happened? The `how' is the response of a mechanical mind, the response of the old; and the following or the practicing of the `how' is the continuation of the machine. See how false our thinking has become. We are always concerned with the past, the how, the way, the practice and so on. You see all this process. The `how' is empty, and an enquiring mind really becomes the old repetitive mind through the practice of this `how'.

There are two different states of the mind, one pursuing the `how' and the other enquiring and not seeking a result. The mind which enquires, which pursues in research, will only help us. Enquiry and seeking a result are two entirely different states. Now which is the state of your mind, the one that seeks a result or the one that is enquiring? If you seek a result, you are merely pursuing mechanically; then, there is no end; that leads to deterioration and destruction. That is obvious.

Is your mind really enquiring to find out the answer whether the mind can come to an end, not how to make it come to an end? The `how' is entirely different from the `can'. Can it? Have you put that question yourselves? If you have, with what motive, with what intention, with what purpose have you put it? That is very important. If you have put the question `can it?' with the motive that you want a result of which you are conscious, then you are back again in the mechanical process. So, you have to be extraordinarily alert and extremely subtle to answer that question - not to me but to yourself. If you really put the question without the intention to find out what happens, if you enquire, you will find

that your mind is not seeking a result, it is waiting for an answer; it is not speculating about a answer; it is not desiring for an answer; it is not hoping for an answer; it is waiting.

Look at this. I ask you a question; what is your response? Your immediate response is to think, to reason, to look, to find out a clever argument to reply. Question and response is a daily observable psychological action, verbally and psychologically. That is, you are not answering, you are responding, you are giving what are the reasons; in other words, you are seeking an answer. If you want to find out the answer to a question, the response is mechanical, other than waiting. That is, the mind that waits for an answer to come is non-mechanical, because the answer must be something which you don't know; the answer which you know is mechanical. But if you are faced with the question and you wait for the answer, then you will see your mind is entirely in a different state. Waiting is more important than answer. You stand? Then, mind is no longer mechanical but quite a different process; it is quite a different thing that comes into being without being invited.

Question: You said that it is our idea of fear that stands in the way of facing it. How is one to overcome fear?

Krishnamurti: First of all, one must be conscious of it, one must be aware of it. Are you? May we try together and experiment? Let us see, in our explaining this thing, whether fear will not completely go away from us. I am going to take you on the journey. If you willingly come, so much the better. If you are willing to come, let us go to the end of it, not stop in the middle of it.

We know various forms of fear - fear of public opinion, fear of

death of someone, fear of what people will say, fear of losing an object; there are innumerable forms of fear. You ask 'How am I to overcome fear'? Can you overcome anything? You know what is meant by overcoming conquering, being on top of it, suppressing it, going beyond it. When you overcome something, you have still again to conquer it, haven't you? So the very process of overcoming is a continuation of constant conquering. You cannot overcome your enemy because, in the very over coming, you strengthen the enemy. That is one factor.

We are concerned with understanding fear and seeking the implications of it. We are going to take the journey together. How does fear come into being? Is it the word 'fear' or the fact of fear? You understand? Is it the word that is causing me fear, or the fact of some thing in relationship to something else? Which is causing fear? It is not complex, it is very simple if you watch.

Am I afraid of the word 'fear'? We are going to find out. Now what happens when one is afraid? The obvious reaction is to run away from it in many ways - drink, women, temple, master, beliefs; they are all at the same level, they are no better, no worse. A man who runs away from fear through drink, is as righteous as one who runs away from fear through virtue. Sociologically, it may have different values; but they are all the same, mentally, psychologically.

What is the reaction to fear? To escape from it. That is, our reaction to fear is condemnation, is it not?, or justification. Am I really afraid? Do I think of the term 'I am afraid of' when I am running away from it? Obviously not. I cannot understand fear if I run away from it, if I justify or condemn it, or even if I identify

myself, or say 'I am afraid', and reason. So if I am to understand fear, there must be no escape. And our mind is made up of escapes. So mind is unwilling to face that thing, understand, respond to, discover what is causing fear; and so I run away from it.

What is then important, fear or running away from it? What is the most important thing in our life when there is fear? Running away from it, is it not? Not how to dissolve fear, but how to escape from it. I am more concerned with escapes rather than understanding. And can I understand it when I am looking in the other direction? I can look at it when I am completely concentrating about it. Is there any possibility of complete awareness, full concentration of it, when I am all the time dreading it? Obviously not.

To understand fear, you don't run away by suppression, domination, by belief, virtue and so on. Then, you are nearer to the fact which is causing you fear. What is your relationship to it? Is it verbal? - verbal in the sense that the mind speculates about it and is afraid of the speculation, the mind foresees and says 'if that happens, this will happen; and therefore I am afraid'. So what is your relationship to it? Follow this closely, because on that relationship depends your solution. Are you related to what is causing fear, merely verbally - that is, speculatively - , or are you confronting it without speculation, which is non-verbalization? If you are related to it verbally, you have no direct communication with it, you have escaped from it. If you confront it, you have ceased to run away, there is no escape whatsoever.

Let us next consider the relationship of words and their meaning. Is fear caused by the word or by the fact? Do you

understand? The word being the mind, the mind is creating a screen through verbalization and not facing it. So, is fear created by the word - that is, the mind by thinking about it, thought being the process of verbalization? If so, your thought about it is to escape from it. Otherwise, you are facing the fact without verbalization, without thought process, without escape; then you are directly in relationship with it, directly in communion with it.

When you are directly in communion with something, what happens? Have you been directly in communion with anything without thought process, have you? Obviously not. When you are, the thing which you have named as fear, has ceased to be. It is these screens, these escapes, this verbalization, this mental process, that create fear, not the fact itself. So these screens between you and the fact are productive of fear, not the fact; there is no overcoming of the fact. If you see the whole process and have followed this step by step, you will see you have no fear. Then, you are observing the fact, and the fact is going to alter, the fact is going to take action and not you in movement towards an escape.

Question: How can the thinker and the thought be united?

Krishnamurti: The `how' is a school boy's question. But we are going to find out if it is possible to bring together the two separating processes of things at work. First, we know the thinker and the thought are separate. Are we aware of it? To you, the thinker and the thought are two separate entities; and you want to find out if they can be brought together. If the thinker is separate and always dominating thought, thought is always crippled and the thinker is always conquering. There will be no alleviation, there will be constant battle between the thinker and the thought. I want

to find out if it is possible for the two to be together so that there is no division, no battle; because I see that it is only when there is no struggle, there is something new.

Violence does not produce peace; it is only when violence is not, peace is. Similarly, I have to find out if the thinker and the thought are two separate entities, eternally dividing, never brought together.

You and I are going to take the journey of discovering and really experiencing the fact. We know that the thinker and the thought are separate. Most of us have never even thought about it, we take it for granted. It is only when somebody outside of you asks the question, then you are enquiring. I am asking, and therefore you are enquiring, you are taking the journey of enquiry.

Taking the journey is understanding of `what is', what is actually taking place, not what you would like, but what actually happens.

Why are the thought and the thinker separate? Not that they should not be or must not be, but why are they separate? They are separate because of habit. We have not doubted it; we have accepted it, taken it for granted; therefore, it has become a habit for us. The thinker is separate from his thought and the struggle between the two, the domination of the thinker over the thought, is our daily habit - habit being routine, repetitive. That is a fact, is it not?

What would happen if the thinker and the thought were not separate? My mind is used to this habit. What would happen to my mind if this habit stops? The mind would feel lost, would it not? It would be puzzled, bewildered by something unexpected,

something new; so the mind prefers to live in habit; so it says 'I keep my habit going. I don't know what would happen if these two come together, and I shall prefer the old things to continue'. So you are more interested in the continuation of habit, rather than in enquiring what would happen if they come together.

Why do we want the old to continue? For the obvious reason that we want security, certainty, some thing to hold on to; because it is the only thing we know. We are sure of the thinker and the thought. We have not thought of what would happen if they come together. Certainty makes us hold on to the old. That is a psychological fact, an observable fact. Our problem then is not how to bring the thinker and the thought together, but why the mind is seeking security, certainty. Can the mind exist without certainty, without seeking something to which it can hold on - knowledge, belief, what you will? The mind cannot be without the process of security. The mind that we know is secure; it is not interested in finding out; it is interested in being completely safe, completely secure.

Why does the mind seek security? Because you realize that thought suddenly changes any moment; there is no actuality in thought; so thought creates the thinker as a permanent entity which will go on indefinitely, so, in the thinker, it has vested interests. And so the mind has found security in the thinker, certainty which is the old habit.

Our problem then is whether the mind can ever have security, or is it only an illusion of security to which it clings. The mind has the power to create the illusion of security and clings to it; therefore, so long as it is seeking security, it cannot understand the other. So

long as the mind is not interested in discovering what will happen if the thinker and the thought come together, it would hold on to something it is already sure of.

So our problem is whether there is security, certainty. Is there? Obviously not - neither in God, nor in wife nor in property which you would want to have. There is no security. Of that you are not convinced; of that, you have had no experience. There is complete loneliness without any dependability, without anything on which the mind can rest, hold and cling to. Because the mind is afraid to be alone, it invents the thinker as a permanent entity that will continue. Or if the thinker is not, it would invent God, or property, or wife, any thing - a tree would do, a stone would do, a carved image.

The mind in its desire for security, has created the thinker as separate from the thought, and has accustomed itself to this division by habit; where there is habit there is permanence, and mind becomes mechanical. When you realize, not merely verbally but in actual experience, that the thinker is the result of thought, that it seeks permanency, that it seeks continuity, then you will see there is no effort by the mind to bring the two together. Then there is only a state of understanding, without any words, without the thought process of the thinker and the thought. For that, you must have an extraordinary insight into the whole process of consciousness which we have been considering this evening, which is the process of meditation. That meditation is only possible when the mind understands the whole content of consciousness, which is yourself.

February 2, 1952

MADRAS 10TH PUBLIC TALK 3RD FEBRUARY 1952

As I was saying yesterday, one of the fundamental causes of deterioration is the will in action. I also said that imitation, repetition, the mechanical response of the mind, of memory, is another factor of deterioration of the mind. Is not self-perpetuation one of the major factors that bring about destruction, deterioration of the mind?

We see that every religion, every philosophy, even the totalitarian state, desires to destroy the separative process of the mind. No revolution, no outward economic change, or the so-called inward discipline, has in any way destroyed or brought about the ending of the self. I think most of us perceive or are aware that the self must come to an end, not theoretically but actually. One can philosophize over it and speculate about it; most people do it only surreptitiously or with an aggressive purpose like most politicians by whom we are ruled, or like the rich men who control most of our outward economy, or like those who pursue the spiritual path. All of them in different forms, more subtly or more aggressively, pursue self-expansion. Is not that one of the vital factors that destroy the mind?

The only instrument we have is the mind. We have used it hitherto, wrongly. Is it possible now to bring to an end this whole process of the self with all its deteriorating factors, with all its destructive elements? I think most of us realize that the self is separative, destructive, antisocial; outwardly and inwardly, it is an isolating process in which no relationship is possible, in which

love cannot exist. We more or less feel this actually or superficially, but most of us are not aware of it. Is it possible to really bring that process to an end, not substitute it for something else, or postpone, or explain it away?

As we have seen, mere discipline, mere conformity, does not end the self; it only gives it a vital strength in another direction. Most intelligent people, thoughtful people, must have enquired into this. Apart from religious sanctions, totalitarian compunctions, injunctions and concentration camps, most of us must have asked if the self can really come to an end. When we do put that question to ourselves, the automatic, the natural response is the 'how'. How is it to come to an end? So to us, the 'how' becomes very important. Only the 'how', the practical way, the manner, matters to us. If we can examine a little more closely the whole question of the 'how' and its technique, perhaps we shall understand that the 'how', the practical way of achieving a result, will not end the self.

When we want to know the method of ending the self, the way how to bring it about, what is the process of the mind? Is there the 'how', the way of doing, the method, the system? If we do follow the system, does it end the self? Or, does it give strength in another direction? Most of us are anxious, particularly those who are somewhat earnest and religiously inclined, desire to know or find out the method of ending, the way of becoming, the way of achieving a result. If we look deeply into our hearts and mind, it is obvious that we would pursue the method of ending the self, should there be one.

Now, why does the mind ask the way, the technique, the method? Is not that an important question? What happens is this.

You have a system, a method, the 'how', the technique; and the mind shapes after the technique, the pattern. Does that end the self? You may have a very rigorous and disciplining method, or a method that will gradually ease you out of the conflict of self, a method that will give you solace; but essentially, the desire for a method only indicates really the strengthening of the self. Does it not? Please follow this closely and you will see whether or not the 'how' indicates a thought process, an imitative process, through which the mind, the self, can gather strength and have greater capacity and not end at all.

Take the question of envy. Most of us are envious at different levels, which causes untold misery to others and to ourselves; you have envy of the rich, envy of the learned, envy of the guru, envy of the man who achieves. Envy is the social motive, a drive in our existence. It is clothed sometimes in a religious form but essentially it is the same; it is the desire to be something, spiritually, economically. That is one of our major drives. Is there a method, a means, by which you can get rid of it? Our instinctive response, if we are at all thoughtful, is to find a way to make it come to an end or to bring it to an end. What happens? Can envy be brought to an end by a method, by a technique? Envy implies the desire to be something here or hereafter. You have not tackled the desire which makes you envious; but you have learned a way to cover up that desire by expressing it in another way; but essentially, it is still envy.

So, if you can understand this process of how we want a method to achieve a result, and if we also understand the mind that cultivates the technique, we can then see that essentially it is the

strengthening of thought. Thought is one of the major factors that bring about deterioration, because thought is a process of memory, which is verbalization of memory and is a conditioning influence. The mind that is seeking a way out of this confusion is only strengthening that thought process. So, what is important is, not to find a way or a method - because we have seen what the implications in it are - , but to be aware of the whole process of the mind.

Thought can never be independent; there is no independent thinking, because all thought is a process of conformity to the past. There is no independence or freedom through thinking. How can a mind which is essentially the result of the past, which is conditioned by various memories, climatically, socially and environmentally and so on, how can such a mind be independent? So, if you seek independence of thought, you are only perpetuating the self. What is the process of this independence? Most of us are lonely, and there is a constant craving for fulfilment. Being aware of this emptiness in ourselves, we seek various forms of escapes from it - religious, social; you know the whole business of escapes. As long as we do not solve that problem, the independence that we are seeking in thinking will only be the perpetuation of the self.

For most of us, creation is non-existent; we do not know what it means to create. Without that creativeness which is not of time, which is not of thought, we cannot bring about a vitally different culture, a different state of human relationship? Is it possible for the mind to be in that receptive state in which creativeness can take place? Thought is not creative; the man who pursues the idea can never be creative; the pursuit of an ideal is thought process and is

conditioned after the mind. So, how can the mind which is thought process, which is the result of time, which is the result of education, of influence, of pressure, of fear, of the search for reward, of the avoidance of punishment, how can such a mind be ever free so that creativeness can take place? When we put that question to ourselves, we want to know the method, the 'how', the practical way to achieve that mental freedom. Trying to know the 'how', the method, is the most absurd thing and is a school boy's affair. The 'how' implies always the method which is the pursuit of thought, the conformity to a particular technique. We see also that only when the mind with its thought process comes to an end, is there creation.

Surely, in the present crisis of the world and with the politicians and their cunning exploitations, creation is the most difficult thing to achieve. We do not want more theories, more ideals, more leaders, more and newer techniques, the means of supporting a pattern. The only minds that are creative are those of human beings that are integrated.

Is it possible for the mind which is the result of centuries of thought process, ever to be in that creative state? That is, can the thought ever receive, or ever cultivate, that creative urge? It seems to me that is one of the most important things we should ask ourselves, because the mere following of a pattern has not led us anywhere, socially or religiously. No leader can give us the real creative urge; no example can do that; every example is the expansion of the self, the hero is the expansion of the 'me' glorified. So is the pursuit of the ideal an expansion of my self, fulfilling of myself in an idea; it is continuation of thought as time,

and therefore there is no creative state. I think it is very important to find this out, to be aware how essential it is for each of us to discover for ourselves that creative spirit. The mind can never discover that, do what it will; thought can never understand or bring about that creative state.

What is that creative state? Surely it cannot be stated positively. To describe it is to limit it. The description will be a process of measuring; and to measure it is to use a thought process. Obviously it is so. Therefore thought can never capture it. It is of no value to describe it. But what we can do is to find out what are the barriers, by negatively approaching it, obliquely coming upon it. Most of us will object to it, because most of us are accustomed to be direct. 'Do this thing and you will get that' is the attitude that governs your approach. What we are discussing is not to describe that state, but to find out what you should do to discover for yourself the impediments that prevent that creative state, that extraordinary state in which the mind, the observer, is non-existent.

What is the first thing that stands in the way? Surely, the whole desire to be powerful, to dominate, stands in the way. The desire for power is a process which is separative; though it may be identified with the whole, with a country, or with a group, it is an isolating process. The impediment is the mind which is ambitious at any level - the so-called spiritual ambition, the mind of the politician, of the rich and of the poor man. All these persons desire to have more. The urge for more is the most destructive element that stands in the way. That is very difficult to grasp because the mind is so subtle. You may not seek power in the crude form, but you may seek it as a politician with his excuse of doing things in

the interests of the state; or you may be an electioneer. There are different forms of pursuit of power which are all essentially the will to be, the will to be come something, which expresses it self through virtue, through respectability, through the action of the mind, the sense of domination, the pride of having power.

So, one of the major factors, major barriers, is this desire for power, this desire for domination. Do watch in your own lives and you will see the separative, the destructive desire in action. That will obviously defeat love. It is only love that is our redemption. But you cannot have love if there is any sense of domination, any sense of the desire for power, position, authority, the will in action, the desire to achieve a result. We know all this. Vaguely we are aware of it also. We are caught in the stream of becoming, in the stream of desire for power; and we are incapable of stopping it and stepping out. To step out, there is no `how'. You see the full implications of power; and when you realize it fully, you step out; there is no `how'.

One of the hindrances that prevents creativeness is authority, authority of the example, the authority of the past, authority of experience, authority of knowledge, authority of belief. All these are impediments for a creative state. You do not have to accept what I am saying. You can observe it in your own life; and you will see how belief, knowledge and authority strengthen the separative process of the mind.

Obviously, another factor that prevents the creative state is repetition, imitation, perpetuation of an idea. Repetition is not only of sensation but of rituals, vain repetition of the pursuit of knowledge, repetition of experience, which have no significance at

all. All these are hindrances. There is no new experience. All experience is a process of recognition. When there is no recognition, there is no experience; and the process of recognition is a process of the mind, which is verbalization.

Another factor that divides us from that creative state is this desire for a method, the `how', the way, practicing something so that our mind can achieve a result; this is a process of continuity, repetition; and the mind which is caught in repetition, can never be creative.

So, if you can see all that, then you will find that it is the mind actually that is preventing the creative state from coming into being.

So when the mind is aware of its own movement, mind comes to an end. It is only then that the creative state can be; it is the only salvation because that creative state is love. Love has nothing to do with sentiment. It has nothing to do with sensation. It is not a product of thought, nor can the mind manufacture it. Mind can only create images, images of sensation, of experience; and images are not love. We do not know what it means though we use that word very freely. But we know sensation; and it is the very nature of the mind to feel sensation, and pursue sensation through images, through words, through every form of conceit. But the mind can never know love; and yet we have cultivated the mind for centuries.

It is extremely arduous for the mind to see all this process so that the experiencer is never apart from the experienced. It is this division between the observer and the observed that is the process of thought. In love, there is no experiencer or the experienced. And

as we do not know it and as that is the only redemption, surely an earnest man must watch the whole process of the mind, the hidden and the open. That is very arduous. Most of us are wasting our energies through climate, through diet, through idle gossip - I am sorry, there is no idle gossip, there is only gossip - through our envy. We have not the time for enquiry. It is only through meditative search, that we can have awareness of the mind and its content; then, the mind comes to an end and love can be.

Question: How is man to fulfil himself if he has no ideals?

Krishnamurti: Is there such a thing as fulfilment, though most of us seek fulfilment? We know, we try to fulfil ourselves through family, through son, through brother, through wife, through property, through identification with a country or a group, or through pursuit of an ideal, or through the desire for continuity of the 'me'. There are various, different forms of fulfilment at different levels of consciousness.

Is there such a thing as fulfilment? What is the thing that is fulfilling? What is the entity that is seeking to be in or through certain identification? When do you think of fulfilment? When are you seeking fulfilment?

As I said, this is not a talk at the verbal level. If you treat it at verbal level, then go away; it is a waste of time. But if you want to go deeply, then pursue, then be alert and follow it; because we need intelligence, not dead repetition, not repetition of phrases, words and examples with which we are feed up.

What we need is creation, intelligent integrated creation; which means, you have to search it out directly through your own understanding of the mind process.

So in listening to what I am saying, relate it to yourself directly, experience what I am talking about. And you cannot experience it through my words. You can experience it only when you are capable, when you are earnest, when you observe your own thinking, your own feeling.

When is desire to be fulfilled? When are you conscious of this urge to be, to become, to fulfil? Please watch yourself. When are you conscious of it? Are you not conscious of it when you thwart it? Are you not aware of it when you feel extraordinary loneliness, a sense of inexhaustible nothingness, of yourself not being something. You are aware of this urge for fulfilment only when you feel an emptiness, loneliness. And then, you pursue fulfilment through innumerable forms, through sect, through relationship with property, with trees, with everything at different layers of consciousness. The desire to be, to identify, to fulfil, exists only when there is consciousness of the `me' being empty, lonely. The desire to fulfil is an escape from that which we call loneliness. So our problem is not how to fulfil, or what is fulfilment; because there is no such thing as fulfilment. The `me' can never fulfil; it is always empty; you may have a few sensations when you are achieving a result; but the moment the sensations have gone you are back again in that empty state. So you begin to pursue the same process as before.

