

BULLETIN

KRISHNAMURTI
FOUNDATION
INDIA

1983

3

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, England.
U.S.A.	Krishnamurti Foundation of America, P.O. Box 216, Ojai, California 93023, U.S.A.
PUERTO RICO (Spanish America)	Fundacion Krishnamurti Hispanoamericana. P.O. Box 1782, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00919-1782 U.S.A.
CANADA	Krishnamurti Educational Centre of Canada, 538 Swanwick Road, R.R. No.1, Victoria, B.C. V8X 3W9. Associated Committees.
AUSTRALIA	Mrs. Mavis Bennett, Krishnamurti Books, P.O. Box 655, Surfers Paradise, Queensland 4217.
BELGIUM	Comte and Comtesse Hugues van der Straten Ponthoz, Mr. R. Linssen, Domaine du Bercuit, 211, 5980, Grez-Doiceau Dutch Speaking Committee, p/a: Catoor Monica, Mortierstr II, Poesele-Nevele, 9850.
BRAZIL	Instituicao Cultural Krishnamurti, Avenida Presidente Vargas 418-Sala 1.109, Caixa Postal 1827-ZC-00, Rio de Janeiro Estado Do Rio de Janeiro.
DENMARK	Krishnamurti Komiteen, Skodsborgvej 339, 2850 Naerum.
FINLAND	Krishnamurti-Kirjat, Eerikinkatu, 26-A 9, 00100 Helsinki 10.
FRANCE	Association Culturelle Krishnamurti, 73, Rue Fondary, Paris 15C. Mlle Pascaline Mallet, President.
GERMANY and AUSTRIA	Mrs. I. Von Massenbach, Ganghoferstr 7, D-8031 Gernlinden, Mr. Manfred Schneider, D-6072 Dreieich-Gotzenhain, Albert-Schweitzer-Strasse 1.
GREECE	Dr. I. Demetriades-Bachas, 26, 40 Ekklesion Str. Nea Smyrni, Athens.
ICELAND	Mr. S. Halldorsson, Bakkastig 1, Reykjavik.
INDONESIA	Mr. M. Dalidd, 14 Djalan Singkep, Malang.
ISRAEL	Mr. Avraham Jacoby, Aneveim Street, No. 7, Shicoon-Mizr, Rishon-le-Zion, Israel.
ITALY	Dott. Ing. Giovanni Turchi, Via Garofalo 19, 20133 Milano.
NETHERLANDS	Stichting Krishnamurti Nederland, Secretary : Lage Duin 19, 2121 CC Bennebroek, Bookorders, Bulletin: Weikamperweg 93, 7351 TG Hoenderloo.
NEW ZEALAND	Mr. Ray Falla, 9, Ulm Place, Christchurch 6.
NORWAY	Krishnamurti Biblioteket, Post Box 1703, Vika, Oslo 1. Norway.
PORTUGAL	Nucleo Cultural Krishnamurti, Av. Leonor Fernandes 36, 7000 Evora.
SOUTH AFRICA	Krishnamurti Learning Centre of Southern Africa, 113. Ninth Avenue, Durban.
SPAIN	Krishnamurti Informatcion, Calle Canuda 45-47 Barcelona 2.
SWEDEN	Krishnamurti Center, C/o. Englund, Storskogsvagen 45 14400, Ronninge.
SWITZERLAND	Krishnamurti Freunde der Schweiz (German and Italian speaking) Mr. Franz Haller, Bachstrasse 18, 5303 Wurenlingen Miss Gisele Balleys (for the Suisse Romande), Rue Encyclopedie 6 bis, 1202 Geneva.
SRILANKA	Krishnamurti Centre, Sri Lanka, 23/3, Mirihana Road, Nugegoda.

FROM THE EDITOR

Krishnaji is arriving on the 28th October in Delhi and will start his talks on 6th November.

All of you know about the unfortunate events of tension and violence in Sri Lanka for the last few months. In view of this volatile atmosphere prevailing there, the visit of Krishnaji to Colombo has been cancelled. His revised schedule of talks is as follows :

Talks in Delhi	: Nov. 6, 7, 12 and 13, 1983.
Stay in Rishi Valley	: 19th Nov. to 24th Dec.
Talks in Madras	: Dec. 31, 1983, Jan. 1, 7 and 8, 1984.
Questions & Answers	: Jan. 3 and 5, 1984.
Seminar	: To be announced.
Talks in Bombay	: Feb. 4, 5, 11 and 12, 1984.

This will be the last Bulletin for this year. We are grateful to those who have responded to our appeal for funds for meeting the expenses of the Bulletin, but I am sorry to say that it is not sufficient and I again wish to stress the need for your participation and support. Please renew your subscription for the year 1984.

A printed catalogue of audio cassettes has been published giving the contents of each of the talks. This is priced at Rs. 2.

We have brought out reprints of the following books :

Within the Mind	— Rs. 40
Letters to the Schools	— Rs. 16
Meditations (Deluxe edition)	— Rs. 25.

The new book for this year is a book of talks. The date of release of this book will be announced at the time of the public talks.

A SEMINAR IN MADRAS

Session-II

Krishnaji : May I set the ball rolling? We were talking yesterday that when the human being is the past, the present and the future, he is timebound. He invents his own time. He is the result of all human endeavour. He is like the tide that goes out and comes in. This is the perpetual motion in which he is caught, and we should talk over together whether this movement of the outer and the inner, is inter-related, really radically not separate, like the water going out and the water coming back, whether that movement has ever a stop. Or must it always continue? And what is that state of mind which is not caught in this tidal movement? Considering what the world is becoming — utterly immoral, corrupt, without any sense of integrity — what is our responsibility as scientists, philosophers, and as ordinary human beings? If we do undertake certain responsibility, will it ever change this enormous disintegration? As so-called educated human beings, do we ever consider other people at all, or are we only concerned with ourselves, with our becoming, with our achievements, totally neglecting our relationship with each other and with the world? I would like to discuss these points.

And what have the scientists achieved? They have certainly made extraordinary technological progress and also they are responsible for the instruments of war, the instruments of destruction of other human beings by the millions or thousands. They have invented the atom bomb and also they have invented the computer, the robot and all the technological necessities of life, which is essential. But also they have invented the biological warfare, the destruction of human beings by the untold number, which has been going on for the last five thousand years, by historical process, a war every year. And

those who are responsible for this are the educated people, the so-called educated people, the learned; the men in power have not been able to solve any of these problems — the human problems, human misery, the terrible agony that human beings go through. So, what do we do? What is our responsibility? Do we verbally enjoy exchange of words, exchange of theories, or is it possible for human beings like us to transform or empty our consciousness of all the travail, the conflicts and miseries?

Dr. Rupert Sheldrake : It seems to me that the crucial fundamental question is whether changes in people we know affect everybody else, affect the whole world, and the difficulty of the question seems to me is this : if such a change has already happened at any time in human history to transform humanity, we would not be in such a position as we are now. There would already be a state of transformation. So the fact is this transformation has not occurred in the state of the world, which means we are talking about something which has never had a precedent, which has never occurred, and therefore it seems to me it is an extremely difficult question to ask or say that such a thing is possible.

