
Bulletin

A VIEW OF THE GANGA AT RAJGHAT, BANARAS



**Krishnamurti
Foundation**

India, 1979

②

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATIONS

INDIA	Krishnamurti Foundation India, " Vasanta Vihar " 64-65, Greenways Road, Madras-600 028.
ENGLAND	Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd., 24, Southend Road, Beckenham, Kent BR3 1SD.
U.S.A.	Krishnamurti Foundation of America, P.O. Box 216, Ojai, California 93023. U.S.A.
PUERTO RICO	Fundacion Krishnamurti Hispanoamericana, P.O. Box 1782, Hato Rey Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00919. U.S.A.
Associated Committees	
AUSTRALIA	Mr. H. S. English and Mrs. Mavis Bennet, P.O. Box 655, Surfers Paradise, Queensland 4217.
BELGIUM	Comte and Comtesse Hughes van der Straten Ponthoz, Mr. R. Linssen, Domaine du Bercuit 211, 5980, Grez-Doiceau.
BRAZIL	Instituicao Cultural Krishnamurti, Avenida Presidente Vargas 418—Sala 1. 109, Caixa Postal 1827-ZC-00. Rio de Janeiro—Estado Do Rio de Janeiro.
CANADA	Krishnamurti Educational Centre of Canada, 780 King George's Way, West Vancouver, B.C. V7V4K4.
DENMARK	Krishnamurti Komiteen, Skodsborgvej 339, 2850 Naerum.
FINLAND	Krishnamurti-Kirjat, Eerikink, 26A 9,00100 Helsinki 10.
FRANCE	Association Culturelle Krishnamurti, 76119 Varengeville/Mer, Mlle. Pascaline Mallet, President.
GERMANY and AUSTRIA	Mr. E. Kanther, D-81.21 Raisting, Ledergasse 22b., Germany
GREECE	Mr. Manfred Schneider, D-6072 Dreieich-Gotzenhain.
ICELAND	Dr. I. Demetriades-Bacha, 28 Varnis Str., Nea Smyrni, Athens.
INDONESIA	Mr. S. Halldorsson, Bakkastig 1, Reykjavik.
ISRAEL	Mr. M. Dalidd, 14, Djalan Singkep, Malang.
ITALY	Mrs. S. Goldshmidt, 409/11 Maalot, Western Galilee.
NETHERLANDS	Dr. Pietro Cragnolini, 55 Via Di Grotta Rossa, Rome, Italy.
NEW ZEALAND NORWAY	Stichting Krishnamurti Nederland, Meetings Secretary, treasurer: Karel van Gelderlaan, 16A, Oosterbeek 6120. Book orders, Bulletin: Weikamperweg 1 Hoenderloo 6736
SOUTH AFRICA	Mr. Ray Falla, 9, Ulm Place, Christchurch 6. Krishnamurti Biblioteket, Uranienborgvn 11c, Oslo.
SRI LANKA	The Misses Shepherd, 24, Kildare Road, Durban 4001.
SWEDEN	Krishnamurti Centre, Sri Lanka, 23/3, Mirihana Road, Nugegoda.
SWITZERLAND	Krishnamurti Centre, Reginsvagen 4, 161 41 Stockholm Bromma. Krishnamurti Freunde der Schweiz (German & Italian speaking), Casella Postale 97, CH-6600 Muralto. Miss Gisele Balleys (for the Suisse Romande), Rue Encyclopedic 6 bis, 1202 Geneva.

From the Editor :

Krishnaji's programme in India during the coming winter of 1979-80 is finalised. He arrives in Rajghat, Benaras on the 1st November and stays there till the 19th. There will be a camp between 10th to 17th at Rajghat. He is in Rishi Valley from the 22nd November to 19th December during which period it is proposed to hold an educational conference between 3rd and 15th December. Krishnaji then spends three weeks or so in Madras, from 19th December 1979 to 13th January 1980. He will be giving six public talks in Madras on the 22nd, 23rd, 29th, and 30th December 1979 and on 5th and 6th January 1980. There will be two or three public discussions, which will be announced later. In Bombay he will be giving six public talks, instead of four, like in the previous years. The talks will be held on 16th, 19th, 20th, 27th and 30th January 1980. He leaves for London on 1st February 1980.

The Krishnamurti Foundation India completes 51 years from the time it was started in the name of Rishi Valley Trust, which became the Foundation for New Education which in 1967 came to be known as the Krishnamurti Foundation India. To mark this occasion, we will be publishing a book containing articles on Krishnaji and his teachings. These articles are contributed by a few people, from India and abroad.

A new book will be published this year edited by the Indian Foundation titled "Exploration into Insight". It will be published by Victor Gollancz Ltd. in England, by Harper and Row in the U.S.A. and by the Krishnamurti Foundation in India.

We are very sorry to inform our readers about the passing away of Pant Sachiv, Raja of Bhor last month. He was greatly interested in Krishnaji's teachings and was a well-wisher and a helper of the Foundation for many years.

The Verb "To be"

(A Talk by J. Krishnamurti)

We have so many problems. The house is burning, not only the one in your particular little backyard but the house of everyone, it doesn't matter where he lives—in the communist world or in the world of affluence or in this poverty-ridden country—our house is burning. There are revolts, racial conflicts, immense poverty, the explosion of population. There are no limits any more, either in going to the moon or in the direction of pleasure, sexual or otherwise. Organised religions with their doctrines, beliefs and dogmas, their priests, have completely failed. They have no meaning any more, probably they never had. There is war, and the peace that the politicians try to bring about is no peace at all. The politician has no value any more; he is irrelevant. Education, except along technological lines, has lost its meaning. Why should we be educated at all? To become lawyers, professors, businessmen, to spend your life, forty years of it, in an office? There are the gods, the rituals, all the claptrap of religion, the hypocrisy—to believe one thing, think another, do something entirely different.

Do we see this, not as a theory, not as something that someone points out to us, for us to accept or reject, but as something that is there right in front of us? It is there for us to answer and we cannot possibly escape, or resort to some monastery or retreat, or take shelter into some past traditional ideation. It is our responsibility.

We have to find out, if possible, whether there is a new action, a new way of looking at the whole phenomenon of existence. We cannot possibly look at these problems with our old minds, with our conditioned, nationalistic, individualistic lives. We individuals, as we are, are divided in ourselves, we are fragmented, we are in contradiction; what we are, the society is, and the world is. So the world is you and I, not something apart, outside.

So when you observe this phenomenon right throughout the world, the confusion which the specialists are creating, and the politicians with their lust for power, and the priest turning back to his old responses, when you observe all this you see that you have no faith or trust in anything or in anybody any more. The more you observe outwardly what is going on and the more you observe inwardly, you see you have no trust in anything nor you have confidence in yourself, because you see you are the result of the past, of environmental influence, of theories.

Then what are you to do? It is not an intellectual question, a verbal question, a rhetorical question; it is a question that you must answer, if you are a human being. What are you to do, confronted with this enormous problem, knowing that there is no authority to whom you can turn, or rely on? All authorities have failed, and they will always fail. It is not a question of seeking shelter and comfort through the knowledge of another, or the spiritual achievement of another. The moment there is any achievement on the part of a religious man, he is no longer religious. Enlightenment isn't something to be achieved, to be sought after, to be practised. It comes with its own beauty, with its own clarity when the mind is unspotted.