So the `me' is the creator of that emptiness. The `me' is the empty; the `me' is a self-enclosing process in which we are aware of that extraordinary loneliness. So being aware of that, we are trying to run away through various forms of identification. These identifications we call fulfillments. Actually, there is no fulfilment

because mind, the `me', can never fulfil; it is the very nature of the `me' to be self-enclosing.

So what is the mind which is aware of that emptiness, to do? That is your problem, is it not? For most of us, this ache of emptiness is extraordinarily strong. We do anything to escape from it. Any illusion is sufficient, and that is the source of illusion. Mind has the power to create illusion. And as long as we do not understand that aloneness, that state of self-enclosing emptiness - do what you will, seek whatever fulfilment you will - there is always that barrier which divides, which knows no completeness.

So our difficulty is to be conscious of this emptiness, of this loneliness. We are never face to face with it. We do not know what it looks like, what its qualities are; because we are always running away from it, with drawing, isolating, identifying. We are never face to face, directly, in communion with it. We then are the observer and the observed. That is, the mind, `the I', observes that emptiness; and the I, the thinker, then proceeds to free itself from that emptiness or to run away.

So, is that emptiness, loneliness different from the observer? Is not the observer himself empty and not that he observes emptiness? Because, if the observer was not capable of recognizing that state which he calls loneliness, there would be no experience. He is empty; he cannot act upon it, he can do nothing about it. Because, if he does anything what ever, he becomes the observer acting upon the observed, which is a false relationship.

So when the mind recognizes, realizes, is aware, that it is empty and that it cannot act upon it, then, that emptiness of which we are aware from outside, has a different meaning. So far, we have

approached it as the observer. Now the observer himself is empty, alone, is lonely. Can he do anything about it? Obviously, he cannot. Then his relationship to it is entirely different from that of the relationship of the observer. He has that aloneness. He is in that state in which there is no verbalization that 'I am empty'. The moment he verbalizes it or externalizes it, he is different from that. So when verbalization ceases, when the experiencer ceases as experiencing loneliness, when he ceases to run away, then he is entirely lonely, his relationship is in itself loneliness; he is himself that; and when he realizes that fully, surely, that emptiness, loneliness, ceases to be.

But loneliness is entirely different from aloneness. That loneliness must be passed to be alone. Loneliness is not comparable with aloneness. The man who knows loneliness can never know that which is alone. Are you in that state of aloneness? Our minds are not integrated to be alone. The very process of the mind is separative. And that which separates knows loneliness.

But aloneness is not separative. It is something which is not the many, which is not influenced by the many, which is not the result of the many, which is not put together as the mind is; the mind is of the many. Mind is not an entity that is alone, being put together, brought together, manufactured through centuries. Mind can never be alone. Mind can never know aloneness. But being aware of the loneliness when going through it, there comes into being that aloneness. Then only can there be that which is immeasurable. Unfortunately most of us seek dependence. We want companions, we want friends, we want to live in a state of separation, in a state which brings about conflict. That which is alone can never be in a

state of conflict. But mind can never perceive that, can never understand that, it can only know loneliness.

Question: You said that Truth can come only when one can be alone and can love sorrow. This is not clear. Kindly explain what you mean by being alone and loving sorrow?

Krishnamurti: Most of us are not in communion with anything. We are not directly in communion with our friends, with our wives, with our children. We are not in communion with anything directly. There are always barriers - mental, imaginary, and actual. And this separateness is the cause, obviously, of sorrow. Don't say 'Yes, that we have read, that we know verbally'. But if you are capable of experiencing it directly, you will see that sorrow cannot come to an end by any mental process. You can explain sorrow away, which is a mental process; but sorrow is still there, though you may cover it up

So to understand sorrow, surely you must love it, must you not? That is, you must be in direct communion with it. If you would understand something - your neighbour, your wife, or any relationship - , if you would understand something completely, you must be near it. You must come to it without any objection, prejudice, condemnation or repulsion; you must look at it, must you not? If I would understand you, I must have no prejudices about you; I must be capable of looking at you, not through barriers, screens of my prejudices and conditioning's; I must be in communion with you, which means, I must love you. Similarly, if I would understand sorrow, I must love it, I must be in communion with it. I can not do so because I am running away from it through explanations, through theories, through hopes, through

postponements, which are all the process of verbalization. So words prevent me from being in communion with sorrow. Words prevent me - words of explanations, rationalizations, which are still words, which are the mental process - , from being directly in communion with sorrow. It is only when I am in communion with sorrow, I understand it.

The next step is: Am I who is the observer of sorrow, different from sorrow? Am I, the thinker, the experiencer, different from sorrow? I have externalized it in order to do something about it, in order to avoid, in order to conquer, in order to run away. Am I different from that which I call sorrow? Obviously not. So I am sorrow, not that there is sorrow and I am different. I am 'sorrow'. Then only is there possibility of ending sorrow.

As long as I am the observer of sorrow, there is no ending of sorrow. But when there is the realization that sorrow is the me, the observer himself is the sorrow - which is an extraordinarily difficult thing to experience, to be aware of, because for centuries we have divided this thing - , when the mind realizes it is itself sorrow - not when it is observing sorrow, not when it is feeling sorrow - , it is itself the creator of sorrow, it is itself the feeler of sorrow, it is itself sorrow, then there is the ending of sorrow. This requires, not tradition or thinking, but very alert, watchful, intelligent awareness. That intelligent integrated state is aloneness. When the observer is the observed, then it is the integrated state. And in that aloneness, in that state of being completely alone, full, when the mind is not seeking anything, neither seeking reward nor avoiding punishment, when the mind is truly still, not seeking, not groping, only then, that which is not measured by the mind, comes

into being.

February 3, 1952

MADRAS 11TH PUBLIC TALK 9TH FEBRUARY 1952

During the past several weeks that we have met, we have been considering the problems that affect our whole being, not at any one particular level but the whole process of consciousness, the way of thinking and the effects that produce the false process of thought. We see that the process of thinking is a deteriorating factor. Perhaps this may be, for those who are here for the first time, rather startling or surprising; or they may think that it is rather an idiotic statement; but those who have been earnestly pursuing these talks, need no further explanations. For, explanations are really detrimental to understanding; we are so easily fed by words; we are so easily satisfied by explanations, by a sound sensation; the oft-repeated explanation, or the word is sufficient to make the mind dull.

So, those who have carefully and somewhat seriously followed these talks will, I think, have observed or be aware that thinking, as we now practice it, indulge in it, is one of the major factors that divide man from man; it is one of the factors that bring about no action that postpone action; because ideas are the result of thought and they can never produce action. There is a gap between idea and thought, and our difficulty is to bridge the gap into which we have fallen.

I would like to discuss or consider this evening this question of self-deception, the delusions that the mind indulges in and imposes upon itself and upon others; that is a very serious matter, especially in a crisis of this kind which the world is facing. But in order to

understand this whole problem of self-deception, we must follow it, not merely verbally, not at the verbal level, but intrinsically, fundamentally and deeply. As I was saying, we are too easily satisfied with words and counter-words; we are worldly; and being world wise, all that we can do is to hope that something will happen. We see that the explanation of war does not stop war; there are innumerable historians, theologians and religious people explaining war and how it comes into being; but wars still go on, perhaps more destructive than ever. Those of us who are really earnest, must go beyond the word, must seek this fundamental revolution within oneself; that is the only remedy which can bring about a lasting, fundamental redemption of mankind.

Similarly, when we are discussing this kind of self-deception, I think we should guard ourselves against any superficial explanations and rejoinders; we should, if I may suggest, not merely listen to a speaker, but follow the problem as we know it in our daily life; that is, we should watch ourselves in thinking and in action, watch ourselves how we affect others and how we proceed to act from ourselves.

What is the reason, the basis, for self-deception? How many of us are aware actually that we are deceiving ourselves? Before we can answer the question 'What is self-deception and how does it arise?', must we not be aware that we are deceiving our selves? Do we know that we are deceiving ourselves? What do we mean by this deception? I think it is very important; because the more we are deceived, the more we deceive ourselves, the greater is the strength in the deception which gives us a certain vitality, a certain energy, a certain capacity which entails the imposing of my

deception on others. So, gradually I am not only imposing deception on myself but on others. It is an interacting process of self deception. Are we aware of this process because we think we are very capable of thinking clearly, purposefully and directly. Are we aware that, in this process of thinking, there is self-deception?

Is not thought itself a process of search, a seeking of justification, seeking security, self-protection, a desire to be well thought of, a desire to have position, prestige and power? Is not this desire to be, politically or religious-sociologically, the very cause of self-deception? The moment I want something other than the purely materialistic, do I not produce, do I not bring about, a state which easily accepts? Take for example this: I want to know what happens after death, which many of us are interested in - the older we are, the more interested we are. We want to know the truth of it. How will we find it? Certainly not by reading, nor through the different explanations.

Then, how will you find it out? First, you must purge your mind completely of every factor that is in the way - every hope, every desire to continue, every desire to find out what is on that side. Because, the mind is constantly seeking security, it has the desire to continue, and hopes for a means of fulfilment, for a future existence. Such a mind, though it is seeking the truth of life after death, reincarnation or whatever it is, is incapable of discovering that truth. Is it not? What is important is, not whether reincarnation is true or not, but how the mind seeks justification, through self-deception, of a fact which may or may not be. So, what is important is the approach to the problem, with what motivation, with what urge, with what desire you come to it.

The seeker is always imposing upon himself this deception; no one can impose it upon him; he himself does it. We create deception and then we become slaves to it. So, the fundamental factor of self-deception is this constant desire to be something in this world and in the world hereafter. We know the result of wanting to be something in this world; it is utter confusion where each is competing with the other, each is destroying the other in the name of peace; you know the whole game we play with each other, which is an extraordinary form of self-deception. Similarly, we want security in the other world, a position.

So, we begin to deceive ourselves the moment there is this urge to be, to become or to achieve. That is very difficult for the mind to be free from. That is one of the basic problems of our life. Is it possible to live in this world and be nothing? Because, then only there is freedom from all deception, because then only the mind is not seeking a result, the mind is not seeking a satisfactory answer, the mind is not seeking any form of justification, the mind is not seeking security in any form, in any relationship. That takes place only when the mind realizes the possibilities and subtleties of deception, and therefore, with understanding, the mind abandons every form of justification, security - which means, the mind is capable then of being completely nothing. Is that possible?

Surely as long as we deceive ourselves in any form, there can be no love. As long as the mind is capable of creating and imposing upon itself a delusion, it obviously separates itself from collective or integrated understanding. That is one of our difficulties; we do not know how to cooperate; all that we know is to work together towards an end which both of us bring into being. Surely, there can

be cooperation only when you and I have no common aim created by thought. Go slowly with me because I see several people are not following me. What is important to realize is that cooperation is only possible when you and I do not desire to be anything. When you and I desire to be something, then belief and all the rest of it become necessary, a self-projected utopia is necessary; but if you and I are anonymously creating without any self-deception, without any barriers of belief and knowledge, without a desire to be secure, then there is true cooperation.

Is it possible for us to cooperate, for us to be together without an end, without a result, which you and I are not seeking? Can you and I work together without seeking a result? Surely that is true cooperation. Is it not? If you and I think out, work out, plan out a result, and we are working together towards that result, then what is the process involved in it? Our minds are meeting, our thoughts, our intellectual minds are of course meeting; emotionally, the whole being may be resisting it, which brings about deception, which brings about conflict between you and me. It is an obvious and observable fact in our every day life. You and I agree to do a certain piece of work intellectually; but unconsciously, deeply, you and I are at battle with each other; I want a result to my satisfaction; I want to dominate; I want my name to be ahead of yours though I am said to be working with you. So, we both who are creators of that plan, are really opposing each other, even though outwardly you and I agree as to the plan; inwardly, we are at battle with each other, though consciously we may agree.

So, is it not important to find out whether you and I can cooperate, commune, live together in a world where you and I are

nothing; whether we are able really and truly to cooperate, not at the superficial level but fundamentally? That is one of our greatest problems, perhaps the greatest. I identify myself with an object and you identify your self with the same object; both of us are interested in it; both of us are intending to bring it about. Surely, this process of thinking is very superficial, because through identification, we bring about separation - which is so obvious in our every day life. You are a Hindu and I a Catholic; we both preach brotherhood and we are at each other's throats. Why? That is one of our problems, is it not? Unconsciously and deeply, you have your beliefs and I have mine. By talking about brotherhood, we have not solved the whole problem of beliefs, but we have only theoretically and intellectually agreed that this should be so; inwardly and deeply, we are against each other.

Until we dissolve those barriers which are a self-deception, which give us a certain vitality, there can be no cooperation between you and me. Through identification with a group with a particular idea, with a particular country, we can never bring about cooperation.

Belief does not bring about cooperation; on the contrary, it divides. We see how one political party is against another, each believing in a certain way of dealing with the economic problems, and so they are all at war with one another. They are not resolved in solving the problem of starvation, for instance. They are concerned with the theories which are going to solve that problem. They are not actually concerned with the problem itself but the method by which the problem will be solved. So, there must be contention between the two, because they are concerned with the

idea and not with the problem. Similarly, religious people are against each other though they verbally say they have all one life, one God; you know all that. But inwardly, their beliefs, their opinions, their experiences are destroying them and are keeping them separate.

So, experience becomes a dividing factor in our human relationship; experience is a way of deception. If I have experienced something, I cling to it; I do not go into the whole problem of the process of experiencing; but because I have experienced, that is sufficient and I cling to it and thereby I impose, through that experience, self-deception.

So, our difficulty is that each of us is so identified with a particular belief, with a particular form or method in bringing about happiness, economic adjustment, that our mind is captured by that and we are incapable of going deeper into the problem; therefore, we desire to remain aloof individually in our particular ways, beliefs and experiences. Until we dissolve and understand them, not only at the superficial level but at the deeper level, there can be no peace in the world. That is why it is important for those who are really serious, to understand this whole problem - the desire to become, to achieve, to gain - not only at the superficial level but fundamentally and deeply; other wise, there can be no peace in the world. Truth is not something to be gained. Love cannot come to those who have a desire to hold on to it or who like to become identified with it. Surely such things come when the mind does not seek, when the mind is completely quiet, when the mind is no longer creating movements and beliefs upon which it can depend or from which it derives a certain strength, which is an

indication of self-deception. it is only when the mind understands this whole process of desire, can the mind be still. Only then, the mind is not in movement to be or not to be; then only is there the possibility of a state in which no deception of any kind is possible.

Question: One starts with good will and the desire to help; but unfortunately, to help constructively, one joins various organizations, political or religious-sociological. Presently, one finds oneself cut off from all goodness and charity. How does this happen?

Krishnamurti: Can we think out the problem now together? That is, don't merely listen to me explaining the question, but observe yourself in action in daily life. Most of us, especially if we are young and still sensitive and impressionable, want to do something about this world with its misery and starvation. As we grow older, unfortunately, that sensitivity gets dull.

Being sensitive, desiring to do good, being compassionate, you see all this misery, the village next door, hunger, squalor, every form of desire, corruption; and you want to do some thing. So, you look around. Then what happens? You go to various meetings of the extreme left, middle or of the right, or pick up a religious book and try to solve the problem. If you are religiously inclined, you explain it away - Karma; reincarnation, growth, evolution, 'It is so' or 'It is not so', and so on. But if you are politically mindful of it, then you attend various meetings; the more left promise immediate results; they show what can be done immediately; they are completely adhering to a particular idea, particular concept, particular formula; they keep photographs of what they have done or what they will do and they have all their literature; all that

convinces you more than what others say, and so you are caught in it. You start out wanting to do good with a certain compassionate desire to bring about a result, and you end up in a political organization which promises a future reward, a future utopia.

You who are so eager to bring about a result, join the organization; your eagerness has gone into political activity, into an idea and not immediate action but a future through certain ideological methods, practices and discipline and so on. You are concerned then more with the method, with the party, with the group, with the particular dialectical ideas and so on, rather than with how you should act now to produce a change. Have we not introduced deception, a postponement, a forgetfulness, a deception not of the problem, of the evil that creates the problem, but the deception of the opposing parties which prevents us from doing anything? The result is that we have lost goodness, we have lost charity, we are cut off from all that, from all the source of compassion and love. We call this immediate action. That is the case with most of us. Is it not?

We join groups, we join societies hoping something good will come out of it; and soon we are lost in beliefs, in contention, in ambitions, in appalling stupidities. The difficulty with most of us is that we are cut off; we are in the midst of the society, the group, the political party; we are all prisoners, and it is so difficult to break away, because the parties, the groups, the religious organizations have the power to excommunicate you; they threaten you because they have the power, economic and psychological power, and you are at their mercy; you have committed yourself, and your interests are with them, both psychologically and

economically. It requires a great deal of understanding to break away from all this. No one will help us because every body believes something and has committed himself to something or other. Being caught in all this one grows old; then there is despair and tragedy, and one accepts it as the inevitable.

Is it possible to see this whole total process of how goodness, charity, love, are destroyed by our stupidity because we are all so eager to do some thing? The very desire, to want to do something, brings about self-deception. We have not the patience to wait, to look, to observe, to know more deeply. The very desire to be active in doing good is a deception because the clever man is waiting there to use your goodness, your desire to help; we give ourselves over to him, to be exploited, to be used.

Is it not possible to look at all this, be aware of the whole content of this problem, and to break away, not theoretically but actually, face the problem so as to revive again that pristine goodness, that sense of being intimate with people, which is really being in a state of love? That is the only way to act. When there is love, that will bring about an extraordinary state, an extraordinary result, which you and I cannot plan to produce, cannot think out. All the clever people have planned, thought out; look at what is happening; they are at each others' throats, each destroying the other.

Seeing this whole problem, those who are serious have obviously to break away. In the very breaking is the renewal; in the very seeing is the action which is not idea first and action afterwards.

Question: Why do you say that knowledge and belief must be

suppressed for truth to be?

Krishnamurti: What is your knowledge and what is your belief? Actually when you examine your knowledge or your belief, what is it? Memories, are they not? What have you knowledge of? Of your past memories, knowledge of other peoples' experiences written down in a book! Actually when you think about your knowledge, what is it? It is past memory; you are acquiring certain explanations from others, and you have your own experiences based upon your memories. You meet an incident and you translate that incident according to your memory which you call experience. Your knowledge is a process of recognition. We know what beliefs are. They are created by the mind in its desire to be certain, to be safe, to be secure.

So, how can such a mind, crippled with knowledge which is the accumulation of the past translating the present in terms of its own convenience, how can such a mind burdened with such knowledge, understand what truth is? Truth must be something beyond time. It cannot be projected by my mind; it cannot be carved out of my experience; it must be something unknowable from my past experience. If I know it is from the past, I recognize it. therefore it is not true. If it is merely a belief, then it is a projection of my own desires.

Why are we so proud of our knowledge? We are enclosed in our beliefs, in the state of knowledge in the sense it is understood commonly. You are afraid to be nothing. That is why you put so many titles; you give your selves names, ideas, reputation, a vulgar show. With all this burden on your mind, you say 'I am seeking truth, I want to understand the truth'. When you closely examine

the whole process of acquisition of knowledge and the erection of belief, what happens? Surely, you see that they are the tricks of the mind, to believe, to know; because they give you a certain prestige, certain powers; people respect you as an extraordinary man who has read so much and who knows so much. As you grow older, you demand more respect because you have grown in wisdom, at least you think so; all that you have done is to be ripened in your own experience. Belief destroys human beings, separates human beings. A man who believes, can never love; because to him belief is greater than being kind, gentle, thoughtful; belief gives a certain strength, a certain vitality, a false sense of security.

So, when you examine this whole thing, what have you? Nothing but words, nothing but memory. Truth is something that must be beyond the imagination, beyond the process of the mind. It must be eternally new, a thing that cannot be recognized, that cannot be described. When you quote what Sankara, Buddha, X Y Z has said, you have already begun to compare - which shows that through comparison you have stopped thinking, feeling, experiencing. That is one of the tricks of the mind. Your knowledge is destroying the immediate perception of what is truth.

That is why it is important to understand this whole process of knowledge and belief and to put them away. Be simple, see these things simply, not with a cunning mind. Then you will see the mind which has acquired so much experience, so many explanations. which is bound by so many beliefs, itself becoming new. Then the mind is no longer seeking the new, it is no longer recognizing, it has ceased to recognize; and there fore, it is in a state of constant experiencing, not in relation to the past; there is a

new movement which is not repeatable.

That is why it is important that all knowledge, all belief, should be understood. You can't suppress knowledge; you have to understand it; you can't lock the door on knowledge. Now what is your reaction? You will go away from here and proceed in the same old manner because you are afraid to move from the old pattern.

To find the truth there is no guru, there is no example, there is no path; virtue will not lead to truth; practice of virtue is self-perpetuation. Knowledge obviously leads only to respectability. That man who is respectable and enclosed by his own importance will never find truth. The mind must be completely empty, not seeking, not projecting. It is only when the mind is utterly still, that there is possibility of that which is immeasurable.

Question: What is the relationship between what the psychologists call intuition and what you call understanding?

Krishnamurti: Don't let us bother about what the psychologists say. What do you mean by intuition? We use that word. Don't we? I have used the word 'understanding' very often. Let us find out what it means.

What do we mean by intuition? Don't introduce what other people say. You use that word intuition. What is an intuitive feeling? Whether it is right or wrong, you have a feeling that it must be so or it must not be so. By intuitive feeling, we mean a feeling that is not rationalized, that is not very logically thought out, a feeling which you subscribe to beyond the mind, which you call a flash from higher consciousness. We are not seeing if there is intuition or not, but we want to find out the truth of it.