Dr. Ravi Kapur : This is wishful thinking : if some change occurs in us humanity will be transformed. We have no historical evidence for this.

Krishnaji : I don't think that humanity as a whole can be transformed. But my consciousness and yours and hers, is it so very different from the consciousness of the rest of mankind? The rest of mankind, whether they live in America or Russia they are like my consciousness — miserable, unhappy, incredibly insecure, believing in some outside agency, god and so on. My consciousness is almost similar if I am in that position to the rest of man. So I am questioning whether we are individuals at all, whether there is individuality at all and if one human being transforms radically, fundamentally, and as his consciousness is the content of his consciousness, will it not affect the rest of the consciousness of man?

Dr. Sheldrake : Yes. But the question is, since there have been various people in the past who have undoubtedly undergone unusual transformations — Buddha and so on — now can we say the present state of mankind is already the result of these kinds of transformations and so better than

what it would have been? If there is further transformation, will it merely change the balance in one direction, or is it possible for the whole of humanity to be radically transformed?

Krishnaji : But can I not as an ordinary human being radically change? I am not talking of general humanity. I am talking about your consciousness, my consciousness, hers. They are very similar and so, if I can change, empty my consciousness of all the travail and misery of existence, perhaps I will affect the whole content of human consciousness. This is all I am saying. And is it possible for me as a human being to totally empty my consciousness of all the contradictions and lack of integrity, the absurd beliefs or sane beliefs, throw all that over and be totally free as a human being? If I can bring that about, perhaps I may affect the whole of consciousness of man, like Hitler has affected the consciousness of man, like the Buddha, like anybody. They have affected the consciousness of mankind.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Is it merely an empirical matter? In any case, had these enlightened beings not attained enlightenment, I think things would have been incalculably worse than now. But probably that is not the point. I think Krishnaji has earlier referred to the possibility of containing it — it is more alchemical and mysterious than the way in which the enlightened consciousness touches everything else. I don't think we are meant to know in advance, and this might itself be a disincentive and a pollutant. It seems to me this can easily become a ground for escape. But it does not have to. I think there is a kind of greed involved in wanting to know precisely how all manner of worthwhile results are going to be attained whereas I think here, if I may be permitted to draw upon the notions that something of the categorical imperative, which has simply got to be done; that apart from the category of things like how to help the neighbour in distress and so on, which simply has got to be done; there is also this call of consciousness which certainly is a categorical imperative. I think not to do that would be to add to the number of wrong things that already exist. I am impressed by the suggestion of Krishnaji and others in the past and present times that there are no others so that in so far as one man or woman radically alters, all are affected in some invisible way. I think some sufficiently insightful history would be able to demonstrate this in the case of the

Buddha and Jesus, and Sri Krishna and others. But even if this were not possible, if this is a categorical imperative, we must simply get on with the job.

Dr. Sheldrake : The question was not either what was the exact change like and could be produced in exact details, nor whether or not we would do it, but whether or not this transformation is possible, and it seems to me the difficulty of this question is if it has not happened to me and it may have happened indirectly to me through other people in a suitable way. If something has not actually happened, we do not have direct experience to recognise, name and so on; we may see the possibility of it in others or be encouraged to think so. I deeply wish this were possible. I already want it to be possible.

Pupul Jayakar : Are we talking about the possibility of changing consciousness of mankind or are we talking about the possibility of totally emptying the content of consciousness as is today? *Krishnaji*, one thing you have to understand — you might say we are the consciousness of mankind but we are islands. The mainland may be also the earth. We are also earth, but we are islands, and therefore we cannot think of it as a consciousness of mankind.

Krishnaji : All right, I am mankind, I am the result of mankind, all their miseries, I am all that. My consciousness is in a state of utter confusion, conflict, anxiety, loneliness, despair, depression, immense sorrow. I am all that. Now I am asking, is it possible to be totally free of all that? Otherwise life has no meaning and I am born and die; if I believe in reincarnation that is just another theory, but actually I have only this life and if I am to live that way I don't see the point of living that way. There is no meaning in it. I may be rich, I may be poor, I may be very scholarly and very clever. I may build temples and all the rest of that, but at the end of it I am left where I began. So I say, is it possible radically to empty this stupid existence?

Dr. K. K. Singh : Sir, human existence — man as such has got loneliness, isolation and all these things are impediments. He has been forgotten totally and we are perceiving nothing but mathematics and physics. And we have lost totally human existence, meaning of living.

Pupul Jayakar : That presumes there was a time when there was no fear, greed. Human existence right from the beginning

had all these elements. We are not different basically from what our forefathers were.

Radha Burnier : I think much of the difficulty is that most of the time one is not aware that one is living in this chaos except at a very superficial level and occasionally. Otherwise one is lost in a stream of unawareness. It is only on an occasion like this that one becomes a little aware that there is chaos.

Krishnaji : If I may insist, you are not answering my question. I am the ordinary man caught in this wheel, and what am I to do or not do?

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : I think even this initial first step needs to be taken more comprehensively, more carefully and more many-sidedly than it has been taken so far. It occurs to me that again we might commit the fallacy of comparison, of a terrible mess. Comparisons are not really called for. It is a question of awareness.

Radha Burnier : An awareness which is real awareness, not some kind of a theoretical awareness.

Dr. K. K. Singh : Do you mean to say we should be intensely aware of the chaos? Can we correct ourselves? Is there any possibility of our transformation?

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Well, if awareness can survive its object, that is all right. Surely it has been possible for human beings to take a look and still survive that moment of recognition. I should have thought this itself is ground for hope. May I suggest an analogy? Suppose somebody says he has a cure for cancer. Supposing there is an announcement that we have understood the cause of cancer. I think this itself begins to work in its own silent way. Supposing somebody in some corner of the world, in a completely believable way, and scientifically established way, announces the cure of cancer. So the understanding of the process of time is in itself a pure first step. A lot of very hasty announcements of new plans for the world and so on suffer from a lack of conviction at the heart, because there is no real understanding of radically transformed human beings in the past and in the present we are able to boldly hear without hesitation such an announcement to ourselves and to others.

Krishnaji : May I interrupt? I come to you, professors and scientists, learned people. I come to you with my misery, with

my suffering and all the rest of it. What do you do with me? You tell me something and he tells me something else. But I want water. You give me words. What am I to do or not do? What way am I to change? What makes me change sorrow? I have lot of sorrow, lot of problems, knocks on the head. I have not changed. I have read all the sacred books and all the rest of it and at the end of it all I am just left where I am, after million years, just where we started — fear, anxiety and all the rest of it — and I come to you, and say please you are all so well learned, help me, don't tell me theories, don't tell me if you are aware, should be aware, how much to be aware. All those are meaningless to me. What am I to do?

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : I think as persistent an enquirer as yourself in this make-believe situation would himself bring hope to those who ask this question.

Krishnaji : All right. Where do I start? With myself? If you say start with yourself, how am I to look at myself? What is the mirror in which I can see all my reactions, all the thoughts, all the misery, in which I can see actually, not theoretically but actually, brutally see what I am? Where? There is no mirror like that.

Pupul Jayakar : Why do you need a mirror?

Krishnaji : Where do I look so as to be very clear that I don't deceive myself?