So what is one to do, knowing you cannot possibly go back, you cannot possibly be a Hindu any more, or a Muslim, or a Sikh, or a Christian or a communist or a socialist or a capitalist? You may play with all these things like a child with toys, but they have no answer in them. Please listen to all this, don't resist. You have been trained, conditioned by the propaganda of ten thousand years; and if you hold on to your conditioning, you will never find the answer. We are human beings, not Sikhs, Hindus, Buddhists, Communists or Catholics.* We are human beings and not labels, and we have to face this problem as human beings, not as a conditioned human being.

So the question is whether it is at all possible to throw away immediately all our conditioning. That means, as the problem, the crisis, is so extraordinary, can we have a new quality in the mind, a new heart, a new freshness, innocency?

That word "Innocency" means "incapable of being hurt". It is not a symbol, an idea. We must actually find out if the mind is capable of not being hurt by any event, by any psychological strain, pressure, influence, so that it is completely free. If

there is any form of resistance, opinion in the mind then it is not innocent. Then it is not capable of looking at this crisis as though it was for the first time, with a fresh mind, with a young mind that is in revolt. Students are in revolt against a pattern, the established order, but that revolt does not answer the problem, the human problem, which is much vaster than the revolt of the students.

So, can the mind, which is so heavily conditioned, break through, so that it has great depth, a quality which is not the result of training, propaganda or acquired knowledge? And can a heart which is so burdened with sorrow, which is so heavy with all the problems of life, the conflict, the confusion, the misery, the ambition, the competition—can that heart know what it means to love?—love, that is not jealousy, not envy, that is not dictated by the intellect, a love that is not merely pleasure? Now, for us love is pleasure, sexual pleasure, and when that is thwarted, there is hatred, anger, enmity. The mind must be free to observe, to see, to reason logically, sanely, objectively and not be a slave to opinion, to conclusions, to formulas, to tradition. There must be a mind that is not afraid and a heart that knows what it means to love.

A really religious man has no conflict whatsoever within his own being. The problem is so vast, so complex, so inter-related with every other problem. You cannot take just one problem and try to resolve it, that's impossible. Every problem is related to other problems. So this complex crisis must be met with a mind and a heart that is entirely different, that is capable of meeting the vastness of existence, with a mind that is extraordinarily free.

How are we—you and I—to confront this issue? What shall I do? What will you do? First of all, we must realise that we are slaves to words. The word "to be" has conditioned our mind. Please follow this closely. Our whole conditioning is based on the word "to be", "I was, I am", "I will be". The "I was" conditions, shapes the "I am", which controls the future. All our religions are based on that. All our conceptual progress is based on that word "to be", which means the assertion of "I am". The moment you use the word not only verbally, but use the significance, the meaning of it inwardly you must inevitably assert: "I am", "I am God". "I am the everlasting", "I am a Hindu or a Muslim". So the moment you live within that idea or within that feeling of being, or becoming, or "have been", you are a slave to that word.

The crisis is in the present—never in the future or the past—it is in the present, in the living actual present, and the mind which is conditioned in that word “to be” is incapable of meeting that present. Are you following all this? Following it not verbally, but in your heart, in your mind, in your being, because this is a matter of tremendous meaning and importance. The moment you are caught in that word and the meaning of that word, you have introduced time and you think time will solve the problem. Do you understand this? If there is no future and no past, then your response to the present is immediate. Do please understand this. If you really understood this, it would bring in an extraordinary revolution in your outlook. That is really meditation—to be free from the movement of time—and not all kinds of postures and breathing. What an extraordinary part words play in our life—the word Muslim, a Hindu, a Christian. You are willing to destroy others, because you use those words.

So the verb “to be” has conditioned our minds. Can the mind being aware of itself perceive the truth of this? Perceive it not intellectually, because that has no meaning whatsoever. But can it see the danger of the word “to be”? You know when there is danger, your whole response to that danger is immediate. If you see a snake or a bus hurtling towards you, your response is immediate. And can one be so aware of this word, the verb, the conjugations of that verb, of which our mind is made up, that one can be free of the word? You can only be free when you know the immense danger of that verb.

When you say “I will love”, it is not love. So the “You are”, the “I am” are indications of a mind that is incapable of being free. Don’t accept this as a theory or as an idea to think about. You don’t think about danger, there is no time, there is only action. A mind that is no longer thinking in terms of time, in terms of “to be”, is acting out of time; and the crisis demands action, which is not of time.

This is one of the most difficult things. Don’t say you have understood it. Don’t say “Let’s get on with it”, because on that word “I am” your whole culture is based. The moment you have this feeling “I am”, you must be in contradiction, in division, in duality—‘I am’ and ‘you are’, ‘We’ and ‘They’. So division takes place and the moment division takes place—a fragmentation—in the assertion that you are, you are no longer

an individual. That is a single, whole, unit. You know what that word "whole" means? Whole means healthy and also it means holy. So the individual who is whole, undivided in himself, is healthy, holy, which means he is not in conflict within himself but this he cannot be if he is living in the framework of "to be".

Are you also working as hard as the speaker, or are you merely listening to words? You know the word "communication" means to build together, to create together; not you listening to the speaker saying something in words—that is not the real meaning of that word. To communicate, to build, to create together: that is the beauty of communication, and that ceases when the speaker becomes an authority and you are merely the student or the disciple. There is no teacher, no disciple. There is only learning.

Learn what is implied in that word "to be". See the danger of this. What we do is based on what we have learned. What we have learnt we then begin to apply, which is again based on this word "to be". Therefore learning is always a process of acquisition and acting from what has been communicated, whereas there is another form of learning which is movement—not accumulation. If you understood this with your heart and mind you would lead a different kind of life. The test and the proof of your learning is your life. So we are learning, not accumulating, we are learning what it means to be without that word "to be" and without "I am". The moment you accumulate knowledge such as "I am", you are no longer learning. The present crisis is so immense, and if you are responding to it in terms of "I am" which is the past, then you respond with more misery, more mischief, more wars. As long as you assert "I am that", you are bringing about degeneration in yourself and in the world. Then, how is the mind to act? What is the new quality of the mind and the heart that responds immediately, not in terms of the past, not in terms of the future, because the moment it responds in terms of the past, it is still living in that framework of that word and verb "to be".

Let me put it differently. Our actions are based on ideas, our knowledge, tradition, experience. All scientific knowledge, the development of technology is based on experience and accumulation of knowledge. That is absolutely necessary. Otherwise we would return to a world of savagery. But a mind that has caught a new quality, a new dimension, a new width, must

act without the past and not in terms of the future; and this means freedom. How is that freedom to act to come about? How is the mind to act without the past, the past being the conditioning as a Hindu, the past being the education, the influences? If you act in those terms, then you are not meeting the crisis, for your mind is occupied with that which has been, and trying to act according to that.

So we are asking how is a mind that is free from the past, free from the verb "to be" and the implication of that verb, how is that to act? Please see the meaning of it before we begin to go into it. See the implications of that question. We have always acted on what we have known. What we have known is the "I am". We have acted in terms of time—as the past, the present and the future—which is the very essence of the verb "to be", and therefore there is division. Therefore, we are not healthy, holy individuals. So we are asking how is a mind to act without the past? Please understand the meaning of this. It is necessary to have accumulated knowledge in the technological world, you must have memory; memory is the past, as thought and all our experience is based on the past. Now we are asking quite a different question.