First of all, it is very easy to deceive oneself. Is it not? I have an intuitive feeling that reincarnation is true. Don't you have it? Not because you have read about it, but you have a feeling about it; your intuition says so and you grant it. I am only taking that as an example; we are not considering the truth of the matter whether there is or there is not continuity. Now, what is involved in the intuitive feeling? Your hope, your desire, continuity, fear, despair, feeling of emptiness, loneliness, all these are driving you; all these urge you to hold on to the idea of reincarnation. So, your own desire unconsciously projects that intuitive feeling.

Without understanding this whole process of desire, you cannot depend on intuition which may be extraordinarily deceptive. In some cases, intuition is deceptive. Don't talk about scientists having intuitive perception of a problem; you are not scientists. We are just ordinary people with our every day problems. The scientists work impersonally about a mathematical problem; they work at it, work at it, can't see an answer and then let it go; as they work, they suddenly see the answer; and that is their intuition. But we don't tackle our problems that way. We are too intimate with our problems; we are confined, limited by our own desires; and our own desires dictate, consciously or unconsciously, the attitude, the response, the reaction. We use the word 'intuition' in this connection.

Understanding is the whole perception of the problem; which is, understanding the desire and the ways it acts. When you understand, you will see there is no entity as the examiner who is looking at the examined problem. This understanding is not intuition. This understanding is the seeing of the process how the

desire works, entirely, not just at the superficial level; it is going completely into the thing, in which every possibility of deception is revealed.

Understanding is an integrated process, whereas intuition, as we use it, is departmental. The latter operates occasionally; the rest of the time, we are all stupid. What is the good of having such intuition? One moment, you see things clearly; and for the rest of the time, you are just the old stupid entity that you were.

Understanding is an integrated process, functioning all the time; and that comes into being when we are aware of the total process of desire.

Question: You say that life, as we live, is negation and so there cannot be love. Will you please explain?

Krishnamurti: Why do you want my explanation? Don't you know this? Are our lives very creative, very positive? At least we think we are positive. But the result is negation. We are very positive in our greed, in our hatreds, in our envy, in our ambition. We know that. Don't we? Class division, communal division, natural divisions, every form of destruction, separation, isolation - all these are there.

Our life, though it appears positive, is actually a negation because it leads to death, destruction, misery. You will not accept that because you will say 'We are doing everything positive in this world; we can't live in a state of negation'. But what you are doing is a negative act. Whatever you are doing is an act of death. How can such an activity be anything but negation? If you are ambitious, you are destructive, corrupting, corroding in your relationships; Every act of yours is a negative act.

How can a mind whose whole existence is a series of negation, know love? Then you ask me what love is. Imitation is death; yet, we have examples which we want to follow, we have power; we have gurus; we follow the process of repetition, imitation, routine - which is what? Death, abnegation! Is it not? How can such a thing comprehend any thing? Such an entity can't know love.

The only thing that is positive is love. That comes into being only when the negative state is not, when you are not ambitious, when you are not corrupt, when you are not envious. First you must recognize that which is, and in understanding that which is, the other comes into being.

February 9, 1952

MADRAS 12TH PUBLIC TALK 10TH FEBRUARY 1952

This is the last talk of the series. There won't be any more talks after this meeting is over, at least for the time being.

Most of us, I think, are aware that every form of persuasion, every kind of inducement, has been offered us to resist self-centred activities. Religions, through fear, through promises, through fear of hell, through every form of condemnation, have tried in different ways to dissuade man from this constant activity that is born from the centre of the 'me'. These having failed, political organizations have taken over. There again, persuasion; there again the ultimate utopian hope. Against any form of resistance, concentration camps and every form of legislation, from the extreme to the very limited, have been used and enforced; and yet, we go on in our self-centred activity. That is all we know. If we at all think about it, we try to modify; if we are aware of it, we try to change the course of it; and fundamentally, deeply, there is no transformation, there is no radical cessation of that activity. We know this. At least, the thoughtful are aware of this; they are also aware that when that activity from the centre ceases, only then can there be happiness. Most of us are not aware of this. We take it for granted that it is natural, and that the consequential action is inevitable, only to be modified, controlled and shaped. Now, those who are a little more serious, more earnest, not sincere - because sincerity is the way of self-deception and therefore is out of the question - must find out how one, being aware of this extraordinary total process of self-centred activity, can go beyond.

To understand what this self centred activity is, one must obviously examine it, look at it, be aware of this entire process. If one can be aware of it then there is the possibility of its dissolution; but to be aware of it requires a certain understanding, a certain intention to face the thing as it is, to look at the thing as it is, and not to interpret it, not to modify it, not to condemn it. We have to be aware of that activity which we are doing from that self-centred state; we must be conscious of it. That is one of our primary difficulties because the moment we are conscious of that activity, we want to shape it, we want to control it, we want to condemn it, or we want to modify it; but we are never in a position to look at it directly; and when we do, very few of us are capable of knowing what to do.

We realize that self-centred activities are detrimental, are destructive and that every form of self-centred activity - such as that of identification with the country, with a particular group, with a particular desire, with desires that produce action, the search for a result here or hereafter, the glorification of an idea, the pursuit of example, worship of virtue and the pursuit of virtue and so on - is essentially the activity of a self-centred person. All his relationships with nature, with people, with ideas are the outcome of that activity. Knowing all this what is one to do? All such activity must voluntarily come to an end, not self-imposed, not influenced, not guided. I hope you see the difficulty in this.

Most of us are aware that this self centred activity creates mischief and chaos; but we are only aware of it in certain directions. Either we observe it in others and are ignorant of our own activities; or being aware, in relationship with others, of our

own self-centred activity, we want to transform, we want to find a substitute, we want to go beyond. Before we can deal with it, we must know how this process comes into being. Must we not? In order to understand something, we must be capable of looking at it; and to look at it, we must know its various activities at different levels, conscious as well as unconscious, and also the conscious directives, the self-centred movements of the unconscious motives and intentions. Surely, this is a self-centred process, the result of time. Is it not?

What is it to be self-centred? When are you conscious of being the `me'? As I have suggested often during these talks, don't merely listen to me verbally but use the words as a mirror in which you see your own mind in operation. If you merely listen to my words, then you are very superficial and your reactions will be very superficial; but if you can listen, not to understand me or what I am saying, but to see yourself in the mirror of my words, if you use me as a mirror in which you discover your own activity, then it will have a tremendous and profound effect; but if you merely listen as in political or any other talks, then I am afraid you will miss the whole implication of the discovery for your self of that truth which dissolves the centre of the `me'.

I am only conscious of this activity of the `me' when I am opposing, when consciousness is thwarted, when the `me' is desirous of achieving a result. The `me' is active, or I am conscious of that centre, when pleasure comes to an end and I want to have more of that pleasure; then there is resistance and there is a purposive shaping of the mind to a particular end which will give me a delight, a satisfaction; I am aware of myself and my activities

when I am pursuing virtue consciously. That is all we know. A man who pursues virtue consciously is unvirtuous. Humility cannot be pursued and that is the beauty of humility.

So, as long as this centre of activity in any direction, conscious and unconscious, exists, there is this movement of time, and I am conscious of the past and the present in conjunction with the future. The centre of this activity, the self-centred activity of the 'me', is a time process. That is what you mean by time; you mean the psychological process of time; it is memory that gives continuity to the activity of the centre which is the 'me'. Please watch yourselves in operation; don't listen to my words or be mesmerized by my words. If you watch yourself and are aware of this centre of activity, you will see that it is only the process of time, of memory, of experiencing and translating every experience according to memory; you also see that self-activity is recognition, which is the process of the mind. Now can the mind be free from it? That may be possible at rare moments; that may happen to most of us when we do an unconscious, unintentional, un-purposive act. Is it possible for the mind ever to be free from self-centred activity? That is a very important question first to put to ourselves, because in the very putting of it, you will find the answer. That is, if you are aware of the total process of this self-centred activity, fully cognizant of its activities at different levels of your consciousness, then surely you have to ask yourselves if it is possible for that activity to come to an end - that is, not to think in terms of time, not to think in terms of what I will be, what I have been, what I am. From such thought, the whole process of self centred activity begins; there also begin the determination to become, the

determination to choose and to avoid, which are all a process of time. We see, in that process, infinite mischief, misery, confusion, distortion, deterioration taking place. Be aware of it as I am talking, in your relationship, in your mind.

Surely the process of time is not revolutionary. In the process of time, there is no transformation; there is only a continuity and no ending. In the process of time, there is nothing but recognition. It is only when you have complete cessation of the time process, of the activity of the self, is there the new, is there revolution, is there transformation.

Being aware of this whole total process of the `me' in its activity, what is the mind to do? It is only with the renewal, it is only with the revolution - not through evolution, not through the `me' becoming, but through the `me' completely coming to an end - there is the new. The time process can't bring the new; time is not a way of creation.

I do not know if any of you have had a moment of creativity, not action - I am not talking of putting something into action - I mean that moment of creation when there is no recognition. At that moment, there is that extraordinary state in which the `me', as an activity through recognition, has ceased. I think some of us have had it; perhaps, most of us have had it. If we are aware, we will see in that state that there is no experiencer who remembers, translates, recognizes and then identifies; there is no thought process which is of time. In that state of creation, creativity, or in that state of the new which is timeless, there is no action of the `me' at all.

Now, our question surely is: Is it possible for the mind to experience, to have that state, not momentarily, not at rare

moments but - I would not use the word `everlasting' or `for ever', because that would imply time - to have that state, to be in that state without regard to time? Surely, that is an important discovery to be made by each one of us, because that is the door to love; all other doors are activities of the self. Where there is action of the self, there is no love. Love is not of time. You can't practice love. If you do, then it is a self-conscious activity of the `me' which hopes through living to gain a result.

So, love is not of time; you can't come upon it through any conscious effort, through any discipline, through identification, which are all a process of time. The mind, knowing only the process of time cannot recognize love. Love is the only thing that is new, eternally new. Since most of us have cultivated the mind which is a process of time, which is the result of time, we do not know what love is. We talk about love; we say we love people, love our children, our wives, our neighbour; we say we love nature; but the moment I am conscious that I love, self- activity has come into being; therefore it ceases to be love.

This total process of the mind is to be understood only through relationship - relationship with nature, with people, with our own projection, with everything. In fact, life is nothing but relationship. Though we may attempt to isolate ourselves from relationship, we cannot exist without relationship; though relationship is painful from which we try to run away through isolation by becoming a hermit and so on, we cannot do that. All these methods are an indication of the activity of the self. Seeing this whole picture, being aware of this whole process of time as consciousness, without any choice, with out any determined, purposive intention,

without the desire for any result, you will see that this process of time comes to an end voluntarily. not induced, not as a result of desire. It is only when that process comes to an end, that love is, which is eternally new.

We do not have to seek truth. Truth is not something far away. It is the truth of the mind, truth of its activities from moment to moment. If we are aware of this moment-to moment truth, of this whole process of time, this awareness releases consciousness or that energy to be. As long as the mind uses consciousness as the self activity, time comes into being with all its miseries, with all its conflicts, with all its mischiefs, its purposive deceptions; and it is only when the mind, understanding this total process, ceases, that love will be. You may call it love or give it some other name; what name you give, is of no consequence.

Question: How can one know if one is deceiving oneself?

Krishnamurti: How do you know anything? What is the process of knowing? Please follow this and you will soon find out whether you are deceiving yourself or not. That is, if you are earnest in your question, you can find out.

You want to know when you are deceiving yourself. Now, what do we mean by deceiving? When do you know? When you are interpreting, is it not? You only know when you recognize, when there is the interpretation process going on, when you are experiencing and translating that experience; then you say 'I know'. As long as there is the process of recognition, there is knowing.

What do we mean by self-deception? When do we deceive ourselves, consciously or unconsciously? Most of us, though we deceive ourselves, are totally unaware that this process is going on.

We may be superficially aware, aware at the superficial levels of consciousness of the word; we may be aware of the self-deception in a vague way. But that will not do. We must know that at all levels, fundamentally. That is rather difficult. We must enquire, we must find out, we must search and understand what we mean by deception. When do we deceive ourselves, delude our selves? Only when there is an imposition on ourselves or on others. That word 'delusion' surely implies that. Does it not? Imposing a certain experience on others or being attached to that experience, which is the imposing of that experience on ourselves. What I am saying is not difficult to follow. If you go step by step, it is quite simple. Self-deception exists as long as I am trying to impose an experience on others or on my self, as long as I am translating an experience through attachment or through identification or through the desire to convince another.

So self-deception is a process of time. It is an accumulated process. 'I have had an experience as a boy and I want that experience to continue. I am convinced that experience as a lad is true and I want to convince you of it, because I have experienced it and I hold on to it; that is how we know. So, the knowing which is the interpretation of experience, brings about self-deception which is a process of time.

Don't you know when you are deceiving yourselves? Don't you know it? There is a fact and you translate that to suit your own vested interests, your own likes and dislikes; and immediately, there has begun self-deception. When you are incapable of facing a fact and are translating that fact in terms of your memory, immediately self-deception has begun. I have a vision which I

translate and to which I hold on; there is the experience which I translate according to my like or dislike and proceed to deceive myself through my past experience; there self-deception begins, starting with interpretation.

When I am capable of looking at the fact without any kind of comparison or judgment, without translating, then only there is the possibility of not being deceived. When I do not want anything out of it, when I do not want a result, when I do not want to convince you of it or convince myself about it, this possibility of not being deceived exists. I must look directly, be in contact with the fact, without any interpretation between me and that fact. Between me and that fact, the time process which is deception, should not be there.

I have an experience as a boy, as a lad, of a guru, a Master or what you will; then, what happens? I interpret it according to my likes, my conditioning. Then I say 'I know'. There begins self-deception. I cling to an experience which is translatable. An experience that is translatable, is the beginning of self-deception. From there I proceed, I build up this whole process of knowing. If I have capacities, I convince you of my experience; and you, uncritical, superstitious, follow me because you also want to be deceived, you also want to be in the same net. The net has to be thrown away. You can plough the ground every day, do nothing but plough, plough and plough; but until you sow a seed, you won't get anything. That is how we are deceiving ourselves constantly and deceiving others.

So, to discover for oneself if there is self-deception is very simple, very clear. As long as there is the interpreter translating the

experience, there must be deception. Don't say there is infinite time to get free from the experiencer, from the translator. That is another of your ways of self deception; that is your desire to evade the fact.

If we want to know whether we are deceiving ourselves, it is very clear and it is very simple. It is only when you do not ask, when you do not put out the begging bowl for another to fill, then only you will know the state in which no deception is possible.

Question: You say that through identification we bring about separation, division. Your way of life appears to some of us to be separative and isolating and to have caused division among those who were formerly together. With what have you identified yourself?

Krishnamurti: Now, let us first see the truth of the statement that identification divides, separates. I have stated that several times. Is it a fact or not?

What do we mean by identification? Don't just merely and verbally indulge in it, but look at it directly. You identify yourself with your country. Don't you? When you do that what happens? You immediately enclose yourself through that identification with a particular group. That is a fact, is it not? When you call yourself a Hindu, you have identified yourself with particular beliefs, traditions, hopes, ideas; and that very identification isolates you. That is a fact, is it not? If you see the truth of that, then you cease to identify; therefore you are no longer a Hindu or a Buddhist or a Christian, politically or religiously. So, identification is separative, is a deteriorating factor in life. That is a fact; that is the truth of it whether you like it or not.

The questioner goes on to ask if I have, through my action, brought about division among those who were formerly together. Quite right. If you see something true, must you not state it? Though it brings trouble, though it brings about disunity, should you not state it? How can there be unity on falsity? You identify yourself with an idea, with a belief; and when another questions that belief, the idea, you throw that other fellow out; you don't bring him in, you push him out. You have isolated him; the man who says what you are doing is wrong, has not isolated you. So, your action is isolating, and not his action, not the action of the person who points to the truth. You don't want to face the fact that identification is separative.

Identification with a family, with an idea, with a belief, with any particular organization is all separative. When that is directly put an end to, or when you are made to look at it and are given a challenge, then you who want to identify, who want to be separative, who want to push the other fellow out, say that man is isolating.

Your way of existence, your way of life, is separative; and so you are responsible for separation. I am not. You have thrown me out; I have not gone out. Naturally, you begin to feel that I am isolating, that I am bringing division, that my ideas and my expressions are destroying are destructive. They should be destructive; they should be revolutionary. Otherwise, what is the value of anything new?

Surely, Sirs, there must be revolution, not according to any particular ideology or pattern. If it is according to an ideology or pattern, then it is not revolution, it is merely the continuation of the

past; it is identification with a new idea and therefore it gives continuity to a particular form; and that is certainly not revolution. Revolution comes into being when there is an inward cessation of all identification; and you can only do that, when you are capable of looking straight at the fact without deceiving yourself and without giving the interpreter a chance to tell you what he thinks of it.

Seeing the truth of identification, obviously I am not identified with anything. Sir, when I see a truth that something hurts, there is no problem; I leave it alone. I cease to identify there or elsewhere. You realize that the whole process of identification is destructive, separative; whether this process takes place in religious beliefs or in the political dialectical outlook, it is all separative. When you recognize that, when you see that and are fully aware of it, then obviously you are freed; therefore there is no identification with anything. Not to be identified means to stand alone, but not as a noble entity facing the world. This has nothing to do with being together. But, you are afraid of disunity.

The questioner says I have brought disunity. Have I? I doubt it! You have discovered for yourself the truth of it. If you are persuaded by me and therefore identify yourself with me, then you have not done a new thing; you have only exchanged one evil for another. Sirs, we must break to find out. The real revolution is the inward revolution; it is a revolution that sees things clearly and that is of love. In that state, you have no identification with anything.

Question: You say there can be cooperation only when you and I are as nothing. How can this be true? Is not cooperation positive action, whereas being as nothing is almost unconscious negativity?

How can two nothingness be related and what is there for them to cooperate about?

Krishnamurti: The state of nothingness must obviously be an unconscious state. It is not a conscious state. You can't say I am as nothing. When you are conscious as being nothing, you are then something. This is not a mere amusing statement, but this is a fact. When you are conscious that you are virtuous, you become respectable; a person who is respectable can never find what is real. When I am conscious that I am as nothing then that very nothingness is some thing. Simply because I have made that statement, don't accept it.

There can be cooperation only when you and I are as nothing. Find out what it means, think out and meditate about it. Don't just ask questions. What does that state of nothingness mean? What do you mean by it? We only know the state of activity of the self, the self-centred activity. Whether you are following some guru, master, that is all irrelevant. We only know the state which is self-action. That obviously creates and engenders mischief, misery, turmoil, confusion and non-cooperation. And then the problem arises: 'How is one to cooperate?'

We know now that any cooperation based on an idea leads to destruction, as has already been shown. Action, cooperation, based on an idea is separative. Just as belief is separative, so is action based on an idea. Even if you are convinced, or millions are convinced, still there are many to be convinced; and therefore there is contention going on all the time. So, we know that there cannot be fundamental cooperation, though there may be superficial persuasion through fear, through reward, through punishment and

so on - which is not cooperation obviously.

So, where there is activity of the self as the end in view, as the utopia in view, that is nothing but destruction, separation; and there is no cooperation. What is one to do if one is really desirous, or one wants really to find out, not superficially but really, and bring about cooperation? If you want cooperation from your wife, your child, or your neighbour, how do you set about it? You set about by loving the person. Obviously!

Love is not a thing of the mind; love is not an idea. Love can be only when the activity of the self has ceased to be. But you call the activity of the self positive; that positive act leads to destruction, separativeness, misery, confusion, all of which you know so well and so thoroughly. And yet, we all talk of cooperation, brotherhood. Basically, we want to cling to our activities of the self.

So, a man who really wants to pursue and find out the truth of cooperation, must inevitably bring to an end the self-centred activity. When you and I are not self-centred, we love each other; then you and I are interested in action and not in the result, not in the idea but in doing the action; you and I have love for each other. When my self-centred activity clashes with your self-centred activity, then we project an idea towards which we both quarrel; superficially we are cooperating, but we are at each other's throats all the time.

So, to be nothing is not the conscious state; and when you and I love each other, we cooperate, not to do something about which we have an idea, but in whatever there is to be done.

If you and I loved each other, do you think the dirty, filthy

villages would exist? We would act, we would not theorize and would not talk about brotherhood. Obviously, there is no warmth or sustenance in our hearts and we talk about everything; we have methods, systems, parties, governments and legislation's. We do not know that words cannot capture that state of love.

The word `love' is not love. The word `love' is only the symbol and it can never be the real. So, don't be mesmerized by that word `love'. It is not something new. That state can only come into being when the activity of the `me' has ceased; and in that cessation of the `me', you are co operating with what is to be done and not with any idea. Don't you know all this, Sirs? Don't you know that when you and I love each other, we do things so easily and so smoothly; we do not talk about cooperation; we do not talk about a system of how to do a thing and then battle over the system and forget the action. You smile and you all pass it by. We have grown old in our cleverness and not in wisdom.

Question: What system of meditation should I follow?

Krishnamurti: We are going to find out. You are not going to listen to my truth and make it yours. You can only imitate the words but that won't be truth. The symbol is not the real. When you worship the symbol you become idolatrous, and the man who is idolatrous can never find what is truth.

Now, you are going to find out what is the truth, not the ultimate, absolute and final truth but the truth of the system which will help you to meditate. That is, we are going to find out the truth if systems, methods, help you to meditate. You understand?

The questioner probably asks whether systems, methods and definite steps, will help you to meditate. We are going to find that

out. Truth is not something far away, miles away for which we have to go. It is there right under your very nose, to be discovered every minute; it is there for you to discover with a fresh mind which is creative. We shall discover in this way the truth, the whole implication of meditation.

What is the implication of a system? Practice, doing the thing over and over again, repetition, copying and imitation. Is it not? All systems imply only this. Is it not? Through practice, through repetition, are you going to find happiness? That happiness, bliss, something which is not measurable, cannot come that way.