Pupul Jayakar : You look at the ground from which this springs.

Krishnaji : Where is the ground?

Pupul Jayakar : My mind.

Krishnaji : My mind? Show me what my mind is. It is so perverted, so distorted, so degenerated. Your education has done all this to me.

Pupul Jayakar : Still I can look at the perversion, distortion. Why are you saying that it is not possible?

Krishnaji : My mind, my brain functions in a very, very small, narrow groove.

Pupul Jayakar : So I see the narrow groove.

Krishnaji : Do I see or is it an idea that my mind is in a narrow groove?

Pupul Jayakar : You asked, in what mirror will I look?

Krishnaji : I can only look very clearly in my relationship to others. That is the mirror.

Pupul Jayakar : Sir, this is something which I don't understand. When you say relationship with another, even that act sprouts from the ground of the mind, even that which accompanies my relationship to another, the sprouting of that is in the ground of my mind. When you say I see myself in the mirror of relationship, it is really seeing the ground from which the sprouting has been; so whether narrow or wide, it is still the ground. What is the difficulty in perceiving that ground? Is it really possible and with what instruments will I perceive that ground and the sprouting from that ground? With what will I face it?

Krishnaji : The only instrument that I have is thought.

Pupul Jayakar : Thought is that which sprouts.

Krishnaji : I have only that thought as the instrument with which to look. I have cultivated thought for million years and that is the only instrument I have and with that instrument you are telling me to look and before I look you say look at the ground from which thought has risen. Is that it?

Pupul Jayakar : No. I say thought first makes that enquiry, thought says it can look at the ground, but it also has other instruments. Don't limit it.

Krishnaji : The other instruments are seeing, tasting, smelling and the senses. The senses are my misery.

Pupul Jayakar : They are also my instruments.

Krishnaji : Yes. I am only partially aware or use one or two senses. I never use all the fullness of my senses.

Pupul Jayakar : Before I can even get to the fullness of my senses, the starting point of the enquiry may be partial, starting point of enquiry will be thought and the instruments which I have, which are my senses, to perceive the ground.

Krishnaji : The instrument I have is thought and desire.

Pupul Jayakar : Also the instruments that I have are seeing, listening, feeling.

Krishnaji : It is all translated into desire.

Pupul Jayakar : Why do you say that?

Krishnaji : I see a beautiful house, I want it. I see a beautiful woman, I want her. I see a lovely car, I want. The seeing is translated into desire.

Pupul Jayakar : Yes, the seed of this desire to have the car sprouting in my mind, that is the first movement.

Krishnaji : Then what is my mind, what is the quality of my mind? Are we separating the mind from the brain? Then what is the mind which is so very different from the brain?

Pupul Jayakar : Is the mind different from the brain? You perceive this sprouting; you neither perceive the mind nor the brain.

Krishnaji : So what?

Pupul Jayakar : So the words "mind" and "brain" in terms of the mirror have no meaning.

Krishnaji : Where am I left at the end of this?

Pupul Jayakar : You said where will I perceive, where will I come into contact, and I am trying to see whether we can proceed into this.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : There is a contradiction in the words. If the "I" in himself is so troublesome, that is indeed so pervasive, why does it limit it to just this one finite human being? This in itself is a first-class contradiction to confront the miserable man with; on the one hand, you have made a cosmos of this "I" in its compliant misery and then you have restricted this very "I" to just one tiny place in the universe. Either you should consistently deny any substantiality of this I or "I" as other.

Dr. George Sudarshan : I was reminded of a metaphorical story from our traditional knowledge — Kiratarjuniyam — when you talked about the misery, how overpowering the misery is, when I hear Mr. Ramachandra Gandhi talk about the cosmic trouble of some "I". Arjuna went to do *tapas* to be able to get Shiva to come to greet him and embrace him with additional powers. Naturally he went into a forest and while he was doing *tapas*, a hunter appeared, chasing an animal. Arjuna told him, "Don't disturb me, don't you see I am meditating?" He said, "I don't know who you are, you do your job and I will do my job." They fought. Arjuna used all his powers and was completely overpowered. In fact, he was so completely exhausted that he could not even close his eyes. In his utter shame in not being able to close his eyes, he looked up and saw at the top of the hunter's head the crescent moon. At this point he realised that in fact having exhausted all the devices that he had, what he had already been wanting at the back of his mind, the disturbances disappeared.

As for misery that surrounds us, I don't for one really agree that scientists are responsible for the misery or that the misery is so overpowering. Using the metaphor of absolute misery, it is really a good thing; then you will really have to do something about absolute misery. You are not as miserable as you could be for if you realise that these are temporary things, you could be more miserable and want a total transformation. Transformations don't come because your miseries are removed. Sometimes great miseries can be threshold for total transcendence.

Achyut Patwardhan : I take issue with Dr. Sudarshan on two points. One is that I don't think as a scientist he can disown the sway that his tribe has held over humanity during our lifetime : Man's capacity to wipe out life on this planet. This is certainly something which did not exist before. The second thing that you said is also to my mind quite open to question. So both the things that you have said, I think, are slightly rhetorical, because you must admit that we are facing a totally new crisis; at least the intensity of the crisis. I don't think man has ever been faced with the crisis of his survival as he is today and that he is responsible for it; that is, the responsibility of man has never been so total as it is in 1982.

Pupul Jayakar : But may I ask what relation this has with what 'K' is talking about? First of all, do we really want to empty the content of one's consciousness? I think that is the fundamental question. It is no use your saying give me water. Unless I say I am prepared to face the consequences and in the real sense put my neck under that sword and press the sword with my own hand to cut off my own head.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : I think irrationality is out because of the self-image of the modern man as a rational being. It may not be the only style of this spirituality but it may be one way of embarrassing deeply.

Pupul Jayakar : If one says one wants to empty, then one can open the door, or even move towards the threshold.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Of course, man is still vain. Often the way is to make holes in the pot. I don't think this marvellous Socratic Zen conversation that Krishnaji has initiated is one way of drilling a hole in that pot because we are too vain to empty. But I think we must shoot straight into that pot by argument and by example.

Pupul Jayakar : He may have emptied the pot. I was going to ask him when he said "give me water". It is really his having to give the water.

Dr. Sudarshan : I stand accused by two of the most excellent people here and I must at least put up my own defence. There is a notion that modern man is rational, modern man is scientific, modern man is objective as science is objective, and we are dominated by science, by technology. But ultimately the decision of how much objective truth is to be accepted is a subjective judgment, and with regard to the question of relating to the world, if one is convinced by now that this particular world-view is not satisfactory, one will change it not necessarily for something better, but one will change. The reason one does not change the world-view is because one is really not convinced about all the statements about misery.

I would like to say that all of us who are here are reasonably comfortable in the world. In fact, I have not seen one person who is really miserable. Nobody is thirsty here, nobody has gone hungry, and everyone has enough to wear or even to know that there is food for tomorrow or day after. There is a great deal of law and order despite all the lawlessness and corruption that one is talking about. Modern life is stressful but not necessarily as insecure as one tries to make it out.