Is there an action which is instant, whole, complete, not in terms of the past? Unless you understand this question, you won't understand the answer. If you respond according to your tradition, it is this very tradition that has divided people as the Christian, the Muslim, the Hindu, the Communist. Knowledge—the past—has divided people, it has conditioned people, conditioned you; and if you rely on that conditioning, however deeply you dig into that conditioning, you will be caught more and more in the depth of that conditioning, and if you respond to that, according to that, your mind is not fresh to meet this thing, your heart is incapable of rejoicing in the challenge. So you have to find out, learn how to act without "the past", which means the past of your memory, of your particular culture. Have you understood this question? If you have understood the question, then you will see what is important is "perception, seeing, observing". When you see the danger of a snake, in the very perception is the acting. There is no interval between perception and action. When you see something which is dangerous, which may cause harm physically, your response to it is instant. There is no thinking about it, there is no interval between perception and action, no gap. There is

immediate response and action. In the interval is the "I am". Now see that the past does not solve the problem under any circumstances, that the past cannot respond completely, wholly, to this immense challenge of life. If you see the past as being immensely dangerous, then action is completely new. Do you "see", or do you see intellectually? which means verbally? If you see it verbally, you are seeing it fragmentarily, and therefore it is not a whole response; but if you actually see the danger of your conditioning, of the culture in which you have been brought up, then there is the immediate action of freedom.

The mind is not only the activity of the brain. By the mind we mean the total quality in which there is no fragmentation at all; the intellect, the brain, the emotions, sentiment, the whole of it. The mind sees much faster than even the brain, than visual perception. Does your mind see the danger of nationalism, of this absurdity called religion? Do you see the danger of it, constantly repeating in terms of the past? Do you see that if you act according to that you are not only adding to the confusion, to the misery, you are utterly degenerate?

Degeneracy comes in only when you see the danger and not act. When you see the danger of calling yourself a Hindu, and divide yourself into family, sect and group, you are degenerating. Now can there be a seeing the danger of it, and acting? It is only the mind that sees, listens, that is always acting. Therefore there is never action but acting. So acting—the active principle is in there being no division and hence no conflict. A mind that is learning is in movement and that which is in movement is free but a mind that has conclusions, formulas, opinions, judgements, commitments, such a mind is not a free mind. And therefore such a mind, when it meets the immense, complex problem of living, is incapable of meeting it wholly, that is, with complete health, with a feeling of sacredness.

The house is burning and all your attempts in terms of the past will not put the fire out. That fire demands a new quality of the mind, and a vital movement of the heart, which is completely different. This is the quality which you must have now, not tomorrow, a quality which you cannot possibly practise, which you cannot possibly cultivate. That which you practise, cultivate, becomes mechanical.

So you have these two things—the slavery to words—and the greatest slavery is to the verb "to be"—and the action

which is free, which is the seeing and doing, not only in great things but in little things—in seeing the absurdity of smoking or of your rituals. When you see clearly, you see the whole of it, not parts of it, and you drop it.

We have to live in this world, we have to work, we have families. When the family becomes yours and you are that family, you have brought calamity. When you say “my god” and “your god”, you are degenerate. Truth is not yours or mine. It is under no temple, no Church, it is not an image, it is not a symbol. It is there for you to see, and only the free mind, the lovely, clear, perceptive mind sees and acts.

NEW DELHI,

12th November 1968.

The Seeker and Society

- P** : What is the relationship of a man who is searching, who is in a state of inner revolution, to the outside world, the world of economics, the world of politics, the world of society as such? Yesterday you said no one has ever asked you that question.
- K** : What is the relationship between a man who is attempting to bring about a psychological revolution, and society, politics, the social structure of modern society? That is the question. Does he have any relationship?
- P** : How can you escape relationship?
- K** : We will discuss this slowly. Let us put it this way. A man who is attempting to live a holistic life, what relationship has he to society with all its fragmentation, with its corruption and so on? Would he have any relationship at all?
- P** : That is a drastic question. To live is to be related.
- K** : A man who is attempting to live a holistic life, what relationship has he to society, society being fragmented, society being divided into politics, business, religion, chicanery, corruption? If he is not related at all, then, what is he? Then, what is his relationship to the fragmented world?
- Q** : Adjusting and compromising with it.
- K** : You can't compromise with this corrupt world. A man who is living or who is trying to live a holistic life, can he compromise with that?
- PB** : We try to rebel against society.
- K** : No. A man who is attempting to live a holistic life, a life that is whole, complete, that is not fragmented, not broken up, what is his relation to the other, to society which is corrupt, which is broken up?
- P** : is he separate from that society?
- K** : Isn't he?

- P** : Is he ? The individual as such, however he may be seeking, is he separate from that society ?
- K** : I feel he is part of this society and yet because this feeling of attempting to live a holistic life is there, there is separation.
- S** : First, he is part of that society.
- P** : I think we must first take into account that he is that society.
- A** : I would not agree to the proposition that he is part of the society. I feel that the moment he has said that he is attempting to live a holistic life, he has stepped out. He says : " I don't want to be dragged along by the stream." I think the question must start with this : Is he still of two minds, that he would like to drift, he would like to live comfortably in this society, or is he a no-sayer ? In his mind he must be clearly a no-sayer before he can say that he is attempting to live a holistic life. But this no-saying is not a choice. The no-saying is something over which he has no control. It has come to him and he has no choice. I think we must begin from there.
- P** : Can we begin from there ? Can you begin from the state of no-saying ? To say that you are not part of society places you in the category of the holistic. The very fact that you are searching indicates that you are in fragments. you feel that these fragments are destructive, and so you seek a way out which is not fragmented. But because you are fragmented, you are society.
- S** : And yet, there is something awakened in you about fragmented action.
- K** : Achyutji said he is a no-sayer. I question that. I want to find out. Do you say " no " or are you totally indifferent ?
- A** : Sir, the first act is of no-saying.
- K** : Let us go slowly. Do you turn your back on it, do you deny it, do you say " no ", or do you see what it is ? Therefore, you are not saying 'yes' or 'no'. You are seeing it.
- A** : No sir. The first thing that happens is that if you are attempting to live a holistic life, you see the total futility of compromising within that. So, what I say is that the no-saying consists in saying that he can never be a part of that.