At the beginning of your practice, you have both the beginning and the ending of that practice; that is, what you begin with is also what you end up with; the beginning is the end. If I practice, if I copy, I will end up as an imitator, as a machine repeating. If my mind is only capable of repeating, practicing day after day a certain method, following a certain system, at the end my mind is still copying, imitating, repeating. Surely this is obvious, is this not? Therefore at the beginning, I have set the course which the mind shall follow; if I do not understand at the beginning, I shall not understand at the end. That is the obvious truth. So, I have discovered that the end is at the beginning. Systems through promises, through pleasure, rewards, punishments, make the mind mechanical, stupid, drunk. And at the beginning there is no freedom, and therefore there is no freedom at the end. The beginning matters enormously.

To you, meditation is quite a different process. You want to learn concentration; you want to learn the method of achieving a result; you want to worship God, female or male, some stupid

image; you want to pursue virtue. All this is meditation for you. When you pursue virtue, cultivate virtue, what happens? You have the action of the `me'. The `me' desires to be kind, to be generous, to have no greed; and you practice, day after day, month after month. Thereby, are you not strengthening greed in a different way? Because, you are becoming conscious that you are not greedy, and the moment you are conscious that you are not greedy, you are certainly greedy.

Your pursuit of virtue is a form of self-centred activity. That is not meditation. When you want to concentrate, your mind goes wandering and you try to pull it up; and therefore, you set up a battle. The mind is wandering off, and you attempt to concentrate. What does that indicate? When you are here, for the duration you are here, are not your minds really concentrated? That is, is there not instinctive, natural, concentration which is not a process of exclusion?

If your mind is petty, narrow, clever, cunning, ambitious, what is the good of your meditation, what is the good of your learning concentration? If you learn it, then it is another action of the self, which will help you to deceive others or to deceive yourself. So, you have seen the truth that concentration is not meditation; it is only a narrowing, exclusive process designed to force the mind to a particular pattern.

Imagine you have abolished all systems, the whole idea of systems has fallen away. What then? The idea of concentrating your mind on a particular object - Master, some image - which is only exclusion, which is a process of identification and therefore of separation, has also dropped away. Then what happens? Your mind

be comes more cognizant, more aware. Do you not then see that any pursuit of the mind, any form of achievement, is a burden?

Please follow all this, meditate as I am talking; and you will see that any form of achievement of success, any sense of becoming, is still the action of the self, and therefore of time. When you see that clearly, fully recognize it, then there is no longer the pursuit of virtue. Then all sense of achievement, of being somebody, drops away; therefore the mind becomes quieter, more serene, not looking for a reward or punishments; it becomes completely indifferent to flattery and insult alike. What has happened to your mind? Don't go home and think about it there; think now. The things that were agitating you before, the things that acted in a separative way, being unconscious and fearful, seeking a reward, avoiding punishment, all these have gone away. The mind has become more quiet, more alert. There is gripping silence, not induced, not disciplined, not forced. Then what happens? Then, in that quiet state, ideas come up, feelings come up; and you understand them and put them away. Then, if you proceed a little further, you will see that in that state there are certain activities which are not self-projected, which come darkly and mysteriously without invitation, like the breeze, the sunset, like beauty. The moment they come, the mind, seeing the beauty, may like to hold on to it; it may then say 'I have experienced that state', and then it clings to it and thereby creates the process of time, which is memory. That possibility also must go away.

You know how the mind is operating and how it wants a series of sensations, which are called marvellous, and how it is naming them. When you see the truth of all that, these things also go away.

Now, what is the state of the mind that is not seeking, that is not pursuing, that is not desiring, that is not searching out a result, that is not naming, that is not recognizing? Such a mind is quiet; such a mind is silent; the silence has come very naturally without any form of enforcement, without any compulsion, without any discipline. It is the truth that has liberated the mind. In that state, the mind is extraordinarily quiet. Then that which is new, which is not recognizable, which is creation, which is love, call it what you will, which is not different from the beginning, comes. And such a mind is a blessed mind, is a holy mind. Such a mind alone can help. Such a mind can cooperate. Such a mind can be without any identification, be alone, without any self-deception.

What is beyond, is not measurable by words. That which is not measurable, comes; but if you seek like the foolish, then you will never have it. It comes when you are least expecting it; it comes when you are watching the sky; it comes when you are sitting under the shade of a tree; it comes when you are observing the smile of a child or the tears of a woman. But we are not observant; we are not meditating. We meditate only about a mysterious, ugly thing to be pursued, to be practiced and to be lived up to. A man who practices meditation, shall never know; but the man who understands the true meditation which is from moment to moment, only shall know. There is no experience of the individual. Where truth is concerned, the individuality disappears, the `me' has ceased to be.

February 10, 1952

LONDON 1ST PUBLIC TALK 7TH APRIL 1952

It seems to me that having so many problems, each so complex, few of us find a happy solution for them. Intellectually we have many theories, many ways of solving our human complex problems. Politically, the left offers a certain type, either through compulsion, conformity, or by accepting a certain set of ideas; and religions throughout the world offer a hope, either in the future, or through living according to a certain pattern laid down by teachers. And yet, most of us find that our problems are growing more and more complex, our relationship to society more and more intricate, and our individual relationships with one another extremely difficult, conflicting and painful. Few of us are really inwardly content and happy. We do not seem to find a way out, - and when we do, it is an escape, which brings about further complications, further problems, greater intricacies and illusions.

Thought has not solved our problem, and I don't think it ever will. We have relied on the intellect to show us the way out of our complexity. The more cunning, the more hideous, the more subtle the intellect is, the greater the variety of systems, of theories, of ideas. And ideas do not solve any of our human problems; they never have and they never will. The mind is not the solution; the way of thought is obviously not the way out of our difficulty. And it seems to me that we should first understand this process of thinking, and perhaps be able to go beyond, - for when thought ceases perhaps we shall be able to find a way which will help us to solve our problems, not only the individual but also the collective.

And may I suggest here that in listening, we should not reject

anything that we may hear for the first time; for most of us have so many ideas, so many prejudices, so many biases, through which we cannot listen, which hamper our understanding of anything that is put forward, anything that may be new. So may I suggest that we should listen, not in order to condemn or justify, or oppose what is said by our own ideas, but listen so that both of us can understand this problem of living. You and I are talking as two individuals, and if we can think individually, - that is, think over our problems as two friends, going deeply into them, - then perhaps we shall come upon that intelligence which is neither collective nor individual. It is that intelligence alone that can solve our intricate, everincreasing problems. To listen properly is not to oppose one idea by another idea. Probably you know already what you think, the way of your thought; you are familiar with your own reactions. And I presume that you have come here to find out what I have to say. To find out what I have to say you have to listen, surely, with a mind that is free from prejudices, that is watching to find out what the other fellow is saying, - which means, with a mind that is willing to examine the problem, a mind that is capable of discovering freely, and not merely a mind that is comparative, that judges, weighs, balances. So, if I may suggest it, as you would listen to a friend to whom you go with a problem, let us with that same attitude, with that same feeling of two individuals trying together, to solve this complex problem of living.

As I said, thinking has not solved our problems. The clever ones, the philosophers, the scholars, the political leaders, have not really solved any of our human problems, - which are, the relationship between you and another, between you and myself. So

far we have used the mind, the intellect, to help us investigate the problem, and thereby are hoping to find a solution. Can thought ever dissolve our problems? Is not thought, unless it is in the laboratory or on the drawing board, always self-protecting, self-perpetuating, conditioned? Is not its activity self-centred? And can such thought ever resolve any of the problems which thought itself has created? Can the mind, which has created the problems, resolve those things that it has itself brought forth?

Before we can say yes or no, surely we must find out what this process of thinking is, this thing which we worship, this intellect to which we look up. What is this thought which has created our problems and which then tries to resolve them? Surely, until we understand that, we cannot find another way of living, another way of existence. Seeing that thought has not freed man, you and I, from our own conflicts, surely we must understand the whole process of thinking, and perhaps thereby let it come to an end. We may find out, then, if we have love, - which is not the way of thought.

What is thinking? When we say "I think", what do we mean by that? When are we conscious of this process of thinking? Surely, we are aware of it when there is a problem, when we are challenged, when we are asked a question, when there is friction. We are aware of it as a self-conscious process. Please do not listen to me as a lecturer holding forth; but you and I are examining our own ways of thought, which we use as an instrument in our daily life. So I hope you are observing your own thinking, not merely listening to me, - that is no good. We shall arrive nowhere if you are only listening to me and not observing your own process of

thinking, if you are not aware of your own thought and observing the way it arises, how it comes into being. That is what we are trying to do, you and I, - to see what this process of thinking is.

Surely, thinking is a reaction. If I ask you a question, to that you respond, - you respond according to your memory, to your prejudices, to your upbringing, to the climate, to the whole background of your conditioning; and according to that you reply, according to that you think. If you are a Christian, a communist, a Hindu, or what you will, that background responds; and it is this conditioning that obviously creates the problem. The centre of this background is the me in the process of action. So long as that background is not understood, so long as that thought process, that self which creates the problem, is not understood and put an end to, we are bound to have conflict, within and without, in thought, in emotion, in action. No solution of any kind, however clever, however well thought out, can ever put an end to the conflict between man and man, between you and me. And realizing this, being aware of how thought springs up and from what source, then we ask, can thought ever come to an end?

That is one of the problems, is it not? Can thought resolve our problems? By thinking over the problem, have you resolved it? Any kind of problem, - economic, social, religious, - has it ever been really solved by thinking? In your daily life, the more you think about a problem, the more complex, the more irresolute, the more uncertain it becomes. Is not that so? - in our actual, daily life? You may, in thinking out certain facets of the problem, see more clearly another person's point of view, but thought cannot see the completeness and fullness of the problem, it can only see partially,

and a partial answer is not a complete answer, therefore it is not a solution.

The more we think over a problem, the more we investigate, analyse and discuss it, the more complex it becomes. So is it possible to look at the problem comprehensively, wholly? And, how is this possible? Because, that, it seems to me, is our major difficulty. For our problems are being multiplied, - there is imminent danger of war, there is every kind of disturbance in our relationships, - and how can we understand all that comprehensively, as a whole? Obviously it can be solved only when we can look at it as a whole, - not in compartments, not divided. And when is that possible? Surely, it is only possible when the process of thinking - which has its source in the me, the self, in the background of tradition, of conditioning, of prejudice, of hope, of despair - has come to an end. So can we understand this self, not by analysing, but by seeing the thing as it is, being aware of it as a fact and not as a theory? - not seeking to dissolve the self in order to achieve a result, but seeing the activity of the self, the me, constantly in action. Can we look at it, without any movement to destroy or to encourage? That is the problem, is it not? If, in each one of us, the centre of the me is non-existent, with its desire for power, position, authority, continuance, self-preservation, surely our problems will come to an end!

The self is a problem that thought cannot resolve. There must be an awareness which is not of thought. To be aware, without condemnation or justification, of the activities of the self, - just to be aware, is sufficient. Because if you are aware in order to find out how to resolve the problem, in order to transform it, in order to

produce a result, then it is still within the field of the self, of the me. So long as we are seeking a result, whether through analysis, through awareness, through constant examination of every thought, we are still within the field of thought, which is, within the field of the me, of the I, of the ego, or what you will.

As long as the activity of the mind exists, surely there can be no love. When there is love, we shall have no social problems. But love is not something to be acquired. The mind can seek to acquire it, like a new thought, a new gadget, a new way of thinking; but the mind cannot be in a state of love as long as thought is acquiring love. So long as the mind is seeking to be in a state of non-greed, surely it is still greedy, is it not? Similarly, so long as the mind wishes, desires, and practises in order to be in a state in which there is love, surely it denies that state, does it not?

So, seeing this problem, this complex problem of living, and being aware of the process of our own thinking and realizing that it actually leads nowhere, - when we deeply realize that, then surely there is a state of intelligence which is not individual or collective. So, the problem of the relationship of the individual to society, of the individual to the community, of the individual to reality, ceases; because then there is only intelligence, which is neither personal nor impersonal. It is this intelligence alone, I feel, that can solve our immense problems. And that cannot be a result; it comes into being only when we understand this whole total process of thinking, not only at the conscious level, but also at the deeper, hidden levels of consciousness.

Perhaps, as we are going to meet during the whole of this month, we shall be able to talk over this problem more fully,

exchange ideas, discuss them. But what I feel is that to understand any of these problems we have to have a very quiet mind, a very still mind, so that the mind can look at the problem without interposing ideas, theories, without any distraction. And that is one of our difficulties, - because thought has become a distraction.

When I want to understand, look at something, I don't have to think about it, - I look at it. The moment I begin to think, to have ideas, opinions about it, I am already in a state of distraction, looking away from the thing which I must understand. So thought, when you have a problem, becomes a distraction, - thought being an idea, opinion, judgment, comparison, - which prevents us from looking, and thereby understanding and resolving the problem. But unfortunately, for most of us thought has become so important.

You say, "How can I exist, be, without thinking? How can I have a blank mind?" To have a blank mind is to be in a state of stupor, idiocy, or what you will, and your instinctive reaction is to reject it. But surely, a mind that is very quiet, a mind that is not distracted by its own thought, a mind that is open, can look at the problem very directly and very simply. And it is this capacity to look without any distraction at our problems that is the only solution. For that, there must be a quiet, tranquil mind.

Such a mind is not a result, is not an end product of a practice, of meditation, of control. It comes into being through no form of discipline or compulsion or sublimation, without any effort of the me, of thought; it comes into being when I understand the whole process of thinking - when I can see a fact without any distraction. In that state of tranquillity of a mind that is really still, there is love. And it is love alone that can solve all our human problems.

I have several questions here, and I will try to answer them. May I suggest that in listening to the answers, you do not merely listen to me, - that you are not caught by my words, but that actually we go through the problem together and try to resolve it together. That is, do not, if I may suggest, follow verbally the description of the problem, or intellectually try to resolve it. Any of these questions is a problem for most of us, and it will be beneficial, I think, if you can follow them as they are happening in yourselves. If you can listen to each problem, not as of another, but as of yourself, then we can deal with it directly and tackle it immediately.

Question: I have been to several psychoanalysts to free myself from the fear which dominates me. I have not been able to get rid of it. Would you kindly suggest how I am to set about freeing myself from this constant oppression?

Krishnamurti: Surely most of us have fears, conscious or unconscious, of various kinds! We are not discussing the kind of fear, but fear as a whole. When I can understand fear as a whole, then after having understood it I can deal with the particular.

So, let us find out how to resolve this fear, - not theoretically, not as something to be thought over the day after tomorrow, when you have leisure, but actually do it now as we go along. Let us see if we can experiment with this.

How do we look at fear? When we are aware of it, how do we regard it? What is our attitude, our state of mind, when we are aware that there is fear? Please, follow this step by step, and if it is not fear, substitute for it your own particular nightmare, your own particular burden. And let us go into it step by step, completely, if

we can, and see if we cannot resolve it. What is the state of the mind when it discovers that there is fear? What happens to the mind? What do you do? You have opinions about it, have you not? You have ideas about it, have you not? You look at it from a distance, do you not? You do not look at it directly, you are not in immediate contact with it. You are far away from it, and regard it as something to be avoided, something to be got rid of, something about which you can have theories. You look at it, either with condemnation, or with a desire to run away from it, so that you are never directly in contact with it, you never look at it immediately, directly, simply. You have all these barriers of distraction.

So, we are going to look directly. And to do that, you must approach it, you must come nearer to it. And you cannot come nearer to it if you have opinions about it, or about the cause of it. You cannot see it directly if your mind is occupied with analysis, the why and the wherefore going backwards indefinitely. The discovery of the cause of fear will not dissolve fear. It can be dissolved only when you can directly look at it, when you can have direct relationship with it. Merely analysing, groping in the past to discover its cause, will not dissolve it, because your mind is distracted, because you are not facing the fact of fear.

So, having an opinion about it, or analysing it, will not bring you close to it, direct to it. So, that must go away. And it will disappear, this opinion with regard to it, when you feel the urgent necessity of looking at that fear. Then what happens? You have come a little nearer to it, have you not? - to the thing that you call fear. Then what happens? What is the reaction then? You still have ideas about it, have you not? - the idea that you must get rid of it,

the idea that you cannot bear to look at it, the idea that even if you do look you will not know how to resolve it. So, the idea about fear creates fear, does it not? That is, I am afraid, there is fear in me; I am trying to understand what that fear is, - that is, to look at it. I cannot look at it if I have ideas about it, - the idea being the word, the image. As long as I have an idea about fear, surely idea creates fear. If I recognize, if I am aware of that, what is my relationship to the thing that I have called fear? I hope you are following this.

How do I look at the thing that I call fear, now? I've come closer; the barrier of opinion, judgment, analysis, has gone; I am no longer in a position where idea dominates. So, what is my relationship to the thing that I call fear? Is that thing called fear separate from me, the observer, the onlooker? Surely it is not. The observer is fear. The observer is not watching fear; the observer himself is the fear. So, that is a fact.

Now, let us go a little closer, still further. Is that thing which I call fear the result of a word? Is it the product of a word, - the word being thought? If it is, then the word is very important, isn't it? And for most of us the word is very important. Verbalizing is the process of thinking. So for us the word "fear" is fear. The word is fear, not the thing which we call fear. So, when I can look at myself in a state which I have called fear, - which is merely the word, - surely then the word disappears; and I realize that as long as the mind is active, verbalizing, in any direction, - which is, to have symbols, - there must be fear.

So, I am not different from fear; the thinker is the thought. And for thought to come to an end the thinker cannot discipline thought, - because it is himself. All that he can do is to be in a state without

any movement, in any direction. Only then, surely, fear ceases.

Question: We all recognize that inward peace and tranquillity of the mind are essential. What is the method or the "how" which you suggest?

Krishnamurti: Now again, let us try to see the truth of this "how", of this method. You say, tranquillity of the mind and a peaceful heart are essential. Is that so? Or, is that merely a theory, merely a desire? Because we are so disturbed, distracted, we want that quietness, that tranquillity, - which then is merely an escape. It is not a necessity; it is an escape. When we see the necessity of it, when we are convinced it is the only thing that matters, the only thing that is essential, - then, do we ask the method for it? Is a method necessary when you see something is essential?

Method involves time, does it not? If not now, then eventually, - tomorrow, in a couple of years, - I shall be tranquil. Which means, you do not see the necessity of being tranquil. And so, the "how" becomes a distraction; the method becomes a way of postponing the essentiality of tranquillity. And that is why you have all these meditations, these phoney, false controls to get eventual tranquillity of the mind, and the various methods of how to discipline in order to acquire that tranquillity. Which means you do not see the necessity, the immediate necessity, of having a still mind. When you see the necessity of it, then there is no inquiry into the method at all. Then you see the importance of having a quiet mind, and you have a quiet mind.

Unfortunately, we do not see the necessity of having a still mind, a tranquil mind. We are too fond of our distractions; and we want to be weaned away from our distractions through the process

of time. And therefore we ask the method, the "how", the practice. I think that is a very false approach. A tranquil mind is not a result; it is not the end of a practice. A tranquil mind is not a static mind; and that which is a result is static. When you have a quiet mind as a result, through discipline, it is no longer a still mind. It is a state which is a product; and that which has been put together can be dismembered again.

So, what is important in this question is not the method, - because there are innumerable methods to produce a result; and a man who is seeking a result has no tranquil mind. But what is important in this is to see directly, simply, that only a tranquil mind can understand; that a still mind is essential, not in some future, but immediately. When you see such a necessity, then the mind is still.

Such a still mind will know what it is to be creative. Because in that state which is not a result, which is not the product of years of practice, in that still mind, you will find that all movement of thought is non-existent. Thought does not create; thought can never create. It can project its own desires, its own sensations, its own imagery, symbols, but that which it has projected is not true, it is of itself. Let thought be of Christ, of a Master, or what you will, - it is its own projection. And the worship of that projection is self-worship. Such a mind is not a tranquil mind. But you will see, if it is truly tranquil, quiet, that there is no movement in it. Therefore all experiencing, as we know it, has ceased. Because that which we experience is recognizable; and as long as there is the centre of recognition, the mind is not tranquil. For reality, or God, is not to be recognized, is not to be experienced by the mind. When experiencing ceases, - which is, when recognizing comes to an end,

- then there is that which is not to be experienced, that which is not to be recognized. And only when we see the necessity of such tranquillity, such stillness, - only then it comes into being.

April 7, 1952.

LONDON 2ND PUBLIC TALK 8TH APRIL 1952

As we were saying yesterday, we look to ideas for the solution of our problems, and we base our action on ideas, - at least, we approximate our action to a certain set of ideas. And is it ever possible to be free from the conflict of idea and action? Because, between action and idea there is a wide gap, and we are everlastingly trying to bridge this gap, and so we are in constant conflict. And when the mind is in conflict, obviously there is confusion. And when we are in a state of confusion, any choice of idea, any choice of action, is bound to be equally confused. And so, we are caught in a series of conflicts, never ending, but always getting more and more complex. And we can see that only when the mind is very still and quiet, not choosing, is there a possibility of tranquillity.

When the mind is merely accumulating knowledge, - either of the past or of the future, accumulating ideas, and thereby trying to find an action which will bring about the cessation of conflict, not only within ourselves but with society and all about us, - does not the mind merely become then the instrument of conflict, the source of conflict? That is, does knowledge, - the accumulating process of ideas, of information, of that which is of the past or the hope of the future, does knowledge help in bringing about the cessation of conflict? And must conflict go on indefinitely? - conflict within and without, in our relationships and in ourselves?

If that conflict is to continue, and that seems the lot of all of us, everlastingly and without end, - then we must find escapes, - political, religious, every kind of escape, - so that we can at least

drown ourselves in some kind of darkness, illusion, in some theory, in some complicated action which never produces freedom.