It seems to me the possibility of encountering oneself is very much greater at the present time than any time in history; perhaps may be a million years ago, when people were much freer; but it seems today there are very many more opportunities for people to be reminded of the fact that transformation begins with oneself rather than in the outside world. The other thing I want to say is I have been a teacher for many decades now and the art of teaching is in fact being able to be one with the student community and a good teacher is not necessarily one who is clever or learned but one who can in some sense both be at his level as well as the student's level, so that you are communicating more to the students in you than with the student outside and this transformation, it seems to me, is also the same. When somebody comes to you in misery, how do you communicate? If you can internalise that person's problem or if you can enlarge your awareness to be able to absorb both that person's position and your position,

you simply be one with him. If you agree with him that the world is more miserable, you are not doing any favour; he may feel less guilty but you are not doing any good. Communication at the particular level involves, the art of teaching involves, the art of being able to comprehend and maintain two different levels at the same time — your own and his own, and then you can bring the two together because they are both parts of yourself.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : George, I do wish to suggest to you that even if nobody here is miserable, if you attribute to us enough empathy — I think many of us are not for ourselves, not for our tiny selves here — even that many of us are very miserable. That is not the best kind of expression — empathy — but deep down they feel terrible. I don't want to speak in the first person. I feel terrible too because of the hunger of others. I wish the sense of identity could be so complete that we, like Ramakrishna Paramahansa did, suffer pangs. But empathy does not go far enough because it is again founded on the view that the other is other than me, and until that is achieved, the present identity or perfect vacuity — I think there are the only two stark choices.

Pupul Jayakar : May I ask one question? There is one fact in the human mind, in human consciousness, and that is the factor of curiosity. Probably a lot of scientific investigation in various other areas has been man's desire to find out, to know, enquire. Why is it that when it comes to this curiosity being used to discover the space, the distances, the whole structure of the human mind and consciousness and the depths which lie beyond, why do we get bogged, why do we put up obstacles ourselves to this curiosity penetrating? Probably a great unmapped surface remains to be investigated as in any other sphere. Why has man's enquiry never been in this direction?

Achyut Patwardhan : I say the problem of degeneration has achieved a great urgency today because man seems hell-bent on destroying such culture as he has. I feel that this urgency cannot be wiped out, and the fact that you refuse to take note of it, the urgency does not become less because you see that man himself is striving his utmost to destroy. The atom is destroying the physical world, but there is such a thing as the

mind destroying its own heritage, of all human culture. That is to say, like the end of an epoch. There is an appalling degeneration and this degeneration exists side by side with some of the best-minded. This problem of regeneration therefore has attained an urgency in time which I insist cannot be just brushed aside.

Pupul Jayakar : If that urgency is so monumental, then it would have found expression. The fact is we sit around.

Achyut Patwardhan : Permit me, when we sit with Krishnaji, we sit here because I have heard him say this fifty years ago and it could ring no bell. When he talked of freedom, I told him that the British were far more important than what he was talking about. Today, I have really come to the point of seeing that all my defences have collapsed, and I had to accept that there is a priority to the problem of regeneration which we can only ignore if we are blind as bats. And if feel that our top scientists and top philosophers are blind as bats because they are trying their best to ignore that.

Dr. Sudarshan : In my opinion, we are digressing. Since this is a direct question, I must answer. I believe at the present time the greatest danger to the world is more from the confusion in the minds of people than coming from nuclear weapons because nuclear weapons are not under the command of the scientists. By the way, weapon-making is not a scientific tradition but it is a technological, engineering tradition. The weapons are in the control of the administrators, the leaders of the country who are ordinary citizens very often, who refuse to understand science. If there is a responsibility of destruction, of potential destruction, of threat of destruction, it is carried out by the leaders of the country who are elected by the ordinary people and not by the scientists. I am, however, much more concerned with something else for which the scientists are responsible. That is, the tacit acceptance of a negative philosophy of darkness, of basically saying that the whole world is purposeless, that in fact the atoms and molecules or genes and chromosomes or fields and their interactions, are the only things in the world. There are no value judgments, there are no purposes, there is no such thing as enlightenment. In fact, there is almost a prohibition, though I don't think it is written down, for anybody who is interested in consciousness or enlightenment from

holding high office in the scientific and university tradition in this country at the present time. The reason that is possible is not only because of the scientists, because in fact the other intellectuals and other citizens of the country are unwilling to take exception to this statement. There was a big Science Congress in Mysore. You look at the policy statements made by the major leaders of the country. There is no statement about consciousness, awareness, investigation into the nature of perception being the last frontier. All the statements are about technology, about science, about weaponry, increasing production, export drive and so on. At the present time, the danger threatening our country as well as the world is coming in from the ascendancy of the philosophy of darkness, the philosophy which is hostile and inimical to enlightenment and not from the scientist. So science and technology are not dangerous in themselves but it is the people who make it so, people who make decisions with regard to it.

However, I continue to hold the opinion that this is the time when there is greater awareness of the need for doing something radical. There is a greater urgency because the pace of life has quickened, everybody is busy, everything is happening a little too fast. This is the time when there is greater awareness of the genuine nature of our misery but somehow or other it does not find a unified expression in the country. There are a few isolated people who talk about it but the standard position of the country is that science is the saviour of humanity or science is for the defence of the country. It seems to me that physics should be made a compulsory subject for everybody somewhere along the line in adult education to show what is the nature of causation because that is in fact what we are talking about, that somehow once you see the chain of causation, then perhaps like the Buddha, one would be able to see what is the origin of misery.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Of course George, you give with one hand and take away with another. For instance, if there is greater awareness today, there is also very great scepticism about any possibility of a way out among the intellectuals. Of course you responded splendidly to the moral indictment of scientist, but you yourself indicated even more thoroughly when you said that the theoretical world-view is all wrong. I

don't think you can escape that responsibility because if the theoretical world you have inspired by on-going science is so dismal, that is a far greater responsibility than any particular collaboration between scientists and politicians.

I remember reading a very clever phrase : man does not live by bread alone. Whether or not the world is in danger, worldliness seems to be in no danger at all today. That is a terrible thing, that the world is in danger but we keep worldliness intact. We may survive a war for the next fifty years but it will be there in the next hundred years. In fact, the politicians may possess the survival instinct more than the scientist and he may just manage to save the world. The scientist tends to suffer from a despairing nihilism. Workers today in the modern world may push the button. It is very strange that the very politician whom one hates may, in fact, because he wants to win the next election, want the world to survive.

Dr. P. K. Sundaram : May I add a word? We have two senses in which the word "misery" can be used. Dr. George Sudarshan was right when he talked about misery in the first sense namely that misery can be eradicated and in a regeneration of man, a transformation of the world could take place. Perhaps we are not miserable at all and science could do a lot in this direction. But the second sense appears to be more important and more fundamental and that is the very finitude of man itself is a problem. The finitude of man can never be eradicated by sheer physical science and its methods. There must be some other method whereby we can cancel this sense of finitude, this self-alienation, man alienating from himself, standing aloof from himself as it were. This is the dread and this dread of 'Nothing' into which we pass inevitably, no science can put it off, no science can prevent it. Man faces 'Nothing' as the abyss of the dread of death, the emptiness, the 'Nothingness'. How are we going to get out of this? This sort of misery in that fundamental sense must have to be tackled, and it cannot be tackled by science.