- K** : Are you saying sir, that the man who is attempting to live a holistic life, renounces ? When you say "no", is it a form of renunciation ?
- A** : No sir. I say that the moment I know that this road will never lead me where I want to go, I stop. I cannot proceed.
- K** : Are you thinking in terms of renunciation ? The man who is trying to live a holistic life, is he renouncing by saying "no" ?
- S** : I would like to ask a question. When we say "no" to society, what is this "no" ? I want to find out the meaning of this total "no" to society. We only discard a few things.
- K** : I say, to say "no" in itself is coming to a conclusion.
- FW**: May I make another suggestion ? Isn't it the responsibility of the man who sees very clearly what is going on in society to point out to other people what he sees ? I think a man who is really attempting to live a holistic life has the greatest responsibility to society.
- K** : I understand that sir. But what is his relationship, which is different from responsibility for the moment ? Look, I am trying to live a holistic life. I don't know the whole meaning of what it means to live a holistic life. I hear K talk about it a great deal, and I say "yes" that is the way to live, but I don't capture the whole depth and significance of the holistic life. Now, what is my relationship to society, to people around me ?
- A** : I want to clarify what I have to say on my no-saying and your question whether this no-saying is renunciation. I have been taking a little time to find out and to give an authentic answer. I say sir, this no-saying must be born out of love.
- K** : No Achyutji, you are conditioned by the Buddhist idea and you are introducing that idea into this. I know nothing. All I want to do is to live a holistic life. And what is my relationship to you ?
- P** : The fact of living, does it require any conditions ?
- K** : You see this is very complex. We are trying to pass over it very quickly. I ask, what is implied in a holistic life ? What does it mean to live a life which is not fragmented ? The fact is we are fragmented. Now are we trying to renounce fragmentation ? Or are we trying to integrate

fragmentation ? Or, are you looking at the picture of yourself as fragmented ? Which is it ?

S : We have completely discarded the enquiry into the nature of relationship with society.

K : I am coming to that. I haven't discarded it. First, I must find out what it means to live a holistic life. I say my life is fragmented. We all know that, and K says : when you realise you are fragmented, how do you realise it ? Is it an intellectual realisation ? or an actual realisation ? Is the realisation separate from you, or you are the realisation ? All that is implied. Right, Pupilji ?

A : May I say that realisation is not an abstraction ?. It has to arise through several acts of negating fragmentation.

K : No, no. Achyutji, please, How do you realise it ? I realise I don't love. I realise it, what does it mean ? The word " realise " comes from the word " reality ". Reality means seeing the world. Do I realise actually a fragmented life in the same way as I observe a thing ? Is this realisation an observation or an abstraction and the observation of that abstraction ? Do you understand ?

P : First of all, I think the question is wrong, even though I put it myself, is there such a thing as trying to live a holistic life ?

K : No. You are using the word " trying " because I said that. I don't try to love you ; I love you or I don't love you. I will put it quite differently. What is the relationship of a man who is living holistically and the world which is not ?

S : That is different. You are speaking from the other side and we are here.

K : No.

P : Sir, a person who is leading a holistic life does not even want to question his relationship to society.

K : That is right.

P : But there are people who see the momentary, the fragmentary nature of their living and maintain that the fragmentary nature of their living is the reflection of the fragmentary nature of society. And so, they talk of their relationship to society. In a sense, it is one fragment establishing a relationship with another fragment. This is a very important thing because there are certain aspects of society which even a person who is not trying to live a

holistic life might come to understand and negate. I am not talking of the negation of those aspects of society which are obviously detrimental. But when you talk of relationship with society and negate society, is it a piecemeal thing? Can I say that I accept this, I reject that?

- K** : That is what Achyutji was saying—negating bit by bit, bit by bit.
- A** : What I see, I negate, To me it is like this: I see a fact and then alone can it be negated.
- K** : Wait sir. Let us start again. Look, I am an ordinary man living in a fragmentary world. My life is fragmented. I hear K and he talks about the holistic life and it appeals to me.
- B** : It is more than that.
- K** : I see that it is the way to live. Now, how am I to move away from the fragmentary life into that? Is there a way of moving out of this fragmentary life into a holistic life?
- A** : Sir, may I again repeat—I see the fact of death. I know that death is a fact and any fragmentary response to death is meaningless. I see that and it is easy to wipe it out. But then, I see the death of a relationship which is also a form of death. But to qualitatively negate that is not the same as the wiping out of other things, because this is very deeply psychological.
- K** : Achyutji, would you kindly stick to one thing? I heard K talk about a holistic life. I see the importance of it. I have caught a perfume of it listening to it, and I say how true it is. How am I to move away, what have I to do to move away from this? And then, what is my relationship to society?
- FW** : I also see that to want to live a holistic life cannot be? because I am aware of all the psychological factors.
- P** : Let us not get away from it. That is why I say that the question has been wrongly put or is not really revealing itself. We ask ourselves the question all the time—what is my relationship to society? Am I right in my action? We have the government on the one hand. We have personal relationships on the other. All that is the nature of society, the nature of attachment.
- K** : Then, why bring in the holistic life at all? I am society, my relationship is conditioned by the culture, by society. I am that.

- P** : You see it is not a question which you can easily answer because one does not attempt to put oneself apart from society.
- K** : I never put myself apart from society. I have said I am society.
- P** : But we don't say that.
- K** : No, I have said that I am society, I am the world, I am the history of mankind.
- P** : But to us there are certain aspects of society which we consider apart, because of our own conditioning, as detrimental and immoral.
- S** : That is one thing. You see those things to which you are attached and discard them. Then, there is the category of relationship to society which is the result of the becoming process. So long as I am in this movement of becoming. I am related to society.
- K** : Could we begin by seeing the fact that I am society, could we begin with that ?
- P** : Sir, the problem is, society is a whole as we see it, whole in a different sense. It contains the good, the bad, everything. The individual, seeing that, separates the good from the immoral and feels that the immoral has to be negated.
- B** : I don't say this.
- P** : I am saying this sir. I see the picture very correctly. This society also has love in it, in its own way.
- K** : In a murky way.
- P** : It has also goodness in it.
- A.P.** : Pupilji, I do not see society out there. What I see in society is somewhere in me. The point is that I am not dealing with something out there. I am dealing with something which is right here. My relationship is certainly within myself, whether it is corruption or love; all that happens within me. Whatever action I have to take, starts here. Let us not start taking sides with good or bad or indifferent, out there. You can't deal with it that way at all.
- P** : The actual picture is that we do this. The actual picture is that we separate.
- K** : That means you haven't logically, reasonably, sanely worked this out—I am this, I am society, whatever society is, I am that. If you once acknowledge that as a fact, not

- as a theory, then we can proceed. I am that society with all its fragmentation, with everything. I have created this stuff. If I realise the basic truth of the fact which is that I am society, then where is the question of "my relationship" to society?
- P** : Why did you then, sir, in your talk ask that question? You said: "Why is it none of you have asked what is my relationship to society?"
- K** : I asked it because man has not realised this fact that he is society, he is the world, he is the history of mankind.
- A** : Sir, we have to move from fact to fact. I would suggest that the basic realisation about society in the present context is total alienation. I feel that I am totally alienated from this society.
- K** : You are society.
- A** : I know sir. But I say alienation is the central feature of my relationship with society. I am just stating this very hesitantly. I would like you to examine it.
- S** : Sir, after listening to all our questions, you have now come back to the old position and say, you are society, the total society, you are the history of man. So, I ask: What is it you are trying to say when we ask the question, what is our relationship to society.
- K** : That may be a wrong question.
- S** : No. I look at relationship to society in fragments. And you are trying to say: Don't look at your relationship to society in fragments but look at your relationship in toto.
- K** : No.
- S** : Then, what is the meaning of it? When I say I am the total man, it becomes an abstraction.
- K** : No, no. It is not an abstraction. Aren't you society?
- S** : I am society, but.....
- K** : Wait, we will go into it bit by bit. Aren't you the society which is corrupt? Aren't you the society which is vulgar?
- S** : In a general way. But it doesn't strike a chord when you say the whole of it.
- K** : Actually?
- S** : Actually, I don't see myself as a corrupt person. I don't see myself as a dishonest person. I may have ambition; or I may have something else, or I may hurt and get hurt. These are all the things I am related to. Not the totality of society.