If we would really go more deeply into this question of conflict, - whether it will ever produce greater progress, a greater understanding, a greater freedom in our relationships, more love, - then we must find out the source of conflict. For if conflict is ultimately to produce a sense of freedom of the mind, and therefore love, then conflict is necessary. We have taken it for granted that it is essential in one form or another; and without conflict we think we shall become stagnant. We have built our life, our philosophy, our religious thinking, on this series of conflicts, hoping that it will eventually bring about freedom, - be ennobling, and so on. So should we not, before we accept the inevitability of conflict, find out whether conflict ever brings understanding?

When you and I are in conflict, emotionally, verbally, deeply, is there understanding? And, does conflict cease with knowledge? Is not knowledge the very centre of the me, of the self, which is everlastingly acquiring, trying to become something? And, does not this conflict lie in this desire to become, to be? This process of accumulating knowledge, - which is really information, words put together, - will that bring about the cessation of conflict, put an end to the me which is the centre of accumulation, which is the centre of conflict? Is it ever possible to suppress knowledge, and this process of accumulation? We may possess very little, - a few clothes, a little property; we may be unknown, living in a small place; but we are always accumulating knowledge, we are always trying to gather to ourselves virtue. And that is the process of the mind.

I do not know if you have ever thought of this problem of acquiring knowledge, - whether knowledge does ultimately help us to love, to be free from those qualities that produce conflict in ourselves and with our neighbours; whether knowledge ever frees the mind of ambition. Because ambition is, after all, one of the qualities that destroy relationship, that put man against man. And if we would live at peace with each other, surely ambition must completely come to an end - not only political, economic, social ambition, but also the more subtle and pernicious ambition, the spiritual ambition, - to be something. Is it ever possible for the mind to be free from this accumulating process of knowledge, this desire to know?

What is it we want to know? We want to know about ourselves, what we have been and what we shall be. We may want to know about scientific information, but that is merely a side-issue. Fundamentally we all want to know, what? - to know if we are loved, and if we ourselves love; to know if we are free, if we are happy, if we are creative, if we are somebody, something. We want to know either what we have been or what we shall be; so that knowledge becomes a means of personal security, a psychological necessity for one's continuance. And so we gather information, - religious, political, social, and so on; and with that we are satisfied, for we use that knowledge to exploit others or cover ourselves.

So surely, one of our problems is, is it not?, whether it is possible to live in this world without the psychological process of accumulation, without this constant battle to know what one will become, psychologically. So long as we are trying to become something, - accepting certain principles, ideals, beliefs, and then

approximating ourselves to them, surely knowledge becomes a means of self-satisfied security, certainty. And the moment you have acquired, you want more, and so there is the battle, the struggle of this constant desire to be something more, to become something. And for that we must have knowledge. And this accumulating process of the me, the I, the ego, is the centre of this recognition, is the knower, is the knowledge. And, this centre is always translating every experience according to its knowledge, according to its prejudices. And so, this centre of knowledge, this entity that is everlastingly inquiring in order to know, can only experience that which it has known; it cannot experience anything new. The mind that is burdened with knowledge can never be creative; it cannot know what it is to be in that state wherein creation can take place. Every experience has already been tested; and whatever it experiences is its own projection.

A mind that would be in a state in which the new can take place, - whether it be the truth, whether it be God, or what you will, - must surely cease to acquire, to gather; it must put aside all knowledge. Because that which is capable of recognizing is still within the field of time. And a mind which is the result of time, which is the result of accumulation, a mind burdened with knowledge, cannot possibly understand, surely, that which is real, which is not measurable. But most of us are afraid to be in that state, to be entirely free from this centre which is everlastingly accumulating.

All this is not a matter of conviction. You are not being persuaded by me to accept any set of ideas, - that would be a horror. Then our relationship would be one of propagandists. But

surely, what we are concerned with is to find out the truth of this thing which we call the me, the centre that is the cause of conflict, and whether that centre can ever be resolved. And one of its qualities, part of its nature, is the accumulating process of knowledge, the gathering in of memories, of the past and of the future, so that it can be secure. I am not trying to convince you of it; and we need not argue about it. It is not a matter of logic, - logic is always rather cheap. But we can surely try to find out if the mind can be free, can be in that state of not knowing, when it is not gathering or projecting from its own knowledge. Surely that requires investigation, not conviction, not belief. For that you do not have to read any books. All that one has to do is to watch oneself, go into the intricacies of the mind, watch the ways of the self, gathering and rejecting. And then one can see that conflict is not necessary; conflict is not the way to an integrated existence, to a complete life. But so long as the mind is trying to become, acquiring, reaching for more experience, for a greater wealth of information and knowledge, - the more there must be conflict.

Reality, or God, or what you will, is not to be reached through conflict. On the contrary, there must be the cessation of the me as the centre of accumulation, - either of information, or of virtue, or experience, or of any of those qualities that the mind seeks in order to enlarge itself. Only then, surely, is it possible for that state of reality to come into being.

Question: I have tried out many of the things you have suggested in your various talks, but I don't seem to get very far. What is wrong with you or with me?

Krishnamurti: You see, the difficulty is that we want to get

"very far", we want to reach a result; we want the "more". So we experiment in order to arrive; we study, we listen, in order to compare, in order to become something. What I say may be utterly wrong; you have to find out, not accept it. What is important in this question is, is it not?, the desire to become more, to reach far, to arrive somewhere. And so, with that motive in the background you study, you experiment, you observe yourself, you are aware of your actions. With that hidden motive, - to progress, to achieve, to become a saint, to know more, to reach the Master, - with that hidden, subtle motive driving you, you do all; you read, you study, you inquire. And naturally, you do not get very far. So what is important is to understand that motive, that drive. Why should you get very far? Far in what? - in your knowledge, in your ambitions, in your so-called virtues, which are really not virtues at all but the becoming greater in yourself?

You see, the difficulty is that we are so deeply ambitious. As the clerk strives to become the manager, so we want to become the Masters, the saints. We want to arrive ultimately at a state of peace. So ambition is the motive; ambition is driving us. And instead of understanding that ambition, and putting an end to it completely, we turn our face towards becoming more and more, to reaching deeper, going very far. So we deceive ourselves, we create illusions. Obviously, the man who is ambitious is not only antisocial, destructive, but he will never understand what truth is, what God is, or whatever name you like to give to it.

So, if I may suggest, do not try to get "very far", but inquire into the motive, into the activities, of the mind that desires to go far. Why do we want this? Either we want to escape from ourselves, or

we want to have influence, prestige, position, authority. If we want to escape from ourselves, any illusion is good enough.

And it is not a matter of time. The mind is the instrument of achievement; and with the mind, which is the result of time, one cannot understand that which is beyond measure, which is not vague, not mysticism as opposed to occultism - a very convenient division of the thoughtless. To understand this motive, this drive to become something, is what is important; and that we can observe in our daily actions, in our everyday thought, - this urge to be something, to dominate, to assert. It is there that the truth lies, not away from it. It is there that we must find it.

Question: Is it possible for the ordinary individual to lead a spiritual life without having a set of beliefs or taking part in ceremonies and ritual?

Krishnamurti: I wonder what we mean by a spiritual life? Do you become spiritual by performing ceremonies and rituals, having innumerable beliefs, or by having principles according to which you are trying to live? Does that make you spiritual? Ceremonies and rituals sometimes, perhaps, at the beginning, give a certain sensation, so-called uplift. But they are repetitious, and every sensation that is repeated soon wearies of itself. The mind likes to establish itself in a routine, in a habit; and rituals, ceremonies provide this and give to the mind an opportunity to separate itself, to feel itself superior, to feel that it knows more, and to enjoy the sensations of repetitious pleasures. Surely there is nothing spiritual about rituals and ceremonies; they only divide man against man. Since they are repetitious they do not free the mind from its own self-projected sensations. On the contrary, for a spiritual life, a free

life, a free mind, a mind that is not burdened by the ego, the me, is necessary - it is essential to see the falsity of ceremonies. To find reality, or God, or what you will, there must be no ceremonies, no rituals round which the mind can wrap itself and feel itself different, enjoying the sensations of oft-repeated actions. And a mind burdened with belief, - is such a mind capable of perception, of understanding? Surely, a mind burdened with belief is an enclosed mind, - no matter what belief it is, whether it is in nationalism, or any particular principle, or the belief in its own knowledge. A mind that is burdened with beliefs, either of the past or of the future, is surely not a free mind. A mind crippled with belief is incapable of investigation, of discovery, of looking within itself. But the mind likes beliefs, because belief gives to it a certain security, makes it feel strong, energetic, aloof, separative.

We know all this as an everyday fact. And yet we continue in our beliefs, - that you are a Christian and I am a Hindu, - I with my set of idiosyncrasies, traditions and experience handed down from the past, and you with yours. Obviously, belief does not bring us together. Only when there is no belief, only when we have understood the whole process of belief, - then perhaps we can come together. The mind desires constantly to be secure, to be in a state of knowledge, to know; and belief offers a very convenient security. Belief in something, belief in a certain economic system, for which one is willing to sacrifice oneself and others, - in that the mind takes shelter, it is certain there. Or, belief in God, in a certain spiritual system; there again the mind feels secure, certain.

Belief, after all, is a word. The mind lives on words, it has its being in words; and there it takes shelter and finds certainty. And a

mind that is sheltered, secure, certain, is surely incapable of understanding anything new, or receiving that which is not measurable. So belief acts as a barrier, not only between man and man, but also, surely, as a block, as a hindrance, to something that is creative, that is new. But to be in a state of uncertainty, of not-knowing, of not acquiring, is extremely difficult, is it not;-perhaps not difficult, but it requires a certain earnestness, without any distraction, inward or outward. But unfortunately most of us inwardly want to be distracted; and beliefs, ceremonies, rituals, offer good, respectable distractions.

So, what is important in this question is, is it not?, to free the mind from its own self-created habits, from its own self-projected experiences, from its own knowledge, - which is, from the entity which is gathering, accumulating. That is the real problem, - to be free inwardly, to be in that state when the mind is no longer inviting or accumulating experience. That is extremely arduous. And it is for everyone, not for the few, to free themselves from the process of time which is the process of accumulation, gathering in, the desire for the more. This is only possible when we understand the ways of the mind, how it is constantly seeking security, permanency, either in beliefs, in rituals, in ceremonies, or in knowledge. All these are distractions; and a mind that is distracted is incapable of quietness. To go into this problem very deeply, one has to be aware inwardly, both at the conscious and at the unconscious level, of those attractions and distractions that the mind has cultivated, - to observe them, and not try to transform them into something else, but merely observe. Then begins the freedom in which the mind is no longer acquiring, accumulating.

Question: I feel that much of my unhappiness is due to my strong urge to help and advise those I love - and even those I do not love. How can I really see this as domination and interference? Or, how can I know if my help is genuine?

Krishnamurti: You mean to say that you are unhappy because you cannot help another! I should have thought you would help others because you are happy. Because you love, you help; and if you do not help you are not unhappy. I think that is where the key of this problem is; you are unhappy because you cannot help. That is, helping gives you happiness. So, you are deriving your happiness from helping others. You are using others to get your own satisfaction. Please, this is not a clever, smart remark. But most of us are in that state; we want to be active, we want to do things, interfere, help, love, be generous; we want to be active doing something. And when that is thwarted, we are unhappy. And as long as we have the freedom to act, to fulfil, and that activity is not thwarted, we call it happiness.

Surely, the action of help is not of the mind. The generosity of the mind is not the generosity of the heart. But because we have lost the generosity of the heart, we are generous with our mind, - which when thwarted rebels, and there is the ache. And so we join groups, parties, create societies to help. When we have lost generosity we turn to social service; when we have lost love we turn to systems. So surely, in this problem the underlying difficulty is that we are seeking satisfaction; and that is a very difficult thing to be free of, because it is so subtle. We want to be satisfied in everything that we do; or, we go to the other extreme and become martyrs, put up with anything. Until we understand this desire to be

satisfied, then help becomes interference and domination. The desire to help another becomes interference and domination until we understand the urge, the craving to find satisfaction.

The mind is always seeking satisfaction, is it not? - which is, seeking a result, to be sure that one is helping. And when you are certain that you are giving help, you feel satisfied, from which comes so-called happiness. So, is it possible for the mind to be free from this urge to be satisfied? Why do we seek satisfaction? Why do we seek gratification in everything? Why are we not merely content to be what we are? For, if we can see what we are, then perhaps we can transform it. But always seeking satisfaction away from what we are brings about the whole problem of interference and domination, - whether your help is genuine or not, and so on.

So, the problem of satisfaction is very difficult to resolve, because it is so extraordinarily subtle and varied. And it can only come to an end by constant watching, being aware of how the mind is seeking to be certain in its own satisfaction. Again, this is not a matter for disputation, for argument, to be convinced of it, - but it is to be inquired into, to be found. To really see that your mind is seeking satisfaction, - not merely to repeat what has been said, which leads nowhere, but to see the truth of it, brings about an extraordinary discovery. Then it is something new which you have found. To find out for yourself the ways in which the mind is subtly seeking satisfaction, to discover it, to see it, to be aware of it, brings freedom from it.

Question: How do you "see" a fact with out any reaction: without condemnation or justification, without prejudice or the desire for a conclusion, without wanting to do something about it,

without the sense of the me and mine? What is the point of such "seeing" or awareness? Have you actually done this, and could you exemplify from your own experience?

Krishnamurti: First of all, do we see a fact? - not how do we see a fact, but do we see a fact? Do we see the fact, for example, of greed, of contradiction, in ourselves? What exactly do we mean by "seeing"? Am I aware that I am greedy? And how do I regard it? Am I capable of seeing that I am greedy, without explanations, without condemnation, without trying to do something about it, without justifying it, without the desire to transform it into non-greed? Let us take the example of envy, or greed, or feeling inferior or superior, or jealousy, and so on. Take one thing like that, and see what happens.

First of all, most of us are unaware that we are envious; we brush it casually aside as a bourgeois thing, as being superficial. But deeply, inwardly, profoundly, we are envious. We are envious beings. We want to be something, we want to achieve, we want to arrive, - which is the very indication of envy. Our social, economic, spiritual systems are based on that envy. First of all, be aware of it. Most of us are not. We justify it; we say, if we hadn't envy what would happen to civilization? - if we did not make progress and had no ambition, and so on, what would we do? - everything would collapse, would stagnate. So, that very statement, that very justification, surely prevents us from looking at the fact that we are, you and I, envious.

Then, if we are at all conscious, aware, seeing all this, - then what happens? If we do not justify, we condemn, don't we? - because we think that state of envy, or whatever state it is you feel,

is wrong, not spiritual, not moral. So we condemn; which prevents us seeing what is, does it not? When I justify, or condemn or have a desire to do something about it, that prevents me from looking at it, doesn't it? Let us examine this glass in front of me on the table. I can look at it without thinking who made it, observing the pattern, and so on; I can just look at it. Similarly, is it not possible to look at my envy, not to condemn it, not to have the desire to alter it, to do something about it, to justify it? Then, if I do not do all that, what happens? I hope you are following this, substituting for envy your own particular burden. I hope you are not merely listening to me telling you something about it, but are observing your own relation to a certain fact which is causing you disturbance, or pain, or confusion. Please watch yourself, and apply what we are saying to yourself, - watch your own mind in the process of thinking. We are partaking together, sharing together in this experiment to find out what "seeing" is, going more and more deeply into it.

So, if I would see that I am envious, be aware of it, see the content of it, then the desire to do something, to condemn, to justify, obviously comes to an end, because I am more interested to see what it is, what is behind it, what is its inward nature. If I am not interested to know more deeply, more intimately, the content of this whole problem of envy, then I am satisfied by merely condemning.

So, if I am not condemning, not desiring to do something about it, I am a little nearer, intimate, more close to the problem. Then, how do I look at it? How do I know I am greedy? Is it the word that is creating the feeling of wanting more? Is the reaction the outcome of memory, which is symbolized by a word? And is the

feeling different from the word, the name, the term? And by recognizing it, giving it a name, a label, have I resolved it, have I understood it?

All this is a process of seeing the fact, isn't it? And then, to go still further, is the me, the observer, experiencing greed? Is greed something apart from me? Is envy, that extraordinarily exciting and pleasurable reaction, something apart from me, the observer? When I do not condemn, when I do not justify, when I am not desirous of doing something about it, have I not removed the censor, the observer? And, when the observer is not, then, is there the word greed? - the very word being a condemnation. When the observer is not, then only is there a possibility of that feeling coming to an end.

But in looking at the fact, I do not start with the desire to bring it to an end; that is not my motive. I want to see the whole structure, the whole process; I want to understand it. And in this process I discover the ways of my own thinking. And it is through this self-knowledge, - not to be gathered from books, from printed words and lectures, but by actually sharing together as in this talk, - that we find out the ways of the self. It is seeking the truth of the fact, - which I can only do when I have been through this process, - which frees the mind from that reaction called envy. Without seeing the truth of that, then do what you will, envy will remain. You may find a substitute for it, you may do everything to cover it up, to run away from it; but it is always there. Only when we can understand how to approach it, to see the truth of it, is there freedom from it.

April 8, 1952.

LONDON 3RD PUBLIC TALK 15TH APRIL 1952

It seems to me that our problems are not so much concerned with the illusions that the mind creates, but rather in the fact that we avoid coming face to face with our own inadequacy. We do not see that we are really escaping from ourselves constantly. It is these escapes, these illusions, that create the conflict, and not, the discovery of ourselves as we are; and I think that is the real crux of our problem. We have got so many illusions, so many beliefs, so many certainties and prejudices; and these create the problem. We are trying constantly, are we not?, to adjust our inward urges, our inward experiences, our inward difficulties, - to adjust them to the beliefs, the knowledge, to the superficial conditions of our lives. And so we are for ever avoiding facing the real issue, which is ourselves. We are extremely bored with ourselves, with what we are, - and so we seek superficial knowledge, or, acquire beliefs, that will act as security, as permanency; and constantly we are running away from what we are. And perhaps this evening we can see what these escapes are, and actually cut ourselves off from them, - not theoretically, not verbally or intellectually, but actually face them, realize their full significance, and thereby let them drop away, so that without the suggestions or persuasions of others we can directly experience for ourselves, directly face, that which we are.

I think it is important not to discuss what our beliefs are, and how to get rid of them, - what our superstitions are, whether rituals, ceremonies, Masters, are necessary or not; those are all childish things. Because, our central problem is not those illusions, but

what is actual, - and from that we are running away. And if we can experience, come into contact with what actually is, not from a distance, but come very close and examine it, look at it, observe it, go into it deeply, then we shall see that though we are in despair, though there is war, though there is anxiety, a sense of eternal loneliness from which we are continually running away, we can deal with it, we can deal with the direct issue. That is where our difficulty lies; because, we have surrounded ourselves, have we not?, with so many fancies, so many illusions, so many myths, and all these are utterly valueless if we would discover what we actually are, and go beyond. As religious people, so-called religious, - which presumably most of us here are, - we have created many systems of philosophy, disciplines, beliefs, and we have formed many societies, organizations, which actually take us away from the central issue, - which is, what we actually are.

So, until we face that, - not intellectually, not verbally, - we cannot proceed to bring about an integration between what verbally we understand, and action. Intellectually we see that we are actually running away, taking flight from ourselves. We are conscious of it intellectually; verbally we accept it. Which again creates another problem, does it not? For the problem then arises, how am I to act, in order to come near, to understand, what actually I am? So, we make the "how" into another problem. And so, we increase one problem by another, - what to believe and what not to believe, what kind of meditations, disciplines we shall follow, how to still the mind, how to reject, what to acquire and what not to acquire, and so on and on; which only brings further confusion, further problems, ever multiplying and increasing.

Can we not see all this as illusion? - not theoretically, but really see that the mind is projecting these things and escaping through them in order to avoid the central issue of what we actually are? We can never find out what is actually the present state of the mind, and what lies beyond, unless we put aside or understand these illusions, - like beliefs in reincarnation, in Masters, - dozens of beliefs, - with which we have crippled the mind, and which have made it so enclosed that it can never be free. It is only when we have relinquished these, actually set them aside, - then only, when the mind is free, can we approach our central difficulty, which is ourselves.

Surely that is the problem, is it not? You may have wonderful philosophies, theories, of economic relationship, - how to bring about brotherhood, unity, and so on. But they will all be worthless, will they not?, unless we have solved the problem of the centre, of the motive, of the drive which makes us what we are. Surely that is the problem, is it not? And what is the difficulty that makes us incapable of meeting our problem fully? Why is it that we cannot, by understanding the escapes, come to the central point? - which is, our own anxiety, our own fear, that sense of utter loneliness, despair, which we are everlastingly trying to fill, to cover up. Is not our difficulty primarily the fear of uncertainty? The mind obviously dislikes a state in which it is uncertain, in which it cannot rely on something, - on a belief, on a person, on an idea. So, is not our difficulty the fact that most of us are seeking a permanency? - a permanent explanation, a permanent answer, a permanent relationship, an idea that cannot be shattered under any circumstances, - the idea of God, or what you will, - to which the

mind clings. And so, the mind projects the permanent, and holds on to it.

Now, can we not, seeing all this, - how the mind acts, its process, - can we not put aside those escapes? Not as a separate entity putting these things aside and thereby again dividing the mind in itself and producing another problem, of how to bring about integration of the mind. But can we not see the full significance of these escapes, and be in direct relationship then with that central issue, instead of going round in circles about things that really do not matter? - what nationality you belong to, what belief you have, what gods you worship, - which are all really the result of immature thinking. Can we not put those aside? Can the mind not see their actual value, their significance, and thereby be free from them and so come to the central point?

Can we not experiment with this problem as I am talking, so that you actually experience the freedom from these self-created illusions of the mind? And being free of them, then you can look directly at that thing which we call fear, anxiety, loneliness. It is only when the mind is free from anxiety, from fear, from loneliness, that it can then understand that which is not measurable by the mind; only then is it possible for that to take place, - not by seeking an explanation for that infinite anxiety, not by trying to reason it out, not by trying to escape from it, but by going through it. And it can only be gone through when the mind is not agitated with finding an answer, when it is not trying to look at what lies beyond it, when it is not measuring its own experiences in relation to the future to the thing that it hopes to discover. Only then, surely, can we find out what is reality, what God is, or whatever

name you may give to it. But merely to speculate from this side, to have theories, to have dogmas, is surely immature, and only creates further confusion and misery.