Dr. Shel Drake : The tradition has an answer for this. The answer is the man who is miserable says "What can I do? Give me water". The traditional answer in the great religions is to give people water and to say liberation is possible or salvation

is possible and these are the ways to do it. It may or may not happen in this life, may happen in the future life, or it may happen after death or in another kind of existence, and this is the traditional sphere in which not science but religion offers an answer. I know that the question remains whether or not religious answer is valid or not. I don't think we can dismiss the whole lot on the basis of vague dismissal of the historical thoughts of world religions and it seems to me this is to which the question reaches because when man says, "What can I do? I am miserable, give me water", if he goes to a Christian Evangelical man, he still responds to that appeal and he says, "Here is the answer, and if he goes to any other religion, he says, "Here is the answer". So what is wrong with their answers? I can't see how we can dismiss these answers.

Dr. P. K. Sundaram : Here we are not concerned with the validity of the answers. These are answers within answers.

Dr. Sheldrake : Well, the question we started off is whether or not it is possible to undergo transformation. Now, there are many people who say it is. They say just follow this method and you will undergo transformation. The question is then whether we believe in them or not. Many people tell us it is possible to undergo transformation and in the end, the authority must always be based on their claim to have undergone it. It seems to me the question is whether we believe in them or not, if we are trying to answer the question, "Is it possible?"

Dr. Sudarshan : It is known in physical sciences that anything that happens cannot be supernatural. Therefore, the ultimate test is in terms of actual, not in terms of any number of elegant theories. Therefore all pursuits are simply a shorthand understanding of a whole body of experience that you have and all experience together is not in terms of knowledge. It is simply a premise for perceiving things at a particular time. And direct perception, direct experimentation is the only way. Therefore, the prediction of what would happen by following a certain path is always a tentative one. No one can tell you what would happen, one can tell you what is likely, what is probable, what is expected, but ultimately what happens is what happens. Men don't fly, so you don't expect to fly. But if you want to fly, you make another condition, in which you

get inside an aeroplane. So you actually come to a situation in which those things that are constrained by law, you don't even want it. And then you find out where the freedom is, where is the little gap in the chain so that you may slide through, if you want to get out. However, any statement by anybody including oneself saying that it is possible to get out of this misery is tentative until you actually get out.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : It really is an age of scepticism, not only about the world but about the past and the present too. Why is this inability to see? I think it is absolutely scientific, it is not that it has to happen for the first time because if we can be sceptical about the whole body of the past in respect of this, I don't see how we will accept the result of any successful experience even if those results were to stare us in the face. I think we would find a way of doubting them.

Krishnaji : Sir, I would like to ask, if I may, I am agonized by fear. Really agonised by it, not verbally but deeply I feel it is a terrible state to be in, fear. You tell me it is partly good to be in fear and another tells me it is good you can get out and so on. But the fact remains that it is a tremendous agony to be in fear, help me to get out of it. Don't say you can help yourself and all the rest of it but help to be free of this burden. That is all I am asking. I come to you as a man who has travelled, who is a scientist, all the rest of it. I say please help me. I don't say it is good to have a little fear, it is good to have a little cancer, it is good to be this, good to be that. I say 'please, those are not my questions, it is a tremendous feeling that I have, an incredible fear I have'. All that you tell me does not affect me. I want to be free of it, which is, it is a burning demand. It is not just a pleasant thing to bear. I ask you to help me. If you say I can't help you, old boy, I understand that very well. But I come to you because you are all very learned and I say help me and you have not helped me. So I say, what is the point of all this? I go to her and she says do this and do that, but at the end of it I know jolly well that I am not going to be free of it. So what am I to do? There is death, there is birth. I can go into it all as much as you like but the fact is at the end of all this discussion, literature, science, war, there is this deep-rooted fear in me. I am talking of an ordinary human being, not too bright, not too highly educated but fairly intelligent and I say please help me

to be free of it. That is all my question. I have no other question. If I am free of it, then my life is like the tree.

Lots of people have come to see me about fear. I am taking the part of the man who comes to you and says "please don't talk all this high-falutin stuff. Come down to earth and help me to be free of this monster." And you have nothing to say to me.

Dr. Sheldrake : I would say if I am a Christian, Evangelical and I am in fact a Christian — sorry to shock you — I would say in answer to that, that there are answers to this problem which is given by this religion, by faith, by prayer, and so on.

Krishnaji : I won't accept all that.

Dr. Sheldrake : You said you are an ordinary man. Many ordinary men do accept it.

Krishnaji : I have been through all that. I have been through prayers, devotion, the whole lot of that.

Dr. Sheldrake : Then you are a very extraordinary man.

Krishnaji : Do you see what they do with me? Do you see how they push me off? I don't accept all that. They are only substitutes for fear. They are just surrogate to something which is burning me and I say look, don't tell me about the Bible, don't tell me about the Upanishads, I don't want any of that. I am a very sceptical man.

Dr. Sheldrake : Yes. I don't know what to do with you.

Krishnaji : That is all I want you to tell me — "I don't know what to say". Now, stop there. You say, my dear chap, I don't know what to do, because I myself have not resolved it.

Dr. Sheldrake : No, I would not say that.

Krishnaji : See the game they are playing with me. I won't accept this game. I won't accept the ball in my court. It is in your court.

Dr. Sheldrake : All right. I accept the ball is in my court. What I would say in this situation is the answer that I would pray.

You do not accept my answer then. The problem is I tell you the answer and you say I don't accept that.

Krishnaji : I don't accept, I have tried all those.

Dr. Sheldrake : Well, I might say, maybe you have not tried.

Krishnaji : That is a trick of the priest. I won't accept it.

Dr. Sheldrake : You are trying to be sceptical. If you reject all things and all ways, I could say if you say you have tried all

this, at least enquire. I am not a priest in the strict sense of the word, I might enquire in what ways you have tried and find out the sort of trial you have made.

Krishnaji : I know what I have done. I have done what all human beings do. I have tried to escape, I have tried to suppress it, I have tried to transmute it by thinking about something else, I have tried rationalisation, I have tried to pray, I have tried going to Sudarshan and asking him what science tells him. I have been to the analyst. I have done all the tricks that human beings have done. At the end of the day, I say, I am stuck where I am. I am afraid.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Will you permit me to respond to your question? Well, Krishnaji, you are telling that in an extraordinarily moving fashion.

Krishnaji : It is not moving, it is dreadful.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : You must accept my response also because I find it is moving. This simply can't be you speaking, because that, "that" to which you attribute all this fear is not ultimately real. If you have really tried and rejected the thought, that, "that" in me to which I attribute this radical misery is at the bottom unreal. If you have tried, rejected that, then I would like to learn from you.

Krishnaji : That's an idea. To me that is the bottom. To me fear is the bottom of all my life. You may say basically at the bottom there is no fear, that fear may be superficial, an illusion, but deep down there is no fear. I say I have touched the bottom of my life.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : I say you have not touched the bottom of 'yourself'.

Krishnaji : 'Myself' is fear. I have touched that blasted thing.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : You have not called the bluff of the ego. The bluff of the ego is that you are not real, this subject of total misery is not really me. It is a pretender.