- A** : No Sunanda, it is not that way.
- B** : What he is saying may be this, the sense is the same. There is variation in the seeing between Balasundaram and Sunanda, but it is the same thing.
- A** : Look, I want to state this. Perhaps I may be saying the opposite of what you have said. You say I am the world and I say "no sir". For us, the fact is alienation. Now, can we negate alienation?
- KB** : Krishnaji, I feel that this is one of the dilemmas that appears to come out of the statement: "I am society" or "You are society", "You are that". Does that mean we are denying the possibility of individual evolution until the sum total of society evolves?
- K** : No Sir. We began with the question: A man who is trying to live a holistic life, what is his relationship to society? We gradually found, as we went along, that it is a wrong question, because you are society, not that you are different from society. You may not be corrupt but you have other factors which are the factors of society; I may be dishonest to myself in a different way and so on. So, I am society. Do I realise that fact? If I realise it, I will not ask what is my relationship to society, because I am that.
- PB** : Sir, is it that the moment you realise the nature of your fragmentation and the fragmentation of society, is it that the fragmentation ends?
- K** : No, nothing ends. The fact is simple. Do you actually realise your whole consciousness is put together as society?
- PB** : When you realise this, when you actually observe yourself as society, as corrupt society and you become aware of the corruption, don't you also become aware of the space within yourself?
- K** : No. You see that space is not different from society.
- P** : Can I really see the fact that I am society, that I am the total sin of mankind?
- A** : You say "I am society", but that is not a fact for us. Now, can we move from that fact to the other?
- K** : Do you see yourself as the whole content of society factually? That is all. Start with that.

- P** : But how do you see that ? You can't say that I have seen it without saying how I see it. The difficulty is, society is too big an abstraction.
- K** : It is not an abstraction. The poor man in the street is me.
- P** : When we use the word " society ", the mind as such cannot hold that totality. I say that the mind cannot comprehend the totality of this thing. Now, the mind can see certain facts which we call society.
- K** : You see, Pupul, be careful, you are looking at society fragmentarily.
- P** : But one does see it as such.
- K** : You don't see society as a whole and say, I am that, and work out the detail.
- P** : If I don't see, what is to be done ? I say if I cannot see, and I have not been seeing for thirty years that society is me, what is it that is going to open my eyes to this now ? It is like seeing the history of the whole human race in one glance.
- K** : What is your problem—that you don't see society as a whole, which is you ? Is that it ?
- B** : Seeing means realising.
- K** : I said that. See, realise, comprehend, be aware, whatever it is. You are saying that you don't see the whole of society as you. When you say the whole, what do you mean by that word " whole " ?
- P** : Is there a seeing the whole, the whole thing ? The whole is not in the nature of what is seen.
- K** : May I just go on ? When you say I am society, what does it mean ? Do you mean the details, the particulars, the fragments, or do you see the whole of it like looking at a map : you see the whole map ? You will not see the whole map if you have a direction from one village to another. If you are concentrated on one way from here to the village, then you don't see the whole map. So long as you have no direction, then you see the whole. What do you say to that ? Look, let us put it differently. Do you see yourself, apart from society, as a whole ? Or, do you see yourself in fragments ? What do you say to that Pupulji ? I am asking a question please. Do you see yourself in fragments or do you see yourself as a whole ?

- P** : I say neither.
- K** : Right, go on, proceed. What do you mean by neither?
- P** : When you are seeing, you don't differentiate it as the fragment or the whole.
- K** : You see it. When you see, what do you see? A fragment? or, do you see the fragment which is in the whole?
- P** : I say that in the very process of seeing, this differentiation between the fragment and the whole is not there.
- K** : Yes. But what happens, how do you look at it? When you say I am looking at myself, studying myself, knowing myself, understanding myself, how do you look at yourself?
- B** : Sir, I think we have come to the crux of the problem. The problem is not the fragment or the whole but the nature of seeing.
- K** : Can we go into that? When I say, "seeing myself", what is that seeing? Could we go into that? What is it I am seeing? I see the name, the form in a mirror. We are talking of seeing the psychological structure of my whole life. So, how do I look at my whole psychological structure—sorrow, sex, pleasure, fear, association, saying I am society, I am not society, all that—how do I look at it? Do I look at it as an entity separate from that? Do I look at it separating it from all that which I have observed— anxiety, fear, society, corruption? Do I say I am not that?
- P** : Sir, looking in itself is a pure thing.
- K** : I am seeing now. Do I see with my eyes, the nerves transmitting it to the brain and the brain responding? That is one part of seeing. What is the other part? Do you see me as I am or do you see me through the image which you have built about me?
- Q** : We have got images. We can't help it.
- K** : No. It is not that you can or can't help it. What is the fact? Do you see me through an image which you have built about me? and is that seeing me? And then what happens? When you see, you have no image.
- S** : Going back to the question: "how do I see consciousness as a whole" I say I see the content little by little. I do not see the content of consciousness totally. I see the nature of consciousness through content. I also see myself as separate from the content operating on the content. That is another factual state of consciousness.

This is also seeing. Then, when the question is asked: do you see yourself as a whole, what does it mean?

K : What is the manner of your perception of yourself?

S : What is the self which is perceiving that? I want to understand that question. Who perceives what? Where is the self?

K : You are moving off, Sunanda, please. Don't get too complicated. Be simple. Do you see yourself as separate from your greed, if you are greedy? Do you see yourself as separate and greed is over there, and you say I am not greedy?

S : It is something which one has observed, seen it as finished, then afterwards.....

K : No, Sunanda, you have not answered. I am asking a question which is: When you are greedy, at the moment you don't understand. But later on, you say I was greedy. Is that "I" separate from greed?

S : One can see that it is not separate.

K : Is that a fact?

S : I say simply that is a fact.

K : Look, I am greedy. At the moment of greed, there is neither "I" nor anything. There is just that reaction. A second later thought comes in and says, "I was greedy". Is that "I" separate from greed? What do you say?

S : I am greed.

K : So, you are greed. Then what happens is a different matter. Now, do you realise, do you see that you are not separate from your reaction? Your reactions are you.

S : That is all right sir. It can be done with reference to one thing. But when you say the whole of it, it is a different problem.

K : If you see greed as an actual fact, not as a theory, you see that you are not separate from that, you are that, then what takes place?

P : You have asked this question for many years.

K : For millennia.

P : I now would like to ask you a question: There is greed. Next moment there is the reaction; "I should not be greedy".