Surely the earnest, the thoughtful, must have gone through all this. But perhaps we have not gone further, - that is, to know the process of our own minds. And, when we understand the full significance of our own minds, then the division between the thinker and the thought, the observer who is looking at that anxiety or fear and trying to overcome it, surely disappears. There is only then that state of being which is fear, or anxiety, or loneliness, - not the observer of fear.

That integration between the thinker and the thought takes place only when the mind has completely put aside all escapes, and is not trying to find an answer. Because, whatever movement the mind makes in trying to understand the central issue must be based on time, on the past. And time comes into being only when there is fear and desire.

So, realizing all that, is it not possible for the mind, being free from those escapes, to look at itself, not as the thinker looking at his thoughts, as the experiencer experiencing, but merely observing the state of the mind, being aware without this division? That integrated state comes only when there is no desire to experience something more, the greater than what is.

And, if we can understand what is and go beyond it, then we shall find out what love is. And love is the only remedy and the only revolution that can bring about order. But unfortunately most of us are not very serious or earnest. Earnestness, surely, means discovering the process of one's own thinking, - not multiplying

beliefs or rituals or all that nonsense, but understanding the ways of our own thinking, the motives, the pursuits, the activities, the chatterings of the mind, from which all mischief arises. Having understood them, they will naturally come to an end; and thereby the mind, being free from its own pettiness, can penetrate without effort, without that constant battle, and discover what is beyond itself.

Question: I have tried writing down my thoughts with a view, to bringing thought to an end, as you once suggested. Do you still suggest this? I have not found it very helpful myself, as it seems to become a sort of diary.

Krishnamurti: Without understanding the process of thought, how thought comes into being, the ways of your own individual thinking, how your thought is driven by motives, by desires, by anxieties, - without knowing the whole content of thought you cannot possibly bring about tranquillity. I suggested once that by writing down, being acquainted with your own thinking, with your own thought, perhaps self-knowledge would come out of it. For without self-knowledge there is no understanding. Without knowing the intricacies of your own thought, at both the conscious and the unconscious levels, without knowing the depths of it, then, do what you will, all superficial activities of control, of domination, of adjustment, of what to believe and what not to believe, are utterly useless. So, perhaps you can get to know yourself more deeply, not only by observing superficially your daily thoughts, but also by writing them down; and perhaps thereby you will release the unconscious motives, the unconscious pursuits, desires and fears.

But, if you have a motive, - that by writing down your thoughts you will put an end to thinking, - then obviously the thing becomes a diary. Because you want a result; and it's very easy to produce a result. You can have an end and achieve a goal, - but that does not mean you understand the whole process of yourself, the total process of yourself. The intention is, surely, not how to achieve a result, but to understand yourself, and also to understand why the mind craves for a result. In achieving a result the mind feels secure, there is a satisfaction, a sense of permanency, a vanity, a conceit.

So, after all, what is important is, is it not?, to understand yourself. Not, what your values are, - your nationality, belief, religion, church, and all the rest of it; those are all immature activities of the mind. But, what is important is, is it not?, to understand the ways of your thinking, to know yourself. And you can only do that by observing your own thinking, your own reactions being aware of your dreams, of your words, of your gestures of your whole being. And that you can observe in the bus, in relationship, all the time if you wish. But for most of us that becomes very strenuous; and so, without actually experiencing, we repeat phrases, and thereby prevent the actual discovery of the process of own thinking.

After all, as long as the mind is active, or merely concentrated on a particular idea or a particular desire, it is not free. Thought can project, and worship that which it has projected. With us, that is almost always the case. So, one has to be aware of the activities of the mind, its reactions. And, only then can thought come to an end. Not, as a result, as a thing to be willed, towards which the mind disciplines itself, suppressing, rejecting, sublimating itself, and so

on. But the ending of the thought is an indication that the mind is actually tranquil, still. But if it is merely a result, then the mind is in a state of stagnation. Because, the mind again wants to go further; so every result, everything that has been conquered, has to be reconquered, broken again.

So the mind, through understanding itself at all its different levels, comes to a state when it is still. And this is not a long, tedious, tiresome, boring process. You know very well what you think and what you feel, if you are at all aware, sensitive to yourself. You do not have to be analysed, dissected, - that is a lazy man's game. But we know, actually inwardly, our own conflicts, and the cause of those conflicts, their significance, what lies behind them. But we don't want to look at it, we don't want to face it. And so, we play around in circles, never coming to the centre.

So, the ending of thought is essential; because the mind must be utterly tranquil, without any movement backwards or forwards, - for movement indicates time, in which there is fear and desire. So, when the mind is utterly tranquil, then only is it possible for that which is not nameable to come into being.

Question: My wife and I quarrel. We seem to like each other, but yet this wrangling goes on. We have tried several ways of putting an end to this ugliness, but we seem unable to be psychologically free of each other. What do you suggest?

Krishnamurti: As long as there is dependency, there must be tension. If I depend on you as an audience in order to fulfil myself, in order to feel that I am somebody talking to a vast number of people, then I depend on you, I exploit you, you are necessary to me psychologically. This dependence is called love, and all our

relationship is based on it. Psychologically I need you, and psychologically you need me. Psychologically you become important in my relationship with you, because you fill my needs, - not only physically, but also inwardly. Without you, I am lost, I am uncertain. I depend upon you; I love you. Whenever that dependence is questioned, there is uncertainty, - and then I am afraid. And to cover up that fear I resort to all kinds of subterfuges which will help me to get away from that fear. We know all this, - we use property, knowledge, gods, illusions, relationship, as a means to cover our own emptiness, our own loneliness, and so these things become very important. The things which have become our escapes become extraordinarily valuable.

So, as long as there is dependence, there must be fear. It is not love. You may call it love; you may cover it up with any pleasant-sounding word. But actually, beneath it there is a void, there is the wound which cannot be healed by any method, which can only come to an end when you are conscious of it, aware of it, understand it. And there can be understanding only when you are not seeking an explanation. You see, the questioner demands an explanation; he wants words from me. And we are satisfied by words. The new explanation, if it is new, you will repeat. But the problem is still there; there will still be wrangling.

But when once we understand this process of dependence, - the outward as well as the inward, the hidden dependencies, the psychological urgencies, the demand for the more, - when we understand those things, only then, surely, is there a possibility of love. Love is neither personal nor impersonal; it is a state of being. It is not of the mind; the mind cannot acquire it. You cannot

practise love, or through meditation acquire it. It comes into being only when there is no fear, when this sense of anxiety, loneliness, has ceased, when there is no dependence or acquisition. And that comes only when we understand ourselves, when we are fully cognizant of our hidden motives, when the mind can delve into the depths of itself without seeking an answer, an explanation, when it is no longer naming.

Surely one of our difficulties is, is it not?, that most of us are satisfied with the superficialities of life, - with explanations, chiefly. And we think we have solved all things by explaining them, - which is the activity of the mind. As long as we can name, recognize, we think we have achieved something, and the moment there is the idea of no recognition no naming, no explanation, then the mind gets confused. But only when there are no explanations, when the mind is not caught in words, is it possible for love to come into being.

Question: Does not what you are talking about require time and leisure? - whereas most of us are occupied with earning a livelihood, which takes most of our time. Are you speaking for those who are old and retired, or for the ordinary man who has to work?

Krishnamurti: What do you think? You have leisure, you have time, even though you have to earn a livelihood. It may take most of your time; but you have at least an hour to yourself during the day, have you not; there is some time when you have leisure. We use that leisure for various activities, to relax from the things which we have been doing all day, which are boring, routine. But even after you have relaxed, surely you still have more leisure, have you

not? And even while you are working you can be aware of your own thoughts. Even while working at things that do not please you, a routine, a job which is not your vocation, but which modern civilization forces you into, - even while you are turning over a machine, surely you have time, you can observe your own thinking! Most of your work is automatic, because you are highly trained. But there is a part of you that is observing, that is looking out of the window, that is seeking an answer to this confusion, that goes and joins societies, that goes in for meditation, rituals, churches.

So, you have enough leisure which, if rightly employed, will break your routine, will bring about action, a revolution, in your life, - which the respectable do not want, of which those well-established with name, with property, with position, have a dread. We want to alter the outward things without inward revolution. But there must be the inward revolution first, which will bring about outward order. This is not just a phrase. But that inward revolution is not possible, either collectively or individually, if each one of us does not go into this whole problem of ourselves. You see, it is you and I who are tackling the problem; the problem is not outside you and me. The problems of war, peace, competition, ruthlessness, cruelty, - we are creating these, you and I. And without understanding the total process of ourselves, mere change of occupation, or having leisure, will have little significance. This is not, surely, for the old or for the young. For anyone who thinks at all, who wants to find out, surely age is not of importance. But we put wrong values on these things, and thereby create more problems.

Question: I have read a great deal, and have studied the religions of both East and West, and my knowledge of these things is fairly extensive. I have listened to you now for several years, but what eludes me is this thing which you call the creative being or state. Could you go a little further into the matter?

Krishnamurti: Perhaps you and I can experiment for the next ten minutes, and see if we cannot go further, more deeply, - not theoretically but actually, - into what it means to be creative. The difficulty with most of us is that we know too much about these matters. We have read a great deal about Eastern philosophy, or Western theories, - which actually becomes a barrier to discovery, does it not? So our knowledge becomes an impediment. Because, our knowledge has already tasted what the creative state is, what God is; because, we have read the descriptions of the experiences of others. So, when we are full of that, we can only compare; and comparison is not experiencing, comparison is not discovery.

So, the thing which we have acquired through centuries as knowledge, that which is measurable by memory, - that has to come to an end, has it not? Which means, that our mind, with all its experience, its knowledge of what we have experienced yesterday, or what we have read of the descriptions by others of that state, - all that must be set aside, must it not? Because this thing must be completely original. God must be something never experienced before. It must be something unrecognizable by the mind. If it is recognized, it is not the new, it is not the timeless.

So, seeing the truth of that, - not theoretically but actually, - cannot the mind be free of the old? Not, free through suggestion, but through seeing the truth of it, - that as long as the mind, which

is the result of time, is capable of measuring, recognizing, projecting, desiring, then it cannot possibly be in a state which is creative. The new cannot be in the old. The old can recognize nothing but its own projections. So, the activity of the mind must completely cease. And it ceases when we understand all these things, when we see the truth of them.

So, let us just listen, - not exercise our minds, but listen, - to find out, to discover, how the mind, by its own activities, which are based on time, of the past, of memories of what we have learned, and of the things we have forgotten, is preventing the creative state. When that is seen, understood, then there is a freedom from it. So, knowledge must be completely set aside for the mind to be still. And then only is it possible for that state, which cannot be described, to come into being. That state is not a permanent state, a thing of time, continuous. It is not a state to be cultivated, to be acquired and held. It exists from moment to moment, without any invitation from the mind. And no amount of reading about it, no amount of your practice, discipline, theories, will ever actually bring that state into being. Only when the mind is completely free from its own activities, from its own demands, is it possible for that creative state to come into being.

April 15, 1952

LONDON 4TH PUBLIC TALK 16TH APRIL 1952

It seems to me that one of our most difficult problems is to co-ordinate or integrate idea with action. Most of us are aware that there is a gap between action and idea, and we are everlastingly trying to bridge this gap. And I think it is important to understand that there will always be a division between idea and action so long as we do not understand and go fully into the question of consciousness, and experience direct relationship between the idea and action itself. For most of us, idea is very important, - idea being symbol, image, words. And we try to approximate action to that idea. And the problem then arises of how to bridge the gap, how to put idea into action. And I would like to go into that problem this evening.

Most of us are aware that envy is the basis of most of our action. Envy, or acquisitiveness, - our social structure is based on that. And the thoughtful, the earnest, obviously see that there must be freedom from envy. And being aware that there must be freedom, how does one set about it? There is the idea first; and then we inquire how to relate it to action. Obviously there must be freedom from envy, because it is a deteriorating factor, antisocial, and so on. For innumerable reasons we are well aware that envy is a quality, an impulse, a reaction, which must be eradicated.

Now how is one to do it? Can one do it through the process of time, through constant denial, through suppression? Or is there a different approach, a different way of looking at it altogether? How can the mind be free from that reaction called envy, upon which most of our existence is based? Because obviously, if we take time,

practise a gradual diminution of it, we are not entirely free of it. The process of time will not give to the mind a freedom from envy. Virtue, after all, is freedom, - not, a cultivation of any particular quality. The more you cultivate a quality, the more you strengthen the self, the me. So it must have struck most of us that we are faced with this problem of how to be free from a particular quality, how to set about it. If we merely cultivate its opposite, we are still held in the opposite, and there is no freedom. Virtue is, after all, a state of being free, and not, being held in a particular quality, - which limits the mind.

So, the problem is, is it not? - how can one deal with a particular quality, - let us say, for example, envy, - and be free of it, immediately? - not, take time, gradually eradicate it, but be immediately free. Is it possible to be free completely? To answer that question deeply, and not merely superficially, we must examine, must we not?, the process of consciousness. That is, we must know, or be aware of our approach to the problem, - how we think, how we regard the problem, in what way we approach it, with what attitude, - not only at the superficial level of the mind, but in the hidden layers. All that is surely the process of consciousness. So, if we are to be completely rid of this thing called envy, we must know how we are looking at it, - with what attitude, with what motive, with what intention we approach it. Which means, how does our mind, both the conscious as well as the unconscious, react to it? That is, are we in direct relationship with it, or are we merely dealing with words and ideas without being in direct contact with the quality?

I do not know if I am making my- self clear on this point, -

perhaps not. So, let me elaborate a little more. What is our consciousness? - consciousness being our mind, both the hidden and the superficial. It is obviously the result of time, - time being memory, images, words, all of which, accumulated, respond to any particular problem, to any challenge, to any question. And our thinking, based on that memory, is verbal. That is, there is no thinking without words, without symbols, without images. So with that background, with that consciousness, we approach the problem of envy, which we are taking as an example. We are never directly in relation with the reaction called envy, but only with the word. Am I directly experiencing envy, am I in relation with it, - or, with the word called envy? Am I in contact with that reaction, immediately and fully aware of it, without giving it a name, without giving it a term? Or, do I recognize envy through the word? If I can experience envy directly, without giving it a term, a name, then there is quite a different experience. But if I am only in relation with that reaction, verbally, through a word, through an image, then it is not a true experience.

So, if we would be completely free from a particular quality such as envy, surely we must find out whether we are experiencing it directly, without the medium of words, or whether the word is giving us the so-called experience. If we are concerned with the word, with the idea, and are in relation only with the idea, then the problem arises, how to relate the idea to action. That is, we are aware that we are envious; but are we aware merely verbally, or are we experiencing envy directly, without giving to that reaction a name? I do not know if you have ever tried it? Take, for example, your sudden awareness that you are jealous. How are you aware of

it? Are you aware of it because you recognize it through the word, or are you aware of it as an actual experience, without giving it a word, a name, a term? I think it is important to find this out. Because if you can have direct relationship with it, then you will see that there is complete freedom from the thing which we have named. But if you are aware of the feeling through the word, through the symbol, through memory, then the problem arises of how to relate the idea to action.

Perhaps we can make this a little more simple. I am envious; I am jealous. How am I to get rid of it? I see its complications, its conflicts, the uselessness of it. And, how am I to proceed to be free from it? Am I to suppress it, analyse it, discipline myself to resist it? - which all takes time, and which brings about conflict between idea and action, does it not? I want to be free from it, but actually I am not. So, there is the idea of wanting to be free, and the actuality of not being free. What is important is the actuality, the reality, not, "I want to be free". So, how am I to set about being free from this quality which I have termed envy? Obviously discipline does not get rid of it. If I create a resistance against it, that resistance does not bring understanding; nor does the cultivation of its opposite, which only creates further conflict. So, how am I to be free from it?

We know the usual, habitual, traditional approach, - which is, by gradually attacking, resisting, disciplining ourselves against it; and one sees that still one is not actually free from it. I wonder if you have ever thought about it in a different way? There must be a different approach; and that is what we are trying to find out. There is a different approach if I can experience the reaction of envy

directly, without naming it. And that is why we have to examine, understand, how our consciousness works, which is really quite a complicated process. We think we understand something when we give it a name; when we can put a label on something, we think we have grasped the full significance of it. So to us, words, symbols, ideas, are very important. And our consciousness is made up of these, - of words, of symbols, of ideas, - which represent our memories. So our memories recognize the reaction called envy, and therefore there is no direct experience of that feeling, but only the recollection of it.

But if we can look at that reaction without verbalizing it, without giving it a name, then you will see you are experiencing it directly for the first time. And I think that is most important, - to experience the feeling, the reaction, for the first time, as it were, afresh, without giving it a name. It is the name that creates the barrier. Perhaps you will experiment with this; and you will see how difficult it is to experience something new. Because memory is always intervening, recognizing, and saying "Yes, that is jealousy, that is envy, the thing which I must get rid of". So, memory creates the idea, and that idea creates its own feeling, its own reactions, and therefore you are only in relationship with the idea, and not in direct relationship with the problem.

So when we have a problem from which we feel there must be complete freedom, such as envy, it is important, is it not?, to find out how our minds approach it, what our reactions are, how we are experiencing that quality, whether the experience is direct or merely through a word. And it is surely only when we can experience something anew, afresh, that there is a possibility of

understanding it fully, completely. If we bring to it all our recollections, all our memories, the names, the conditioning influences, then we are not experiencing it directly; at all; and so the problem ever increases, multiplies, and keeps going. Most of us know that although we have struggled against envy we are not free from it. It is virtue which brings freedom, - not, being caught in words, which bring only a limitation, a respectability, a habit, to the mind.

Question: I have lived through two catastrophic world wars. I fought in one, and became a displaced person in the other. I realize that the individual who has no control over these events has very little purpose in life. What is the point of this existence?

Krishnamurti: I wonder how you and I, as two individuals, regard this problem? There is the historical process; and what is the relationship of the individual to that process? As an individual, what can you do about the wars? Probably, very little. Because wars come into being for various reasons, - economic, psychological, and so on; and how can you stop all that? You cannot, surely, stop the process of war, which multitudes have set going. But you as an individual can step out of it, can you not?, whatever the consequences to yourself. Can you, as an individual, eradicate from your own heart and mind those qualities that create antagonism, hatred, enmity? If you cannot, you are obviously contributing to the cause of war.

Take, as an example, nationalism, - the feeling of being a separate group of people, - in which the individual fulfils himself, finds satisfaction. Inwardly, we are poor, insufficient, lonely; and when we identify ourselves with a particular group of people as

Hindu, Russian or English, obviously we feel secure. And that security we must protect. In pursuing the security we long for, we exploit and are exploited. Now, can you, as an individual, be free from that nationalistic feeling? And when you are free, is it not possible to look upon this historical process with an entirely different attitude? The questioner wants to know, if he is not responsible for these wars, if he has no control over them, what is the purpose of living? But is it not important to find out first if you, as an individual, cannot be free from all the forces, influences, that create war? Can you not actually bring about an inward revolution, - not theoretically but actually, - so that you are a free human being, who experiences love, and who, because he is free from antagonism, from hatred, will find the right answer to the question?

You see, our problem is, is it not?, that we have no love. If the mother really loved her child, if the parents loved, they would jolly well see that there was no war! But to the parents, the prestige and well-being of the country, of a certain group, is more important than love of the child. If one really loved, if there was that feeling of love, then surely you would prevent war. But, not having that inward reality, we resort to all kinds of systems, governments; we look to politicians, various methods, to prevent war. And we will never succeed. Because, we have not, as individuals, solved the problem in ourselves. We would rather remain segregated, enclosed within nationalistic ideologies, in a world of beliefs, and so be separated, be one against the other. And until we solve that problem, - how the individual is seeking security, and thereby causing antagonism, hatred, enmity, - wars of one kind or another will always go on.

When we know for ourselves that we are free, then the purpose of existence comes into being without our asking. Freedom does not come into being through the mere cultivation of virtue, but only when there is that quality of love which is not of the mind.

Question: When trying to empty the mind in order to still it, I obtain a kind of blank mind. How do I know that this state is not simply dozing?

Krishnamurti: Why do we want a still mind? Why do we want tranquillity? Is it because we are so tired, exhausted, by an agitated mind, a mind that is constantly chattering, a mind that is so occupied, - and to escape from that we desire a still mind? Is that it? Or, do we see the necessity of a still mind, of a quiet mind, because a quiet mind understands, can see things directly, can experience immediately? Do we see that if the mind is agitated, there is no possibility of discovering anything new, of understanding, of being free? And, is this a necessity, or merely a reaction from its opposite? Surely that is important to find out, is it not? Do you want tranquillity of the mind because you are fed up with the mind which is so active, so agitated? Surely, that you have to find out, have you not? If it is merely a reaction, then obviously the mind goes into sleep. Then the mind is not tranquil; it merely puts itself to sleep, - through various forms of discipline, controls, and so on.

So, our problem is not, how to bring about a quiet, still mind, - but, to look at those things that agitate the mind, to understand those things that bring about disturbance. And when we understand those, then there will be tranquillity. When we are free from the problem, then there is a stillness. But to induce a stillness when the

mind is crippled with problems, obviously brings about a dullness of the mind. So, our problem is not, how to make the mind tranquil, still, peaceful, but, to understand, to be free from those problems which agitate the mind. The mind obviously creates the problems. If there is a problem, how do we approach it, with what attitude? How do we experience it? It is that which it is important to understand, and not, how to escape from the problem into tranquillity.