Krishnaji : I say that is me.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Have you tried that?

Krishnaji : I have tried that. That to me is just a verbal statement which has no reality.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : But supposing I ask you as Ramana used to ask, well Krishnaji why don't you simply ask yourself who you are in this radical way miserable, and really go into it yourself.

Krishnaji : I have enquired into that. I said who am I? Am I fear or am I different from fear? I say there is no difference between me and fear. I am fear.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Is that the only you?

Krishnaji : That is me.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : The only you?

Krishnaji : The other me is conceit, the other me is arrogance, the other me is feeling loneliness.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : This family of "me"s, is that the only family?

Krishnaji : That is all I know.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : I am not sure whether there is only that in you.

Krishnaji : I told you I also have tremendous aspirations, I have tremendous feeling of guilt, I am also vain, arrogant, full of fun if I want it, and also I am guilty. Also I say I am the ultra-superior entity. I say include all that you have said to me. I am that.

Pupul Jayakar : May I say one thing? You have been asking this question : "I come to you and tell me how to be out of fear."

Krishnaji : I will tell you. But you don't come that way.

Pupul Jayakar : I am coming.

Krishnaji : All right. But you see what I was trying to point out is you don't help me that way. I say I will show you. But have you time? Would you admit desire is part of fear, time is part of fear, thought is part of fear? These are the three basic elements of fear. Then we have to see what is desire. You and I know about it. We have talked about it. Must you and I go into the question of desire?

Pupul Jayakar : I think you should open it up a little more.

Krishnaji : Desire is the beginning of thought when it creates an image out of a sensation. Will you accept that? You have asked me if I can be free of fear and I said that *that is the beginning of fear*. One of the elements of fear is desire. Desire is when thought takes charge of sensation and creates the image out of that sensation. Then time is part of fear; that is the future or the past.

Pupul Jayakar : Fear is the future.

Krishnaji : Any kind of external stimuli, is it necessary? Is that what you are asking? What does that imply? It is only when the brain is not alive, active, then we need a shock, a challenge, a kick. But are you aware how desire arises? Before thought takes charge of sensation, to be aware of that hiatus between sensation and thought interfering with each other, are you catching what I am saying? That is, I see a beautiful woman or a beautiful something; it is a natural sensation and to be so utterly attentive at that moment so thought does not make an image out of that sensation and pursue that. To be so alert that thought does not interfere with sensation. These are the causes of fear. Understand the full movement of desire, where thought does not come into sensation and make a lovely image out of it. That is the beginning of desire, which is the cause of fear. Then time is fear. I am time, my thought is time, I am the past, present and future. I am the time-maker. Since I am the time-maker, I am bound to time, I am in bondage. It is not just words, this has been my blood. Then I say thought — these three are the basic movement of fear — thought projects the future. If you have grasped the fullness of it, there is no fear at all.

Radha Burnier : Sir, it seems to me that there is a primordial fear in which there is no conscious time, thought or desire, primordial in the sense of something which seems to come from an ancient past, from the unknown — the fear of not being.

Krishnaji : That's it — that fear of being is time. Being is time, and not-being is time. When I have understood that, there is no fear.

Radha Burnier : I think there is some difference. I see something beautiful.

Krishnaji : That's all — sensation. Stop there.

Radha Burnier : I am trying to analyse it. There is sensation. Then thought makes an image. Already time has come into being.

Krishnaji : That is, thought is time. The thought is not separate from time. They are both movements. Therefore, thought is time. Time, thought are not different.

Radha Burnier : I see that. But I think there is a fear where there is no such movement. It seems to come from something deep down.

Krishnaji : I won't accept the primordial or deep down. That is the only fear I have — the unknown and the known.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : In your very wonderful play, helpful composition just now, you said that if you can see this, that this is the movement of fear — thought, desire, time — then fear shall end. I think this proclamation or this prospect that fear shall end can sound very presumptuous to people, precisely in the way in which thought will cease, but I think both are on the same level and are not really presumptions at all. There are really these two *margas* and what you presented now, the complementarity of the two *margas* be explored, rather than a mutual rift sustained. I don't think the moment the central movement of fear is seen at that very moment the ego dies.

Krishnaji : I am that. I am desire, I am thought, I am time, I am that.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : If you are still there after this discovery, I am afraid this is not good enough.

Pupul Jayakar : May I say one thing — this movement which has been explored, that 'I' is not separate from that movement. When a statement is made that fear ends, this movement ends and with the ending of this movement, time ends in that sense; now the question which would be relevant is with the ending of that, is there the void of nothingness because after all this is the veil, this is the illusion. When you talk without even making the statement of that, the illusion which hides if you say that there is this super light, there is something which is covering that light, what is covering the light is this movement.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : I think the two must go side by side. What I am suggesting is that we put all our resources together; then I do suggest that the one, the actual undertaking of this marvellous process briefly but so powerfully introduced by Krishnaji has the conviction of those who share it and I think that this ego was never real anyway. I think the two can go together and in a pincer-movement bring freedom. But if you pursue only the one and in somewhat unfortunate rejection of the other, then that would be a false move.

Pupul Jayakar : To go into these two needs a great deal of discussion.

Achyut Patwardhan : I would just like to say that when we get the constituents what is the importance of the name?

When we use the word 'ego', the 'ego' is after all a concept. Now I get the constituents, and I say that time is the factor of fear. I brood over it, I ponder over it because it is the toughest nut to crack. Then I hear that thought is fear. When I examine each of the constituents and I am very critical, very sceptical, and I say that each of the constituents has validity because it is part of my being; it is not external as well as not internal. Is there any meaning left to naming? If I have examined the part, is there any meaning attached to naming? Because then what I have to get rid of is naming.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Supposing I were to say, not with the authority of a *gnani* that the ego is fear.

Krishnaji : Ego is fear.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Very good. This phrase that the ego is fear I heard for the first time today from you. In that simple phrase "the ego is fear", one should see that naming is fear.

Suppose one begins with this thought the one has to go through this movement of overcoming the movement, in addition to the *mantras* — forgive me I will regard these statements — thought is fear, desire is fear, time is fear, as three *mantras* or *mahavakyas*. Now, supposing you have the fourth *mahavakya*, "the ego is fear", that is almost like the four Vedas.

Achyut Patwardhan : I say that if we also give up naming at that point, then perhaps it leaves us at a point which Pupulji has very validly raised that where are you then. "Is there a void?" is a very important question.

Pupul Jayakar : I want to tell Krishnaji that there is a fifth element which may be unrelated to these four but is being stated by Krishnaji and that is that there is a meditation of the universe. There is a meditation of the universe with the ending of this movement. Now can you take all this together?

Achyut Parwardhan : I would paraphrase it in other words which I think might be helpful. I say that when you have arrived at that point, there is the non-divisive existence.

Krishnaji : These are all words.

Dr. Sudarshan : If somebody came to me and said, I am in mortal fear, I would first say, friend I don't know anything to

help you but please tell me. Probably I would have gone somewhere along the way, not so clearly, not so specifically. However, I wonder how many common people can benefit from such a thing. Would not they say "Krishnaji, you are a great man, but these are words. I am in tremendous fear, I am in agony, please help me; don't tell me all this."