- K** : Yes.
- P** : If there is alertness, there is an observation, not that I am the greed, but of a state that denounces the nature of greed.
- K** : What are you saying ?
- P** : That this question, I am the greed, never comes up.
- K** : No, but what has happened ? Look, I am greedy. The reaction to that is, should I be greedy ? So, what have you done ?
- P** : I have moved away.
- K** : No, no. Much more significant. What have you done ? You have responded according to your tradition, according to your habits, according to your conditioning. You have created a division between ' what is ' and what is not. You have created a division. So, there is conflict there.
- P** : Yes. There is conflict.
- K** : Which is what ? When you see, when you remain only with the fact, and not that you should not be greedy, only remain with the fact, you eliminate altogether the division and the wastage of energy.
- P** : I want to be very careful about this : the alertness precedes the greed, in which case greed does not arise.
- K** : No. Pupilji, you are complicating.
- P** : No, I am not complicating it.
- K** : I see the car. I see something beautiful. I would like to have it, that is greed. And instinctively, my conditioning says : don't be greedy.
- P** : That is one instance.
- K** : Wait. I am taking that one. That is the response of my conditioning to tradition which says, " don't ". So, I have created a division, and division means conflict, which means wastage of energy. That is all. I have wasted energy. If I don't waste energy, what takes place ?
- P** : At what instant do I not waste energy ?
- K** : When you don't react.
- P** : See my difficulty. The observation is a reaction from my conditioning. I have no control over it.
- K** : Yes.
- P** : For me, for the reaction, for the conditioning not to be merged with say, the awakening of danger, there must also be simultaneous awakening of attention.

- K** : When you are angry, be tremendously aware that you are angry. Don't say, " I mustn't be angry ".
- P** : I would like to go into it a little more. Can it happen now?
- K** : That is the fun of awareness.
- P** : As I understand it, there are only two states : A state of awareness when one meets the crisis, when no conditioning arises, when there are no reflex responses, and.....
- K** : Remain there.
- P** : But for anger and intelligence to arise simultaneously is not possible.
- K** : I say you are putting a wrong question and therefore making that impossible for yourself. First see what happens: anger and " I must not be angry ". The reaction is your traditional conditioned response. Do you see that? Are you aware, do you see what is implied in it—habit, repetition, mechanical responses. You are accustomed to that. So, K says if you do that, there is a wastage of energy because you have created a non-fact, which is, you should not be angry. The only fact is anger. When you know it, hold it.
- P** : I think we should pursue the original question: what is the relationship of a person, who is seeking a holistic life, to society?
- K** : What is the relationship of a man who realises he is society and realising that, he says there is no society different from me. I am that. So, where is the relationship? I am that.
- P** : There is only action.
- K** : Therefore, there is only action.
- P** : It is really a non-action in action.
- K** : Look, be careful. Let us be clear. I am society. There is no doubt about it. I am that. That is as factual to me as this microphone is. It is not a theory, it is not a concept, it is not a conclusion, it is not an ideal, it is not a verbal statement. It is a factual statement.
- KB** : Sir, may I restate the question of evolution? Is it possible then to evolve individually without the sum total of the society evolving?
- K** : Look sir, If I am society, there is no individual. The individual is the form, the name and the bank account, the house.

KB : Are you denying evolution, Sir ?

K : In a sense, yes. Evolution means to evolve, to move, to proceed. We have evolved from the great apes to what we are. That has taken millennia. Biologically, we can't change any more. That is a fact. Psychologically, we have not evolved at all. Do you see that ? So, will time help us to evolve psychologically ? You understand my question ? If time has not helped man to evolve for the last millennia, two millennia, or whatever it is, time is out. Time has not changed man. It is not the means of ending.

Pupulji asked the question : "What is the relationship of a man who is living, trying to live a holistic life, to society ? I say that is a wrong question. It is a wrong question because man is society. Until that is completely, totally, deeply felt, realised, every other question is meaningless.

Bombay
18-1-1977,

Rajghat Educational Centre

Varanasi

The river flows by along the campus, now quiet and serene, now angry and turbulent but always splendid as ever. It is a long water-front that we have and to watch the sun rise from out of the waters each morning bringing life to a new day is breath-taking. It is the heart of summer now and the children have all gone home. In their place the **gulmohars** are in bloom and the **amaltash**, a bright yellow beside the flame. Rajghat is a riot of colours. And there is that silence that is there in all our places, alive and palpable.

Time was when Rajghat was a secluded spot and the early workers laid the beginnings of this Centre some fifty years ago with but a lantern to guide them through the paths at night. Today Rajghat is no such ivory tower with the city that is bursting at its seams knocking at our door-step on one side and a cluster of villages that have also grown in size and expectations on the other. The pilgrim path that Krishnaji describes in his many writings still wends its way right through the campus and beyond the Varuna to Sarnath carrying a mixture of the old and the new. We have over two hundred acres of sprawling, undulating land about the most beautiful spot in Banaras, at the confluence of the Ganga and the Varuna.

What happens at Rajghat? There is the Rajghat Besant School with about three hundred boys and girls of age seven and up in residence and about thirty teachers most of whom live on the campus. There is the Vasanta College which has over many years devoted itself to the cause of women's education, a rather neglected aspect of educational endeavour in this part of the country. The college has a Department of Education also which prepares teachers over a period of a year. And there is the Vasantashram the hostel for senior women students.

Across the Varuna is the large rural complex—a fully residential Agricultural School for the sons of cultivators with

a hundred students, an instructional farm and dairy unit, a Farmer Training Centre serving young farmers of the district, a charitable hospital where free medical aid is given to about a hundred village-folk a day and a rural primary school for the children of the adjoining villages.

With such a large complex of institutions and activities what do we attempt to do? What lies at the core of our work, one may ask. Truly one can only enumerate the many concerns, the many questions we have pursued. For to speculate on the meaning and purpose of education is one thing. To lay the foundations of a new education brick upon difficult brick is quite another. Realising, as we do, that security, freedom and intelligence are of the essence in this approach to education, we have asked ourselves how do we ensure that our children feel absolutely secure once they enter the portals of the school? How do we turn our hostels into 'homes'? What are the blocks, if any, to this?

Likewise, we have probed into what is freedom and what is order? How do we meet the pressures of the immediate without losing sight of our direction? What is the meaning and content of that word 'freedom'? What lies behind it in the context of a school? How does one help the child live responsibly and see the beauty of order in daily life?

Most parents want their children to be proficient in the various disciplines taught at school. What, we have asked ourselves, is the place we should give to academics? What is the essence of excellence in this direction? If reward and punishment, competition and comparison are to be eschewed in a school such as ours how do we help students develop an intrinsic interest in learning for its own sake? Granting its rightful place for the acquisition of knowledge in a school, how is intelligence to be awakened? What are the instruments available to man for this to come about? Similarly if self-expression is seen as but a veiled form of self-assertiveness, how does one approach art education and the development of aesthetic sensibilities in a school such as ours?

We have a vast rural complex on the campus. In a society where poverty stares you in the face it has its own rationale, its own momentum of concern. And yet it is for us not just an exercise in social reform. For the more affluent students, boys and girls, it provides an excellent opportunity to be exposed

to and to face the stark realities of life, to be sensitive to human suffering. We are conscious that a great deal is yet to be done in this direction. We have just made a beginning.

A number of questions have been raised here. It is not suggested, however, that we have found the answers to these or to the many more that could be asked in like manner. Perchance what is true is that we have discovered the worthwhileness of pausing a while, to probe into these questions during the process of decision-making, for the answers to these, however tentative, will have an inextricable bearing upon the outer crust of what we term a 'school': its structure, content, techniques, organisation, teacher preparation and so on. And yet we realise that the important thing is not to be caught in the peripheral but to move. The challenge is to create an environment where children are helped to nurture that quality of freshness, spontaneity and wonder which they seem to have in abundance when young. The challenge is to give enough freedom to the educator who is serious to help him grow to his fullest in the process of living and guiding the young under his care. The great challenge is to understand what it means to live together as a religious community, where religion must lead to a freedom from the craving for experience and not cultivate a new series of experiences.