How can the mind which is producing problems be quiet? It is impossible. All that it can do is to understand each problem as it arises, and be free from it. And through freedom comes tranquillity. As I was saying previously, without virtue there is no freedom. And virtue is not a thing to be cultivated. If I am jealous, envious, I must be free from it immediately. The immediacy is important, is essential. And if I realize that the immediacy of freedom from that particular quality is essential, then there is freedom. But we do not realize the urgency of it. And that is where our difficulty lies. We like the feeling, the sensation, of being envious, - the pleasure of it; we want to indulge in it. And so gradually we build the idea that we must eventually be free from it. And so, there is never a complete freedom from a particular reaction. And only when the mind is free is there the possibility of tranquillity.

Question: Unless the mind is occupied it soon goes to sleep or deteriorates. Should it not be occupied with the more serious things of life?

Krishnamurti: Is not a mind that is occupied, with the great, or with the trivial, incapable of being free? Is not mere occupation a

distraction, however noble it is? What concerns us is that the mind is so vagrant, wandering all over the place, distracted, and we want it to be occupied with something, for then it feels at rest. Most of our minds are occupied with trivial things, with the daily chatterings. And rejecting those, we begin to occupy ourselves with more serious things, - the serious things being ideas, images, speculations. And as long as the mind is occupied with these so-called serious things, we feel it is more quiet, more concentrated, not wandering. But such an occupied mind is never a free mind. It is only in freedom that you can begin to understand anything, - not with a mind that is crippled by its own concentrations.

You see, we are so afraid to discover the process of our own thinking of our own state; we are so apprehensive of knowing ourselves as we are. And so, we begin to invent cages, ideas, in which the mind can be held, which offer a convenient escape from ourselves. So, what is important is the understanding of ourselves, - not, with what we should occupy our minds. There is no good occupation or bad occupation. As long as the mind is occupied, it is not free. And it is only through freedom that we can understand, that we can know, what truth is. So, instead of asking whether our minds should be occupied, we should find out how our minds work, what our motives are, the whole process of our existence.

After all, we live through sensation, - contact, perception, sensation, - from which arises desire. And when desire is not fulfilled there is conflict, and there is fear. So, fear and desire create time, the sense of tomorrow, the acquiring more, being secure, the importance of the me, the I, the ego. And instead of understanding, going into, that whole problem of consciousness,

we want superficial results; we want to be occupied, we want to know how to meditate, how to be this or that, - which are all escapes, distractions.

So, what is important in all these questions is to go into the process of our thinking, - which is self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge, do what you will, there can be no peace in the world. Without self-knowledge there can be no love. The thing which the mind calls love is not love; it is only an idea. And you can only begin to know yourself deeply, widely, in relationship, - with your wife, with your husband, with your society. Be aware of it; be aware of your reactions, and do not condemn them; because any form of judgment, any form of justification, surely puts an end to a feeling, a reaction, - brushes it aside and does not let it flow out so that you can follow it. After all, if I would understand a child I must study him in all his moods, - when he plays, when he talks. Merely to condemn prevents understanding. Similarly, if I would understand the process of my thinking there must obviously be, not condemnation, but observation. But all our training, socially, morally, and religiously, is to condemn, to resist, - which prevents a direct experience, a direct understanding of the problem.

So, the more you go into the problem of your reactions, without condemnation, without justification, then you will see that you are beginning to understand the whole process of your consciousness, of the me, with all its hidden motives. Then you will see whether you are merely reacting to the word, or are directly experiencing a certain feeling, - whether you are meeting any challenge through the screen of memory, or idea, or whether you are meeting it directly. The more you begin to know yourself, to be aware of

every subtle reaction, every process, every intention, then you will see that quite a different state comes into being, - a state which is not induced by the mind. Because, the mind can induce any kind of state; it can believe in anything, experience anything. But that which the mind experiences, believes in, is not the real. Reality can come into being only through self-knowledge, when the mind, through understanding its own processes, the hidden as well as the superficial, becomes quiet, - not is made quiet, but becomes quiet. Then only is there a possibility for that reality to come into being.

But all this does not imply a series of stages which the mind must go through. What is essential is to see the necessity of being quiet. And it is the urgency the necessity, that brings this about, and not, the cultivation of a particular quality or method.

April 16, 1952

LONDON 5TH PUBLIC TALK 23RD APRIL 1952

Perhaps this evening we could go into the problem of effort. It seems to me that it is very important to understand the approach we make to any conflict, to any problem with which we are faced. We are concerned, are we not?, most of us, with the action of will. And to us, effort is most essential in every form; to us, to live without effort seems incredible leading to stagnation and to deterioration. And if we can go into that problem of effort, I think perhaps it will be profitable; because we may then be able to understand what is truth without exercising will, without making an effort, by being capable of perceiving directly what is. But to do that, we must understand this question of effort; and I hope we can go into it without any opposition, any resistance.

For most of us, our whole life is based on effort, some kind of volition. And we cannot conceive of an action without volition, without effort; our life is based on it. Our social, economic, and so-called spiritual life is a series of efforts, always culminating in a certain result. And we think effort is essential, necessary. So we are now going to find out if it is possible to live differently, without this constant battle.

Why do we make effort? Is it not, put simply, in order to achieve a result to become something, to reach a goal? And if we do not make an effort, we think we shall stagnate. We have an idea about the goal towards which we are constantly striving; and this striving has become part of our life. If we want to alter ourselves, if we want to bring about a radical change in ourselves, we make a tremendous effort to eliminate the old habits, to resist the habitual

environmental influences, and so on. So we are used to this series of efforts in order to find or achieve something, in order to live at all. And is not all such effort the activity of the self? Is not effort self-centred activity? And, if we make an effort from the centre of the self, it must inevitably produce more conflict, more confusion, more misery. Yet we keep on making effort after effort. And very few of us realize that the self-centred activity of effort does not clear up any of our problems. On the contrary, it increases our confusion and our misery and our sorrow. We know this. And yet we continue hoping somehow to break through this self-centred activity of effort, the action of the will.

That is our problem, - is it possible to understand anything without effort? Is it possible to see what is real, what is true, without introducing the action of will? - which is essentially based on the self, the me. And if we do not make an effort, is there not a danger of deterioration, of going to sleep, of stagnation? Perhaps this evening, as I am talking, we can experiment with this individually, and see how far we can go through this question. For I feel the thing that brings happiness, quietness, tranquillity of the mind, does not come through any effort. A truth is not perceived through any volition, through any action of will. And if we can go into it very carefully and diligently, perhaps we shall find the answer. How do we react when a truth is presented? Take, for example, what we were discussing the other day, - the problem of fear. We realize that our activity and our being and our whole existence would be fundamentally altered if there were no fear of any kind in us. We may see that, we may see the truth of it; and thereby there is a freedom from fear. But for most of us, when a

fact, a truth, is put before us, what is our immediate response? Please, experiment with what I am saying; please do not merely listen. Watch your own reactions; and find out what happens when a truth, a fact, is put before you, - such as, "Any dependency in relationship destroys relationship". Now, when a statement of that kind is made, what is your response? Do you see, are you aware of the truth of it, and thereby dependency ceases? Or, have you an idea about the fact? Here is a statement of truth. Do we experience the truth of it, or, do we create an idea about it?

If we can understand the process of this creation of idea, then we shall perhaps understand the whole process of effort. Because, when once we have created the idea, then effort comes into being. Then the problem arises, what to do, how to act? That is, we see that psychological dependency on another is a form of self-fulfilment; it is not love; in it there is conflict, in it there is fear, in it there is dependency, which corrodes; in it there is the desire to fulfil oneself through another, jealousy, and so on. We see that psychological dependency on another embraces all these facts. Then, we proceed to create the idea, do we not? We do not directly experience the fact, the truth of it; but, we look at it, and then create an idea of how to be free from dependency. We see the implications of psychological dependence, and then we create the idea of how to be free from it. We do not directly experience the truth, which is the liberating factor. But, out of the experience of looking at that fact we create an idea. We are incapable of looking at it directly, without ideation. Then, having created the idea, we proceed to put that idea into action. Then we try to bridge the gap between idea and action, - in which effort is involved.

So, can we not look at the truth without creating ideas? It is almost instinctive with most of us, when something true is put before us, to create immediately an idea about it. And I think if we can understand why we do this so instinctively, almost unconsciously, then perhaps we shall understand if it is possible to be free from effort. So, why do we create ideas about truth? Surely that is important to find out, is it not? Either we see the truth nakedly, as it is, or we do not. But why do we have a picture about it, a symbol, a word, an image? - which necessitates a postponement, the hope of an eventual result. So, can we hesitantly and guardedly go into this process of why the mind creates the image, the idea? - that I must be this or that, I must be free from dependence, and so on. We know very well that when we see something very clearly, experience it directly, there is a freedom from it. It is that immediacy that is vital, not, the picture or the symbol of the truth, - on which all systems and philosophies and deteriorating organizations are built. So, is it not important to find out why the mind, instead of seeing the thing directly, simply, and experiencing the truth of it immediately, creates the idea about it?

I do not know if you have thought about this? It may perhaps be something new. And to find the truth of it, please do not merely resist. Do not say, "What would happen if the mind did not create the idea? It is its function to create ideas, to verbalize, to recall memories, to recognize, to calculate". We know that. But the mind is not free; and it is only when the mind is capable of looking at the truth fully, totally, completely, without any barrier, that there is a freedom.

So, our problem is, is it not? - why does the mind, instead of

seeing the thing immediately and experiencing it directly, indulge in all these ideas? Is this not one of the habits of the mind?

Something is presented to us; and immediately there is the old habit of creating an idea, a theory, about it. And the mind likes to live in habit. Because, without habit the mind is lost. If there is not a routine, a habitual response to which it has become accustomed, it feels confused, uncertain.

That is one aspect. Also, does not the mind seek a result? Because, in the result is permanency. And the mind hates to be uncertain. It is always seeking security in different forms, - through beliefs, through knowledge, through experience. And when that is questioned there is a disturbance, there is anxiety. And so the mind, avoiding uncertainty, seeks security for itself by making efforts to achieve a result.

I hope you are following all this, - not merely listening to me, but actually observing your own minds in operation. If you are only listening to me and not really following what I am talking about, then you will not experience, then it will remain on the verbal level. But if you can, if I may suggest it, observe your own mind in operation, and watch how it thinks, how it reacts, when a truth is put before it, then you will experience step by step what I am talking about. Then there will be an extraordinary experience. And it is this direct approach, direct experience of what truth is, that is so essential in bringing about a creative life.

So, why does the mind create these ideas, instead of directly experiencing? That is what we are trying to find out. Why does the mind intervene? We said, it is habit. Also, the mind wants to achieve a result. We all want to achieve a result. In listening to me,

are you looking for a result? You are, are you not? So, the mind is seeking a result; it sees that dependency is destructive, and therefore it wants to be free of it. But the very desire to be free creates the idea. The mind is not free; but the desire to be free creates the idea of freedom as the goal towards which it must work. And thereby effort comes into being. And that effort is self-centred; it does not bring freedom. Instead of depending on a person, you depend on an idea or on an image. So, your effort is only self-enclosing; it is not liberating. So, can the mind realizing that it is caught in habit, be free from habit? - not, have an idea that it should achieve freedom as an eventual goal, but, see the truth that the mind is caught in habit, directly experience it. And similarly, can the mind see that it is pursuing incessantly a permanency for itself, a goal which it must achieve, a god, a truth, a virtue, a being, a state, - what you will, - and is thereby bringing about this action of will, with all its complications? And when we see that, is it not possible to directly experience the truth of something without all the paraphernalia of verbalization? You may objectively see the fact; in that there is no ideation, no creation of idea, symbol, desire. But subjectively, inwardly, it is entirely different. Because there we want a result; there is the craving to be something, to achieve, to become, - in which all effort is born.

And I feel that to see what is true, from moment to moment, without any effort, but directly to experience it, is the only creative existence. Because it is only in moments of complete tranquillity that you discover something, - not, when you are making an effort, whether it is under the microscope or inwardly. It is only when the mind is not agitated, caught in habit, trying to achieve a result,

trying to become something, - it is only when it is not doing that, when it is really tranquil, when there is no effort, no movement, that there is a possibility of discovering something new.

Surely, that is freedom from the self, that is the abnegation of the me, - and not the outward symbols, whether you possess this or that virtue or not. But freedom only comes into being when you understand your own processes, conscious as well as unconscious. And it is possible only when we go fully into the different processes of the mind. And as most of us live in a state of tension, in constant effort, it is essential to understand the complexity of effort, to see the truth that effort does not bring virtue, that effort is not love that effort does not bring about the freedom which truth alone can give, - which is a direct experiencing. For that, one has to understand the mind, one's own mind, - not somebody else's mind, not what somebody else says about it. Though you may read all the volumes they will be utterly useless. For you must observe your own mind, and penetrate into it deeper and deeper, and experience the thing directly as you go along. Because, there is the living quality, and not in the things of the mind. Therefore the mind, to find its own processes, must not be enclosed by its own habits, must occasionally be free to look. Therefore it is important to understand this whole process of effort. For effort does not bring about freedom. Effort is only more and more self-enclosing, more and more destructive, outwardly as well as inwardly, in relationship with one or with many.

Question: I find a regular group that meets to discuss your teachings tends to become confusing and boring. Is it better to think over these things alone, or with others?

Krishnamurti: What is important? To find out, is it not?, to discover for yourself the things about yourself. If that is your urgent, immediate instinctive necessity, then you can do it with one or with many, by yourself or with two or three. But when that is lacking, then groups become boring things. Then people who come to the groups are dominated by one or two in the group, who know everything, who are in immediate contact with the person who has already said these things. So, the one becomes the authority, and gradually exploits the many. We know this too familiar game. But people submit to it, because they like being together. They like to talk, to have the latest gossip or the latest news. And so, the thing soon deteriorates. You start with a serious intention, and it becomes something ugly.

But if we are really, insistently needing to discover for ourselves what is true, then all relationship becomes important; but such people are rare. Because, we are not really serious; and so we eventually make of groups and organizations something to be avoided. So it surely depends, does it not?, on whether you are really earnest to discover these things for yourself. And this discovery can come at any moment, - not only in a group, or only when you are by yourself, but at any moment when you are aware, sensitive to the intimations of your own being. To watch yourself, - the way you talk at table, the way you talk to your neighbour, your servant, your boss, - surely all these, if one is aware, indicate the state of your own being. And it is that discovery which is important. Because it is that discovery which liberates.

Question: What, would you say, is the most creative way of meeting great grief and loss?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by "meeting"? You mean, how to approach it, what we should do about it, how to conquer it, how to be free of it, how to derive benefit from it, how to learn from it so as to avoid more suffering? Surely that is what we mean, do we not, by, how to "meet" grief?

Now, what do we mean by "grief"? Is it something apart from you? Is it something outside of you, inwardly or outwardly, which you are observing, which you are experiencing? Are you merely the observer experiencing? Or, is it something different? Surely that is an important point, is it not? When I say "I suffer", what do I mean by it? Am I different from the suffering? Surely that is the question, is it not? Let us find out.

There is sorrow, - I am not loved, my son dies, - what you will. There is one part of me that is demanding why, demanding the explanation, the reasons, the causes. The other part of me is in agony, for various reasons. And there is also another part of me which wants to be free from the sorrow, which wants to go beyond it. We are all these things, are we not? So, if one part of me is rejecting, resisting sorrow, another part of me is seeking an explanation, is caught up in theories, and another part of me is escaping from the fact, how then can I understand it totally? It is only when I am capable of integrated understanding that there is a possibility of freedom from sorrow. But if I am torn in different directions, then I do not see the truth of it.

So, it is very important to find out, is it not?, whether I am merely the observer experiencing sorrow. Please follow this question slowly and carefully. If I am merely the observer experiencing sorrow, then there are two states in my being, - the

one who observes, who thinks, who experiences, and the other who is observed, - which is, the experience, the thought. So as long as there is a division there is no immediate freedom from sorrow.

Now, please listen carefully; and you will see that when there is a fact, a truth, there is understanding of it only when I can experience the whole thing without division, - and not, when there is the separation of the me observing suffering. That is the truth. Now, what is your immediate reaction to that? Is not your immediate reaction, response, - how am I to bridge the gap between the two? I recognize that there are different entities in me, - the thinker and the thought, the experiencer and the experience, the one who suffers and the one who observes the suffering. And, as long as there is a division, a separation, there is conflict. And it is only when there is integration that there is freedom from sorrow. That is the truth, that is the fact. Now, how do you respond to it? Do you see the thing immediately, and experience it directly, or do you ask the question, "How am I to bridge the division between the two entities? How am I to bring about integration?" Is that not your instinctive response? If that is so, then you are not seeing the truth. Then, your question of how to bring about integration has no value. For it is only when I can see the thing completely, wholly, without this division in myself, that there is a possibility of freedom from the thing which I call sorrow.

So, one has to find out how one looks at sorrow. Not, what the books or what anybody else says, not according to any teacher or authority, but how you regard it, how you instinctively approach it. Then you will surely find out, will you not?, if there really is this division in your mind. So long as there is that division, there must

be sorrow. So long as there is the desire to be free from sorrow, to resist sorrow, to seek explanations, to avoid, then sorrow becomes the shadow, everlastingly pursuing.

So, what is very important in this question is, is it not?, how each one of us responds to psychological pain, - when we are bereaved, when we are hurt, and so on. We need not go into the causes of sorrow. But we know them very well, - the ache of loneliness, the fear of losing, not being loved, being frustrated, the loss of someone. We know all this very well; we are only too familiar with this thing called sorrow. And we have many explanations, very convenient and satisfying. But there is no freedom from sorrow. Explanations do not give freedom. They may cover up; but the thing continues. And we are trying to find out how to be free from sorrow, not, which explanations are more satisfactory. There can be freedom from sorrow only if there is an integration. And we cannot understand what integration is unless we are first aware of how we look at sorrow.

Question: For one who is caught in habit it seems impossible to see the truth of a thing instantaneously. Surely time is needed? - time to break away from one's immediate activity and really seek to go into what has been happening.

Krishnamurti: Now what do we mean by "time"? Please, - again let us experiment. What do we mean by "time"? - ,obviously not time by the clock. When you say "I need time", what does it mean? That you need leisure, - an hour to yourself, or a few minutes to yourself? Surely you do not mean that? You mean, "I need time to achieve a result". That is, "I need time to break away from the habits which I have created."

Now, time is obviously the product of the mind; mind is the result of time. What we think, feel, our memories, are basically the result of time. And you say that time is necessary to break away from certain habits. That is, this inward psychological habit is the outcome of desire and fear, is it not? I see the mind is caught in it, and I say, "I need time to break it down. I realize it is this habit that is preventing me from seeing things immediately, experiencing them directly, and so I must have time to break down this habit."

First, how does habit come into being? Through education, through environmental influences, through our own memories. And also, it is comfortable to have a mechanism that functions habitually, so that it is never uncertain, quivering, inquiring, doubtful, anxious. So, the mind creates the pattern which you call the habit, the routine. And in that it functions. And the questioner wants to know how to break down that habit, so that experience can be direct. You see what has happened? The moment he says "how?", he has already introduced the idea of time.

But if we can see that the mind creates habits and functions in habit, and that a mind which is enclosed by its own self-created memories, desires, fears, cannot see or experience any thing directly, - when we can see the truth of that, then there is a possibility of experiencing directly. The perception of the truth is not a matter of time, obviously. That is one of the conveniences of the mind, - eventually, next life, I shall reach perfection, whatever I want. So, being caught, then it proceeds to say, "how am I to be free?" It can never be free. It can only be free when it sees the truth of how it creates habit, - that is, by tradition, by cultivating virtues in order to be something, by seeking to have permanency, to have

security. All these things are barriers. In that state, how can the mind see or experience anything directly? If we see that it cannot, then there is a freedom, immediate freedom. But the difficulty is, is it not?, that most of us like to continue in our habits of thought and feeling, in our traditions, in our beliefs, in our hopes. Surely all those compose our mind? The mind is made up of all those things. How can such a mind experience something which is not its own projection? Obviously it cannot. So, it can only understand its own mechanism and see the truth of its own activities. And when there is freedom from that, then there is a direct experience.

Question: You have said that neither meditation nor discipline will create a still mind, but only the annihilation of the "I" consciousness. How can the "I" annihilate the "I"?

Krishnamurti: Surely any movement of the I, however lofty, however noble, is still within the field of self-consciousness, is it not? You may divide the I into the higher self and the lower self, - the higher dominating, controlling, directing the lower; but it is still within the field of thought, is it not?

The question is, how can the I, the me, destroy itself? I am saying that the I is a series of movements, a series of activities, responses, a series of thoughts. And thought may divide itself into the higher and lower; but it is still the process of thinking, it is still within its own field. And, can one part of thought destroy another part? That is, can one part of me put aside, resist, conceal, drive away, the other part which it does not like? Obviously it does; it covers it up. But it is still there in the unconscious. So, any movement of thought, any movement of the me, is still within the field of its own consciousness. It cannot destroy itself. All that it

can do is to make no movement in any direction. Because, any movement in any direction is to perpetuate itself, - under a different name, under a different cloak.

Please, experiment with what I am talking about. One part of me can say, I will subjugate anger, jealousy, control my irritability, envy, and so on. One part that controls is desirous of dominating some other part. But it is caught, is it not?, within the field of time, and whatever it does is of its own projection. That is fairly clear, surely? If it says: "I must, through belief, understand God, or attain God", it is caught in its own projection, is it not? And so long as the mind, the me, is active in projecting, in demanding, in craving, the I cannot destroy itself. It only perpetuates itself.