Krishnaji : I won't tell him all this.

Dr. Sudarshan : What will you do?

Krishnaji : Hold his hand.

6.1.1982

KRISHNAJI ANSWERS QUESTIONS :

Question : The Indian mind for centuries has probed into the nature of the self and of cosmos. In spite of this, today it is completely materialistic. What has happened to that ancient wisdom of the mind?

Krishnaji : Shall we talk over this together? Well, the speaker has been every winter, for the last fifty years, coming to this country, travelling abroad, going all over the place. One sees the decline not only in Europe and America but also obviously, palpably, the decline in this country. The speaker has been asking various scholars, politicians, scientists and others, what has happened, or what is the quality of Indian mind. Of course, it is a vast generalisation to ask what is the Indian mind, because the Indian mind varies from north, south, east and west, but assuming that it is inaccurate to put such a generalised question, knowing that probably it is incorrect to say what is the Indian mind, still one asks what it is like. The ancient people of this country exploded all over Asia at one time — historically — as ancient Greece, exploded all over the west, and the questioner asks what has happened to the Indian mind.

So, what actually is the Indian mind today? Not go back to the ancient world and be proud of it : we are a very ancient race and all that kind of business. Actually when you begin to investigate what is the Indian mind, then you begin to enquire into what is not only the human mind, the mind of humanity, but also to particularise that mind — geographically as India. If you do ask that question what is our mind, then is it materialistic, drawn towards technology, following the western world of vast movement of technology? When we are investi-

gating into a thing like this, we must be totally unbiased, totally impersonal, completely unidentified. The Indian mind, as one observes, is authoritarian-bound. It functions in a hierarchical movement. It follows; it accepts authority, ancient tradition, the authority of someone who says he knows. Is this correct? Which means where there is authority, there is fear. Have you ever watched when a politician meets you how you grovel, almost double up with false respect? This is one of the conditions of the Indian mind; following authority, sychophantism, fear and therefore total disorder.

And the Indian mind is capable of absorbing everything : different kinds of philosophies, however contradictory they are. It is so tolerant. It will accept everything — contradictory philosophies, contradictory gurus, contradictory concepts. So when your brain is capable of such absorption, it becomes rather sloppy. When such a mind, brain, is capable of absorbing, tolerating dirt, squalor, disorder, lack of beauty — probably you never look at a tree, never look at the open skies with all the brilliant stars — it will put up with anything. Such a mind is a very sloppy mind. It is not a mind that is active, seeing everything. It is tradition-bound mind and very theoretical, very clever in analysis. The Indians are doing such excellent work in Europe and America. They are capable of great analysis, more subtle than the western world, but it is all theoretical, problematical, hypothetical, quoting the Gita, the Upanishads and then trying to relate what has been said to your life. So essentially the brain has become sloppy. Therefore, it is capable of becoming materialistic : Isn't that so? Do look at it, sirs. Don't accept the speaker's word and refute it, argue against it, split hair about it. Do you really want to try and utterly change such a quality of the brain, which has become so dead? Technologically it has become extraordinarily alive. But in the psychological world, which is much more interesting, there is no activity at all. You will talk about the self, the cosmos, discuss very clearly and cleverly — a sophisticated brain which has lived in theories — but when you come down to your relationship with other human beings, there is nothing at all. And one asks is there love at all? Love, not attachment, not personal pleasure in sex and so on. But is there love in this country?

That is, to be generous, kind, considerate, having great sympathy, the depth of love, compassion. If you have such love, would there be war, would you allow the government to accumulate armaments, to kill other human beings? Enquire into all this : how we treat our women or wives; the husband walks in front, the wife walks behind.

And is the Indian mind, apart from the technological inventions, is it capable of creation, to live a creative life, not a life of following pattern after pattern, system after system? Therefore, gradually the brain withers through constant conflict. Is this the Indian mind? Please ask it yourself. I am not asking it, I am not telling you. Is this the Indian mind that is so chaotic, so disorderly, irresponsible? Please see the tragedy of all this. You may read the Gita, Upanishads, but it is all totally unrelated to daily life. There is no application of what you read to daily life. You hear this, and if one may point out, they are just words. You don't say look, am I like that? Is my life disorderly? Is my life, my way of thinking hierarchical? So, what is the Indian mind?

An ancient race, three to five thousand years of certain culture has been wiped out overnight. The brahmanical culture — don't get upset about using the word, you are all probably anti-Brahmin, pro-Brahmin, or whatever it is, the brahmanical culture — I am not for it or against it — however good or bad, for five to three thousand years has put a strong imprint on the Indian brain, on their culture, their books, everything, and overnight it is gone. Why? You must ask this very serious question. Was it just a veneer, surface, like a coat that you put on and throw off? The tradition which is dead, is this the Indian mind? And if it is, answer this question. You just carry on sloppily, are indifferent, sluggish. Have you ever noticed that whenever you go over to a meeting, somebody is telling you what to do — the politicians, the gurus, the philosophers who are translating or interpreting the everlasting Gita? You know all this, don't you? If you have nothing to do, you make commentaries. You live on commentaries. So, realising all this, what shall we do? This is a question that you must answer. This is the crisis, not wars or nuclear wars. That means one has to observe very carefully, become aware of ourselves, because we are the history of mankind. We are the

story of mankind. If we don't know how to read that book with clarity, without any interpretation, then we are going to destroy ourselves. But you don't care, do you? You have clever arguments against all that the speaker has said and thereby prevent yourself from doing anything. That is what I call a sloppy mind, a brain that is analytical, clever, very subtle, and in its analysis, remain at that superficial, theoretical level, which has nothing whatsoever to do with your daily life. I hope you see the tragedy of this. So, is it possible to change radically, break through our conditioning and be free human beings?

Please, there is no sense of scolding about this, no sense of being superior or inferior. I am not your guru, I am not a philosopher. Each one of us has to be both the teacher and the disciple. The teacher who teaches and the disciple who is learning are learning from life, not from books. There is no end to the making of books. But each one of us, if we see what we are and learn from what we are and change, then we become both the guru and the disciple.

Question : The body ages, but is the ageing of the mind inevitable?

Krishnaji : The body ages, grows old, but is the ageing of the brain — not the mind for the moment — inevitable? As the questioner says, it is inevitable for the body to age, grow old and die through accident, disease or constant usage, malnutrition, wrong food, the battle that goes on in our heart and mind and all that psychosomatic activity, overdrinking, oversex, overeating, no exercise. Look at all that. So the body inevitably ages. And the questioner wants to know is it inevitable for the brain to age and decay. You understand the question? What makes a machine, an internal combustion engine, what makes it age? Any kind of friction in the machine makes the machine grow old. This is obvious. Our brain is a kind of machine and it grows old because we live with friction, we live with conflict, struggle, perpetual battle with ourselves and the rest of the world. I am not saying anything new. This is a fact that as long as there is friction, conflict, battle, quarrels with one's wife, husband, abusing each other, hurting each other, the brain must inevitably decay.