Ahalya Chari

Director.

15-5-1979.

Questions :

Krishnamurti answers some questions asked by the students of Rajghat Besant School.

Student : What do I observe in nature ?

Krishnaji: What do you see in nature ? When you look at a tree or the river or the bird flying, what do you see ? You are seeing those birds flying. The river, the bird, the movement of the leaf in the wind, the cloud, the mountains, all that is nature. What do you see when you see all that ? You have just seen the bird or the beauty of the movement of the bird. Do you just see the cloud or you like the glory of a cloud ? You understand what I am saying ? When you see a tree, do you just see the outlines of the tree and pass by or do you see, look at it, enjoy it, see the beauty of the movement of a branch, feel it ? Or do you say that is just a tree, a mango tree and go on ? So, when you have lost touch with nature, you have lost beauty, you have lost sensitivity and then things which are insensible become very important.

S : Why do thoughts come to our minds ?

K : Now, how will you answer that question ? What is the answer from the older people, the teachers, what would they answer you ? You say you want to learn and that is why thoughts arise. Is that it ? You have thoughts, don't you, and do your thoughts arise because you want to learn about the tree, about the cloud, about the birds, about mathematics, about why you believe in god ? Thoughts arise, you are saying, because you want to learn. You are saying the mind is curious, therefore, thoughts arise out of that curiosity and from that curiosity you are driven to learn. Right ? That is one part of it. That is one part of the question. What is the other part ? Go on, enquire, don't say I don't know. You have said thoughts arise because the mind is curious and therefore wants to learn. The next question is what is thinking, isn't it ? You say thought arises because I want to know what that flower is. But I am

going still further, I want to know what thinking is because if I can understand what thinking is, then I can understand a great many things.

Now what is thinking? Find out, don't say I don't know, but enquire, keep your mind alert. Thinking is to have a relationship with an object. Listen to that statement: Thinking is to have a relationship with an object. My relationship to that thing called microphone is thinking. When I look at that thing and name it as microphone, the naming it is the thinking about it. Right? If I don't name it, am I thinking about it? Have you understood? You said curiosity makes you think. I say when you have a relationship with something, then thought arises. Is that so? I look at that thing which is called microphone. When I put it into words, then thought comes. Only when I put it into words, then thought arises, but if I only look at it, there is no need for words. Therefore, when you don't name it, are you thinking? Find out.

Thinking does not come in the way when you are looking. When you are looking, there is no thinking. Thinking arises only when you say that is a microphone because your knowledge from the past says that it is a microphone. So, thought is the out come of the past. So you are learning. When you are curious you learn. When you look at an object and name it then you are thinking about that object. Now I am asking you what is thinking. We said thinking is the response of the past, but I ask what is thinking. I ask you a question. I ask you a question what is your name. You reply immediately, don't you? Why? Why do you reply immediately to my question 'What is your name'? Because you are familiar with it, isn't it?

Now, I ask you a question "What is the distance between here and Lahore or Paris". You don't know. Do you? So, what do you do? You try to find out. As you don't know, as you are not familiar with the answer, you take time to find out. During that time, you are investigating, you are asking, you look in a book, you ask somebody who may know. In that interval is the response of memory. Memory and thought go together. Do you understand that?

Now if I ask you a question which you don't know at all and which nobody can answer, then you say I don't know. To the question with which you are familiar, the response is immediate.

Then there is the question which needs time to find out the answer and a question to which you say I really don't know the answer. Thought therefore is the response of memory. Memory is experience. Memory is knowledge. So thought is never new, thought is never free because it is anchored, it responds from the past. Have you got it ?

S : Why do older people tell us what to do, why don't we young people say to ourselves what to do ?

K : The older people feel they are responsible for you ; they feel they know better than you, therefore they tell you what to do. The older people have their minds organised by the collective, by the society in which they live ; therefore they think " my child doesn't know much. but I know ". So they tell you what to do, but what happens ? Do they know what to do ? They tell you not to smoke, but they smoke ; they tell you not to lie, but they lie ; they tell you not to eat meat or whatever it is, but they eat meat. They tell you don't be angry and they get angry. So, what happens ? You know they are hypocrites and because they are so, you are frightened.

You are asking why can't we young people do the right thing, is that it ? Young people recognise the right thing to do. Do they ? You haven't thought it out. You know, there is really very little difference between the old people and the young people. You may be younger, smaller but you have all the tendencies of the older people. You are frightened, you obey, you want to do things which everybody is doing, you follow fashions, you grow long hairs, you buy cars, large, small. There is very little difference inwardly. We are talking of an inward freedom which then will express itself outwardly. Then you will not be caught in the stream, then you will never move along with the stream. You are completely out of it.

S : Why do we crave to live ?

K : Don't laugh at it. A little boy asks that question. He says life passes away so quickly and why do we crave to live ? Why do we want to go on living ? That means he has seen for himself that everything passes away—the birds die, the leaves fall down, people grow old, they have disease, pain, sorrow, suffering, a little joy, a little pleasure and always work, work. And he says why do we cling to all this, which means he sees the parents having a miserable life. He sees how young people grow old before their age, before their time. He sees death.

I am translating for him. He does not say all this. All he says is why do we cling to all this ?

Sir, we cling to it because there is nothing else to cling to. Your gods, your no-gods, temples, they don't contain truth. Your sacred books are just words. So, is there anything different ? You cling to the house, you cling to the books, you cling to the idols, gods, conclusions, your attachments because you have nothing else and all that you do brings unhappiness. So you cling to them because you know nothing else.

To find out if there is anything else, you must let go what you cling to. If you want to cross the river, you must let go, away from this bank. You cannot sit here and say I want to be free from all misery and not cross the river. So we cling to something that we know however miserable it is, and we are afraid to let go because we don't know what is on the other side of that river. Leave your clinging and find out what happens.

S: Can one be great without passing examination ?

K: By passing examinations do you become great ? Have you understood what I said ? To you, examination seems to be the most important thing in life. Sir, why do you want to be great, because it brings a lot of money, brings you a lot of power, big houses, is that why you want to be great ? Why do you want to be great ? You know that part of our culture in which you have been born, a man is considered great because he has got a little position, prestige, power, wealth, or he is a very good writer or a scholar, all these persons you call great. Don't you, and are they great ?

Now do you know something I would like to do ? Have you ever sat very quietly ? Have you ever done it ? To sit completely quietly, that means your thoughts, are quiet, your brain is quiet, your body is quiet, you are absolutely still. Have you ever tried it ? Now try. Try it now, to sit absolutely quiet your eyes not moving and your hands not moving, your mind, your thoughts not wandering, just be quiet like a tree that is absolutely quiet on a windless day. Just try it. See what happens.

Varanasi,
November 1972.

How can one live without foundations ?

The reply Krishnamurti gave to a questioner during his talks at Saanen on 16th July, 1974.

Questioner : How can one live without foundations ?