If you see the truth of that, then the mind is still. Because, it cannot do anything. Any movement, negatively or positively, is its own projection; therefore there is no freedom from it. Seeing the truth of that brings about a quietness of the mind, - which obviously cannot come through any form of self-discipline, through any form of spiritual exercise; because they are all indications of self-perpetuation, ideation. Tranquillity of the mind is not a result; it is not something put together, which can be undone again. It is not the result of the mind seeking an escape from ideation. It comes into being only when the mind is no longer manufacturing or projecting. And that can only happen when you understand the process of thinking, your own reactions and responses to everything, - not only the conscious, but the unconscious as well, the hidden responses, the motives, the urges that are concealed. And this does not demand time. Time exists only when you want to achieve a result, when you say, I must have

tranquillity within a couple of years, or tomorrow. Then come all the spiritual exercises, in order to achieve a result. Such a mind is a stagnant mind, it can have no experience of what is real; it is only seeking a result, a reward. And how can such a mind experience something which is immeasurable, which cannot be grasped by any word? The mind is only still when it sees the truth of that, immediately. And the urgency is what is necessary.

April 23, 1952.

LONDON 6TH PUBLIC TALK 24TH APRIL 1952

Instead of the usual talk, this evening I will try to answer some of the many questions that have been put.

It seems to me it is very important to understand the deteriorating factors that destroy us, not only inwardly but outwardly. I have tried during these talks to indicate that there are definite factors that cripple the mind, that pervert and destroy the capacity to discover what is true. The discovery of what is true is not for the few, - though only the few are serious. And those who are earnest can obviously find that which cannot be destroyed. But most of us are caught in things that create constant conflict between what we are and what we should be, and we think this endless struggle is necessary, will bring about a revolution, happiness. We consider this conflict between thesis and antithesis is progress, and we hope it will create a synthesis. But when we go very deeply into it we find this conflict exists only when there is no comprehension of the inward, deeper things of life.

In answering these questions I hope you will not merely listen to what is being said, but actually experience. What is important, I feel, is not merely the experience of a projection, but to experience something which is not of the mind. It is very important, I feel, to understand this thing which we call experience. This so-called experience comes to us when there is recognition of it. When we say " I have had an experience", surely we mean something that we have recognized, that we have named, that memory can respond to. But what is recognizable is not true. And it is the truth that is the liberating factor, and not the thing that we recognize. Because,

recognition is of the mind, of memory, of time, of desire and fear. And so long as we indulge in these things, which we call experience, the other is not. So I hope this evening, if we can, we shall really experience something, - not sentimentally, something which is the response of memory, of what you have read, that you have accumulated and stored up, which reacts or projects, - all of which we call experience. But perhaps, if we go into this problem very deeply, we shall really experience something which is not nameable, which is not a thing of the mind, of memory.

Surely, so long as we are functioning within the field of memory there is no possibility of freedom. And that is why it is important, I feel, to understand the whole process of thought, and if possible to go beyond the projections of thought. The difficulty is that in listening we are apt to merely follow the words, which evoke certain responses; and through those responses we have further reactions of sentiment, sensation. But surely, sensation, which is of the mind, cannot possibly uncover that which is timeless. So, in answering these questions, perhaps we can both go together beyond the verbal level, and experience directly that which is not merely of the mind.

Question: I feel deeply moved when you talk. Is this just sentimentality?

Krishnamurti: Probably it is. But if you can go beyond the mere suggestions, mere reactions, which the words evoke, then you put aside the speaker, then the speaker is not important at all. But what is important, surely, is to find out for yourself what is true; not some distant truth, unattainable, imaginary, mythical, not something that you have read or heard of, but something which you

have discovered directly. And that discovery is not possible if we are merely depending on sensations.

Most of us want to find something which is really indestructible, which is not of time. Everything around us is transitory; all our relationships soon weary and end. Though we are comfortable or not comfortable, have much to do or little, the thoughtful obviously recognize the transiency of everything. And the incessant battle, not only within but outwardly, between groups of people, between nations, further increases war and misery. Knowing all this, we must find out something which is not of the mind, which is not merely knowledge. And perhaps if we can discover that, not through the suggestions of the speaker, but by watching our own daily activities, thoughts, impressions, reactions, then we shall go beyond the mere veil of sentiment; and that is what is important. What the individual is, the society is. What you are, matters infinitely. That is not a mere slogan; but if you go into it really deeply, you will discover how significant your actions are, how what you are affects the world in which you live, which is the world of your relationships, however small, however limited. And if we can fundamentally alter, bring about a radical revolution in ourselves inwardly, then there is a possibility of creating a different world, a different set of values.

But so long as we only treat these talks as a new sensation, something with which to be entertained, - instead of going to the cinema come here, - then obviously it has very little value and very little significance. But those who are really serious, ardent to discover what is true, do not depend on others. They do not follow, they have no authority. And it is their own discovery, from

moment to moment, that is essential; for the discovery of that which is true is the only liberating factor.

Question: What is the function of the mind, if thought is to come to an end?

Krishnamurti: What is the present function of the mind? It is used as an instrument of survival, is it not? - to exist, to survive. And in the process of survival we have created various forms of society, various values, moral, ethical, spiritual, and so on. But the whole activity of our present mind is, in some form or other, the continuance of the self, of the me. That is our present activity, cunning, subtle, - at any cost to survive; to survive in this world, and in the hereafter; to identify with a group, or with a nation, or with a country; or to identify with anything larger, with a word, with knowledge, with a projection; ever seeking permanency, always demanding security, physically or psychologically. That is the present state of our mind, - a self-centred activity, except at rare moments; and we are not discussing the rare moments. Those things are all that we know. And, that has not led us very far. We destroy each other, we exploit each other, our relationships are constant conflicts; with that we are all familiar. Though the mind seeks security, it is destroying itself, and destroying others. Physically, we are insecure; there is always the threat of war. So, in its very search to be secure, the mind is inviting destruction.

That is the state of our mind, its present state. And we say: "What is the function of the mind, if there is no thought?" Obviously, we can see what thought, self-centred activity, has produced. And is it not possible to go beyond that self-centred activity? Every form of inducement has been offered, religiously,

psychologically, and outwardly; every form of compulsion, threat, we have endured; and yet the self-centred activity has never stopped; it is always the me in subtle form. And surely, to find out what is beyond thought, - which is the result of time, thought has to come to an end.

I do not know if you have ever found that creative state which comes when the mind is not active, agitated, but is very quiet, - naturally, spontaneously, not induced. That state of mind, that state of being, cannot be understood by the thought process. And because we are unhappy, because everything we touch deteriorates, every relationship soon withers away, we want something beyond time. I think it is the function of the mind to discover that, to experience that. But it cannot experience that as long as there is the self-centred activity. And that discovery is not something to be pursued relentlessly. It comes; but you cannot invite it. If you do invite it, then it is your own projection, - it is but another form of self-centred activity.

So, recognizing what the mind is, as it is now, is it possible to go beyond and discover? I say it is. But you cannot discover if it is merely a hobby, something you occasionally turn to. But it becomes a reality when the process of the mind and its activities are understood.

Question: The memory of an incident recurs over and over again. How is one to be free from the memory of that incident, and of the incident itself?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by "memory"? How does memory come into being? Perhaps if we can go a little deeply into the matter, we may be able to answer this question fully. Is not the

whole process of memory, the recollection, the recognizing process, - is not that of consciousness? Please, I am not trying to complicate the question. The question itself sounds simple; but if you would really understand it you will find it is very complex. So, we must go into the problem of what we mean by consciousness. Please, have patience; and you will answer the question for yourself.

When are we conscious of anything? Only when there is friction, when there is a blockage, when there is a hindrance. Otherwise, the movement of thought or consciousness is not self-conscious. It is only when we are frustrated, when there is fear, when there is the desire to achieve a result, that there is self-consciousness, - that is, the me being conscious of itself in action. I want to fulfil, I want to achieve a result, - and as long as I am progressing towards what I want there is no hindrance; but the moment I am blocked, there is a conflict. And the process of consciousness is one of recognizing, which means naming. That which I recognize I can only recognize when I name, when I give it a symbol, a term. So, the me is a bundle of memories; the me is the product of time; it is always in the process of accumulating, gathering.

And an incident is an experience, is it not? And that experience comes only when we are capable of recognizing it. If I am not capable of recognizing an experience, it is not an experience. So memory, which is the storehouse of words, of experiences, - not only one's own, but the collective, - is always functioning, whether you are conscious or unconscious of it. So, it retains an incident. Having recognized it, verbalized it, it stores it away. Take a simple

thing like being hurt by another. You are hurt, someone says something cruel, - or something pleasant. It is retained, and the incident is stored away. If you are hurt the feeling of antagonism, of pain, is retained. And then you begin to forgive the person, - if you are morally inclined. So, you first retain, keep the hurt; and then, being trained morally, you begin to forgive. So, the incident is held. For, if we collected no incidents, if we were not constantly active, either receiving hurts or forgiving, being greedy or not being greedy, - if the mind was not in this constant activity it would feel lost, would it not? For it, this activity is necessary, to know it is alive.

So, as long as you are accumulating and rejecting, you cannot forget the incident, or the memory of it; the memory remains with you. And the problem is, what are you to do with it? - because it keeps on repeating. How is one to be free from it? To really be free from it, not superficially, you have to go into the problem of habit, have you not? Because the mind lives in habit, and the memory of the incident has become a habit. And so the mind keeps constantly going back to it. So you discover how the mind lives in the past, and you discover how habits are created. The mind is the past; there is no present mind, there is no future to the mind, the mind exists because of the past; the mind is the past. And you say: "How am I to be free from the past?" You can only be free when you understand the process of accumulation, - which is essentially based on the desire to protect oneself, to be secure, to be certain. So long as that urge, compulsion, exists, there must be the memory of incidents, and the struggle with those memories. So, this question can only be resolved when we understand the whole

process of accumulation, which is the process of time, which is the me, from which all activities take place.

So, to be really free from memory is to meet incidents, experiences, fully, - which is, to be aware of them without condemning, without justifying, without identifying, without naming. By being aware of every movement of thought, whether good or bad, without justifying, - merely observing, without any sense of prejudice, - then you will see that every incident, every experience, indicates its own truth. And what is true is the liberating factor.

Question: How is one to expose the hidden depths of the unconscious?

Krishnamurti: Before we ask how to discover the hidden depths of the unconscious, I wonder if we are aware of the conscious? Are we aware consciously of what we are doing? Are you conscious of what you are saying, what you are thinking? Most of us are not. Not being consciously aware of the superficial level, we ask how to uncover the deeper levels. You cannot, - which is an obvious fact. If I am not aware of what I am actually doing, thinking, at the surface level, how can I go deeper? But if we want to go deeper, to expose the hidden motives, intentions, purposes, obviously the conscious mind must be somewhat tranquil. If I want to find out what my deeper motives are, which are not obvious, if I want to bring them to the surface, the conscious mind must be alert, must it not?, must be somewhat quiet, inquiring, hesitant, tentative, patient. But if the surface mind is incessantly agitated, active, - as most of our minds are, - then what happens? Then there is a conflict between the conscious and the unconscious. And this

conflict becomes more and more accentuated, strong, acute, till there are all kinds of psychological and physiological diseases.

So, if I would discover the deeper levels of consciousness, I have to be extraordinarily awake on the surface, superficially, outwardly. The unconscious is not only the recently acquired, but also it is the storehouse, is it not?, of the past, - of tradition, of the race, of all hopes. Your unconscious is not only limited to the you, but is of the whole past. You are the result, surely, of all the past; you are the summation of all mankind. And to understand that, to go into it really profoundly, mere study of psychology will not help, nor being analysed. Analysis of the unconscious by the conscious mind cannot reveal the truth. If I want to discover the deeper levels of the unconscious I may analyse myself, or go to somebody who will help me to analyse, but what happens? In that process of analysis, of digging down deeply, can I investigate every movement, every nuance, every subtle response? Not only would it take time, but it is almost impossible, is it not? Because I may miss one memory, one layer, one prejudice, which if missed will obviously thwart or pervert my judgment. Also there is the projection of the unconscious through dreams, which need interpreting; and what if I do not interpret them rightly? Even if the analyst does interpret them rightly, the conflict goes on, does it not?

So, the question is, how is it possible to open the unconscious, to let all the hidden pursuits come to the surface, not to have any one blank spot? How does one set about it? We see that analysis, introspection, will not do it; it may uncover a few spots, but the totality of it cannot be understood or revealed by a part of the

mind, a division which merely observes. Surely, to understand something there must be total perception of it. I do not know if you are following all this! If I would understand a picture, a painting, I must see the whole of it, not take a part and investigate that part. Similarly, I must be able to look at this whole process of consciousness as a total thing, as a whole, not as the conscious and the unconscious; I must be able to have an integrated understanding of the whole. If I merely look at it partially, it will be a partial understanding; and a partial understanding is no understanding at all.

So, can I, the observer, the investigator, look at the total process, and not at the part? Please follow this carefully, and you will see. Is not the investigator always the part and not the whole? When you analyse, when you look, when you say "How am I to expose all the layers, intimations. accumulations of the unconscious, the residue of the past?", are you not looking at it, investigating it, as an entity apart from the whole total process? Obviously you are. The analyser is something apart, looking, investigating, trying to understand, trying to interpret, translate. So the analyser is always a separate entity, looking into the unconscious, trying to fathom it, trying to expose it, trying to do something about it. Therefore the entity who keeps himself apart cannot understand the whole total process. Please follow this.

So, as long as there is the interpreter, the analyser, the total process cannot be understood. And to eliminate the analyser is to eliminate the unconscious, - that is, to bring the whole thing out and understand the total process. Because it is the separate entity, the analyser, that is looking. And the analyser, the separate being,

is itself the result of the past, of the total accumulation, of the race, of the individual, of the group. Surely the me, the investigator, is the result of tradition, of memory. And when the investigator, who is the result of memory, tries to understand part of himself, he is incapable of understanding it. You can only understand it when there is complete identity, the cessation of the analyser. It is only then, when the mind is really quiet, that the intimation of the totality is projected, is seen. But as long as the superficial mind, through partial awareness, separates itself and analyses, it cannot understand the totality.

You can experiment with this yourself, very simply. Occasionally, when you are not concerned about yourself and your activities, about what you think and do not think, when you are quietly walking in the country, you suddenly perceive some hidden motive, hidden totality. In that moment there is no conscious investigator; you see the whole thing completely. But then the conscious mind comes in, intervenes, wants to pursue the thing further, - because at that moment it was an extraordinary experience. And the moment the conscious mind intervenes, it becomes a memory, and you pursue that memory. Memory is of the part and not the whole.

So, if you can be in that state of unself-conscious perception, without pursuing the memory, then you will see from moment to moment how the unconscious totality comes up in different forms, different ways of expression. Then you will find that as the truth of each expression is seen, there is a freedom, - freedom from the accumulated prejudices, the racial antagonisms, the incessant desires which have been thwarted, the blind spots. These are all

seen in moment; when the mind is quiet, when the mind is not a separate entity investigating, censoring, judging. Then only is it possible to find that which is indivisible.

Question: I have done a great many spiritual exercises to control the mind, and the image-creating process has become less powerful. But still I have not experienced the deeper implications of meditation. Would you please go into this.

Krishnamurti: Right meditation is important. But to discover what is the right kind of meditation is very difficult. Because we are so eager to still the mind, to find out something new, to experience something which the teachers, the books, the religious persons, have experienced. But perhaps this evening we can go into it and discover what is true meditation. And perhaps if we can experience it as we go along, step by step, we shall know how to meditate.

We think a petty mind, a small mind, a narrow mind, a greedy mind, by disciplining itself will become non-petty, something great. And is that not an illusion? A petty mind will always remain petty, however much it disciplines itself. That is so, is it not? If I am narrow, limited, and my mind is stupid, however much I may discipline I will still remain stupid; and my gods, my meditations, my exercises, will still be limited, stupid, narrow. So, first I have to realize that I have a petty mind, that my mind is prejudiced, that is seeking something as a reward, that it is escaping, - which are all indications of its narrowness. And how can such a mind, though it practises spiritual exercises, controls, disciplines, - how can such a mind be free? Surely it is only in freedom that you discover, not when your mind is bound, trained, controlled, shaped. So that is the

first thing to realize, - that a mind seeking a reward, a result, however much it may train itself, will experience only its own projection. Its Masters, its gods, its virtues, are its own projections. That is the first thing to see the truth of, to realize.

Then we can proceed to the next thing, - which is, that a mind which has learned concentration is incapable of understanding the total, the whole. For concentration is a process of exclusiveness, is a process of discarding, putting aside, in search of a result. A mind that is merely narrowed down, through effort, through the desire to achieve a result, a reward - surely such a mind can only be exclusive; it is not aware of its total process. But most of us are trained to concentrate, in our daily work. And those who are seeking so-called spiritual heights are equally as ambitious as the worldly people; they want to arrive, they want to experience. And it is this drive to experience that forces them to narrow down their consciousness, their thought, excluding all but the one thing they desire to attain, be it a phrase, an image, a picture, or an idea. Again, such a mind is incapable of comprehending the whole.

This does not mean the mind must wander all over the place. On the contrary, the moment there is awareness of the wandering, there is no resistance, there is the understanding of each wandering. Then each thought has its significance, and is understood, not excluded, not put down, suppressed. Then the mind, instead of being petty, narrow, greedy, is no longer fettered by its own compulsions. It is then beginning to be open, to inquire, to discover. Which means, really, that we must discard the whole process of what we have learned as meditation. Then meditation is not for a few minutes or an hour during the day, but is a constant

process, all the time seeking, discovering, what is true.

Then, as you go deeper into the problem, you will see that the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet, - not disciplined, not the quietness of stagnation, of enclosure, but a quietness. a tranquillity, in which all movement of thought has ceased. And in that silence the entity who experiences has completely ceased. But what most of us want is to experience, to gather more. It is the desire for the more that makes us meditate, that makes us do spiritual exercises, and so on. But when all that is understood, when all that has dropped away, then there is a silence, then there is a tranquillity of the mind, in which the experiencer, the interpreter, is absent. Then only is there a possibility for that which is not nameable to come into being. It is not a reward for good deeds. Do what you will, be as selfless as you like, force yourself to do the good things, the noble things, to be virtuous, - all those are self-centred activities; and such a mind is only a stagnant mind. It can meditate; but it will not know that state of silence, quietness, in which the real can be.

And that reality is not the word; the word love is not love. One knows, in that silence, that which is love, without the word. And that love without the word is neither yours nor mine, neither personal nor impersonal. It is a state of being. There are no words to describe it. It is an experience which is not recognizable, because the recognizer is absent. You can call it what you like, - love, God, truth, what you will. It is that experience which puts an end to all conflict, to all misery.

Question: I have listened to all your talks and I have read all your books. Most earnestly I ask you, what can be the purpose of my life if, as you say, all thought has to cease, all knowledge be

suppressed, all memory lost? How do you relate that state of being, whatever it may be according to you, to the world in which we live? What relation has such a being to our sad and painful existence?

Krishnamurti: Since the questioner is earnest, let us go into it seriously. We want to know what this state is which can only be when all knowledge, when the recognizer, is not; we want to know what relationship this state has to our world of daily activity, daily pursuits. We know what our life is now, - sad, painful, constantly fearful, nothing permanent; we know that very well. And we want to know what relationship this other state has to that, - and if we put aside knowledge and become free from our memories, and so on, what is the purpose of existence?

What is the purpose of existence as we know it now? - not theoretically but actually? What is the purpose of our everyday existence? Just to survive, isn't it? - with all its misery, with all its sorrow and confusion, wars, destruction, and so on. We can invent theories, we can say: "This should not be, but something else should be." But those are all theories, they are not facts. What we know is confusion, pain, suffering, endless antagonisms. And we know also, if we are at all aware, how these come about. Because, the purpose of life, from moment to moment, every day, is to destroy each other, to exploit each other, either as individuals or as collective human beings. In our loneliness, in our misery, we try to use others, we try to escape from ourselves, - through amusement, through gods, through knowledge, through every form of belief, through identification. That is our purpose, conscious or unconscious, as we now live. And, is there a deeper, wider purpose

beyond, a purpose that is not of confusion, of acquisition? And, has that effortless state any relation to our daily life?

Certainly, that has no relation at all to our life. How can it have? If my mind is confused, agonised, lonely, how can that be related to something which is not of itself? How can truth be related to falsehood, to illusion? But we do not want to admit that. Because, our hope, our confusion, makes us believe in something greater, nobler, which we say is related to us. In our despair we seek truth, hoping that in the discovery of it our despair will disappear.

So, we can see that a confused mind, a mind ridden with sorrow, a mind that is aware of its own emptiness, loneliness, can never find that which is beyond itself. That which is beyond the mind can only come into being when the causes of confusion, misery, are dispelled or understood. All that I have been saying, talking about, is how to understand ourselves. For without self-knowledge the other is not, the other is only an illusion. But if we understand the total process of ourselves, from moment to moment, then we shall see that in clearing up our own confusion the other comes into being. Then experiencing that will have a relation to this. But this will never have a relation to that. Being this side of the curtain, being in darkness, how can one have experience of light, of freedom? But when once there is the experience of truth, then you can relate it to this world in which we live.

That is, if we have never known what love is, but only constant wrangles, misery, conflicts, how can we experience that love which is not of all this? But when once we have experienced that, then we do not have to bother to find out the relationship. Then love, intelligence, functions. But to experience that state, all knowledge,

accumulated memories, self-identified activities, must cease, so that the mind is incapable of any projected sensations. Then, experiencing that, there is action in this world.

Surely that is the purpose of existence, - to go beyond the self-centred activity of the mind. And having experienced that state, which is not measurable by the mind, then the very experiencing of that brings about an inward revolution, which is the only true revolution. Then, if there is love, there is no social problem. There is no problem of any kind when there is love. Because we do not know how to love, we have social problems, and systems of philosophy on how to deal with our problems. And I say, these problems can never be solved by any system, either of the left or of the right or of the middle. These can be solved, - our confusion, our misery, our self-destruction, - only when we can experience that state which is not self-projected.

April 24, 1952.