And also the computer has come into being. The computer can do almost anything that the human brain can do. It can outthink, outplan, remember vast information. If the computer can do almost anything that human beings can do — of course, it cannot look at the stars and see the beauty of the stars, it cannot watch the movement of the wind among the leaves. But each generation of computers is better than the earlier generation. So what is going to happen to the human brain? Sir, do ask this question for god's sake. This question is not being asked by the professionals, by the top people. They are only concerned with building better computers, more advanced, ultra-mechanical intelligence. What is going to happen to your brain if the computer does almost everything? The brain has lived because it has to struggle, it has to work, go to the office, it has to be active, active in its friction, but when that friction, that activity, is gradually transferred to the computer, what is going to happen to your brain? Either it is going to pursue entertainment, religious entertainment, football, cinema, the puja, to pass time in the name of god, in the name of some silly affair; we all want entertainment. See the seriousness of all this, sir. The entertainment industry is already so active : television, football, cricket. I don't know if you have not noticed the world of sport is becoming more and more popular. So the human brain demands entertainment because it cannot face itself — the trouble, the anxiety, the sorrow, the pain. It wants to escape from all that. Either you escape through all that and therefore the brain becomes inactive being entertained from outside, or you go inward.

There are only two possibilities : Either you are being entertained as you are now, becoming more and more caught in the world of entertainment, going to the temples and so on, or you go inward : the whole exploration of the whole psyche, not according to books and philosophers and psychologists, but for yourself enquire into yourself. Today we are enquiring into the heavens, where they are discovering all kinds of things — black holes — but nobody except very very few have gone into the whole inward world. That inward world is vast, immense, incalculably deep. Don't accept my words. Don't say it is what our ancients said. You are all too clever but you have never gone inward and discovered for yourself the

great beauty where there is a perception that is logical, sane, healthy, a world that is immeasurable, which has nothing whatsoever to do with entertainment. That requires great care, hesitant observation, step by step, that brings about order in one's life. When there is order in your house, there is order in society. But now we want order in society, in environment, while we are disorderly. That is what the communists try to do — establish order outside, tremendous suppression and all the rest of it, hoping to change man. It is the same pattern being repeated in a different stratum. So the brain can remain without ageing if there is no friction, if there is no strain, no conflict, but as long as there is the self — me and you, we and they — so long as there is this idea of the individual opposed to the whole, there must be conflict, and that is what has happened to all human beings. Our brain is troubled by tradition, our brain is caught in past memories, remembrances. There is no pristine quality, but when you have a brain that is untouched by memory, then you have extraordinary vitality, passion in life. Right, sir? Will you do something about it?

Madras,
30th December, 1982.

ATTENTION AND CONCENTRATION

(from The Network of Thought)

Attention is not the opposite of concentration. The opposite has its root in its own opposite. If love is the opposite of hate, then love is born out of hate. Attention is not the opposite of concentration, it is totally divorced from it. Does attention need effort? That is one of our principal activities; I must make an effort; I am lazy, I do not want to get up this morning, but I must get up, make an effort. I do not want to do something but I must. See how extraordinary it is that we cannot catch the significance of this immediately. It has to be explained, explained, explained. We seem to be incapable of direct perception of the difference between concentration and attention; unable to have an insight into attention and be attentive.

When does attention take place? Obviously not through effort. When one makes an effort to be attentive, it is an indication that one is inattentive and is trying to make that inattention become attention. But to have quick insight, to see instantly the falseness of all religious organizations, so that one is out of them. To see instantly that the observer is the observed and therefore one makes no effort, it is so. Effort exists when there is division. Does it not indicate that one's brain has become dull because one has been trained, trained, so it has lost its pristine quickness, its capacity to see directly without all the explanations and words, words, words. But unfortunately one has to go into this because one's mind, one's brain, cannot for example grasp instantly that truth has no path; it is unable to see the immensity of that statement, the beauty of it and put aside all paths so that one's brain becomes extraordinarily active. One of the difficulties is that one has become mechanical. If one's brain is not extraordinarily alive and active it will

gradually wither away. Now one's brain has to think, it has to be active, if only partially, but when the computer can take over all the work and most of the thought, operating with a rapidity which the brain cannot, then the brain is going to wither. This is happening, it is not an exaggerated statement of the speaker, it is happening now and we are unaware of it.

In concentration there is always a centre from which one is acting. When one concentrates one is concentrating for some benefit, for some deeprooted motive; one is observing from a centre. Whereas in attention there is no centre at all. When one looks at something immense — like the mountains with their extraordinary majesty, the line against the blue sky and the beauty of the valley — the beauty of it for a moment drives out the centre; one is for a second stunned by the greatness of it. Beauty is that perception when the centre is not. A child, given a toy, is so absorbed by it that he is no longer mischievous, he is completely with the toy. But he breaks the toy and he is back to himself. Most of us are absorbed by our various toys; when the toys go, we are back to ourselves. In the understanding of ourselves without the toy, without any direction, without any motive, is the freedom from specialization which makes the whole of the brain active. The whole of the brain when it is active is total attention.

One is always looking or feeling with part of the senses. One hears some music, but one never really listens. One is never aware of anything with all one's senses. When one looks at a mountain, because of its majesty, one's senses are fully in operation, therefore one forgets oneself. When one looks at the movement of the sea or the sky with the slip of a moon, when one is aware totally, with all one's senses, that is complete attention in which there is no centre. Which means that attention is the total silence of the brain, there is no longer chattering, it is completely still — an absolute silence of the mind and the brain.

AUDIO AND VIDEO CASSETTES :

A wide range of Audio tapes of Krishnaji's Public talks, talks to the children in the schools and Public discussions are available for sale with the Foundation. Given below is the list of recent tapes :

AUDIO CASSETTES :

1977-78	Rishi Valley	3 Public Talks
1978	Ojai	6 Public Talks
	Saanen	7 Public Talks
	Brockwood	4 Public Talks
1978-79	Varanasi	3 Public Talks
	Madras	6 Public Talks
	Bombay	4 Public Talks
1979	Ojai	6 Public Talks
1979	Saanen	7 Public Talks
	Brockwood	4 Public Talks
1979-80	Madras	6 Public Talks
	Bombay	5 Public Talks
1980	Ojai	6 Public Talks
	Saanen	7 Public Talks
	Brockwood	4 Public Talks
1980-81	Sri Lanka	4 Public Talks
	Madras	6 Public Talks
	Bombay	6 Public Talks
1981	Ojai	6 Public Talks
	Amsterdam	2 Public Talks
	Saanen	7 Public Talks
	Brockwood	4 Public Talks
	Delhi	4 Public Talks
1981-82	Varanasi	3 Public Talks
	Madras	6 Public Talks
	Bombay	6 Public Talks
1982-83	Delhi	4 Public Talks
	Calcutta	4 Public Talks
	Madras	4 Public Talks
	Bombay	4 Public Talks

THE AUDIO CASSETTES ARE PRICED AS FOLLOWS :

Sony C-90 (Imported Cassette)	Rs. 75/-
Coney (Indian)	Rs. 50/-
Only for recording a Cassette	Rs. 30/-

VIDEO CASSETTES :

½" Video Cassettes in colour on the V.H.S. system are available for sale.

For one Cassette containing two talks,

Rs.800/-