Krishnamurti : What do you mean by foundation? This is a question which refers to most of us : we need a basis, a foundation, a something from which to start. Right? Something on which we can rely, something which says, 'That is so', and then on that we build, we move. We say that there is god, millions and millions have said this, and on this they build their lives; that is their foundation. My foundation may be my family, children, my responsibility to them; others may have the foundation of an ideology that makes the State the only god. Each one invents a foundation according to his own temperament, his own conditioning, or according to the culture in which he is born. So we say a foundation, a basis is necessary.

Now who has built that basis? Lenin, Marx, Trotsky, Stalin, and all the rest of that group, have laid a foundation for you and me if we accept them as our gods. If I am a Catholic or a Hindu that is my basis. Now how has this basis been created? Obviously by thought, thought in different forms, in different manifestations, the manifestation depending on one's peculiar reactions. Why does the mind need a foundation? Please ask yourself that question. Why do you need a foundation? Because without it you would have no rudder, no direction, turned this way and that by every whiff of wind? Now see what happens if I have a foundation, if, for instance I have a foundation as a Hindu—which I haven't got, thank god!—or as a Christian, or whatever. I live according to that tradition, according to the beliefs, dogmas and all the rest of it, handed down through centuries, the past. The result of that foundation is that I am different from you though I may be willing to tolerate you—toleration is the invention of the intellect—to live amicably, but it has nothing to do with reality because I am rooted in my

foundation as a Hindu. So there is conflict between you and me, me as a Communist, you as a Catholic, and so on, a believer in god and a non-believer, in Jesus, in Buddha, or whatever else. So I say to myself, 'Why should I have a foundation at all?' If I had no foundation would I go wrong? Does a foundation give me direction, or does it bring confusion? I see foundations have brought man to a great deal of sorrow and misery, He is willing to fight and kill another for what? For ideas, which are part of reasoned thought. And if my foundation is based on thought then I live in conflict and misery for the rest of my life. That is obvious.

So I say to myself, 'Can I live without any foundation?' I know the tree cannot live without foundation, it must have the soil, water, sunshine, darkness. The foundation I need is food, clothes, shelter, but beyond that is foundation necessary? I know that foundations have bred confusion, and we are fighting each other. I can only answer that question: Can I live without any foundations?, when I see the nature and structure of foundations. The very negation of that structure is the foundation, which is intelligence—you understand? Then wherever the mind is, in a palace or in a hovel, walking alone in woods and looking at the beauty of light and shadow, the immeasurable sky, that intelligence is in operation, and it needs no foundation at all. And that intelligence is not mine or yours. It is intelligence. Have you understood?

SOME OF THE TAPES AVAILABLE FOR SALE

at Vasanta Vihar, 64—65 Greenways Road, Madras-600 028.

973	Brockwood	4	Public talks
	Saanen, Switzerland	7	"
973-74 ... India	Delhi	4	"
	Madras	4	"
	Bangalore	4	"
	Bombay	4	"
974	Saanen	7	"
	Brockwood	4	"
	New York	4	"
	Santa Monica	4	"
974-75 ... India	Varanasi	2	"
	Madras	4	"
	Bombay	2	"
975	Ojai	4	"
	Saanen	7	"
	Brockwood	4	"
976	Ojai	6	"
	Brockwood	4	"
	Saanen	7	"
976-77 ... India	Varanasi	2	"
	Madras	6	"
	Bombay	4	"
977	Ojai	6	"
	Brockwood	4	"
	Saanen	4	"
977-78 ... India	Madras	6	"
	Bombay	4	"
978	Ojai	6	Public talks
	Brockwood	4	"
	Saanen	7	"
978-79 (India)	Varanasi	2	"
	Madras	6	"
	Bombay	4	"

Price List

Meditation which transforms the mind			
Ending which is called death			
C-60 Cassette	Rs. 60.00
Recorded Cassette — Indian	Rs. 50.00
Recorded Cassette — Imported	Rs. 80.00
Only for Recording	Rs. 35.00
Spools 5" 4 track 1 7/8 speed four talks (recorded)	Rs. 135.00
2 track 2 talks (recorded)	Rs. 100.00
With spool supplied four tracks (only recording)	Rs. 80.00
2 track (only recording)	Rs. 45.00

BOOKS BY KRISHNAMURTI

Rs. P.

* The Penguin Krishnamurti Reader (1970)	...	12.50
* Second Penguin Krishnamurti Reader	...	13.50
* The First and Last Freedom (hard cover)	...	58.10
* Education and the Significance of Life (1965)	...	6.00
* Commentaries on Living (1956) 1st series	...	10.50
* Commentaries on Living (1959) 2nd series	...	10.50
* Commentaries on Living (1960) 3rd series	...	10.00
* Life Ahead (hard cover)	...	30.00
* Freedom from the Known (paper back)	...	6.00
The Urgency of Change (1971) (hard cover)	...	30.00
Beginnings of Learning (1975) (hard cover)	...	£ 3.25
The Awakening of Intelligence (1973) (hard cover)	...	£ 4.65

PUBLISHED BY KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

* Talk 1974-75	...	4.00
* Krishnamurti—The Years of Awakening (by Mary Lutyens)	...	16.00
* Meditations (1969)	...	1.00
* Krishnamurti's Notebook	...	20.00
* A Dialogue with Oneself	...	1.00
* Inward Flowering	...	2.00
* Wholeness of Life	...	18.00

PUBLISHED BY ORIENT LONGMAN LIMITED

* Conversations: 1969	...	2.50
* Tradition and Revolution (paper back)	...	15.00
* Krishnamurti on Education	...	25.00
Panch Samvad (Marathi Translation of Five Conversations)	...	1.00
Jeevan Bhashye (Marathi Translation of Commentaries on Living-2nd series)	...	12.50
Dyanavasthetil Sphurane (Marathi Translation of Meditations)	...	0.75
Dhyan (Gujarathi)	...	4.50
Inut Visarjun (Freedom from the Known)	...	10.50
Arindadinindrum Vidutalai (Tamil Translation of Freedom from the Known)	...	5.00

PUBLISHED BY MAHARASHTRA RASHTRA BHASHA SABHA

* Samskritika Prasna (Hindi Translation of This Matter of Culture)	...	7.50
--	-----	------

PUBLISHED BY MOTILAL BANARASIDAS

* Pratham aur Antim Mukti (Hindi Translation of The First & Last Freedom)	...	20.00
---	-----	-------

PUBLISHED BY SESHACHALAM & COMPANY

Jeevana Vyakayalu (Commentaries—Telugu)	...	5.50
Dhyanavahini (Telugu Translation of Meditation)	...	1.00
Sambhashanalu (Telugu Translation of Conversations)	...	3.50

PUBLISHED BY SADHANA PRAKASHAN

Jeevan Bhashye (Marathi Translation of Commentaries on Living—3rd series)	...	45.00
---	-----	-------

Edited and published by Dr. Sunanda Patwardhan and Printed at United Printers Syndicate Pvt. Ltd, 65, Habibullah Road, Madras 600 017, for Krishnamurti Foundation India.

Correspondence Address:- Dr. Sunanda Patwardhan, "Vasanta Vihar", 64—65, Greenways Road, Madras 600 028.

* These books are directly available from the Head Quarters.