

# BULLETIN

KRISHNAMURTI  
FOUNDATION  
INDIA

1984

1

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 Ekklision 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-Mizrh, 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 Canada 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, Inc. 23/3, Mirihana Road, Nugegoda.

## **FROM THE EDITOR**

Krishnaji left India by the middle of February after a busy schedule of talks and discussions in New Delhi, Rishi Valley, Madras and Bombay.

The highlights of this year's programmes will be his talk at the United Nations General Assembly in New York and to the nuclear scientists at Los Alamos, New Mexico.

Details of Krishnaji's public talks and discussions abroad and in India during 1984-'85 are given below:

### **USA**

New York City at Felt Forum, Madison Square Garden: April 14 and 15.

San Francisco at Masonic Auditorium, 1111 California Street: May 5 and 6.

California: Oak Grove, Ojai.

Talks: May 19, 20, 26 and 27.

Questions and Answers: May 22 and 24.

### **SWITZERLAND**

Saanen, Bernese Oberland: There will be five talks between July 8 and 22.

Questions and Answers: July 24 and 26.

### **ENGLAND**

Brockwood Park

Talks: Aug. 25, 26, Sept. 1 and 2.

Questions and Answers: Aug. 28 and 30.

## INDIA

There will be a camp at Benares between Nov. 4 and 11. For details please write to Mr. R.R. Upasani, Secretary, Rajghat Executive Committee, KFI, Rajghat Fort, Varanasi - 221 001.

Stay in Rishi Valley between Nov. 25 and Dec. 25. For details regarding the programme there, please write to The Principal, Rishi Valley School, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh - 517 352.

Stay in Madras between Dec. 25, 1984 and Jan. 25, 1985.

Talks on Dec. 29 and 30, 1984, Jan. 5 and 6, 1985.

Stay in Bombay between Jan. 25 and Feb. 12, 1985.

Talks on Feb. 2, 3, 9 and 10.

## KRISHNAMURTI SCHOOLS

The Krishnamurti schools in India would welcome requests for scholarships from parents of middle-income group who are interested in Krishnamurti's approach to life and education. Applications for admission of boys and girls between the ages of 8 and 12 should be sent. Those selected will be given part-scholarships depending upon the economic and other circumstances of the parents. This is an attempt on the part of the Foundation to reach out to people who would like to give their children such an education but are not in a position to afford it. Correspondence may be addressed to Smt. Ahalya Chari, Krishnamurti Foundation India, 64-65, Greenways Road, Madras - 600 028.

## A TALK IN MADRAS

J. KRISHNAMURTI

January 7, 1984

We ought to talk over together a great many things this evening, about why human beings get hurt, not biologically but psychologically. That hurt they carry all through their life. Also we ought to talk over together the question of sorrow, whether that sorrow can ever end, the implications involved in the ending of sorrow, and the question of what is death.

So we are going to find out first the art of living. The word 'art' means, etymologically, join together, join things together. But I think we ought to give a totally different meaning to it. Art is to put everything where it belongs, to put things in their right place. So there is the art of listening, the art of learning, and the art of perception. The art of listening is not merely hearing words. The hearing of words is quite a different process from the art of listening. The art of listening implies that you are actually listening, not interpreting, not agreeing, not putting up resistance, but listening to what another has to say so that you are not translating what is being said. You don't project your own conclusions, prejudices, opinions, judgments; you are actually listening.

That requires certain attention. In that attention you as the listener disappear, you are just listening. If you listen to those crows, those birds, you are listening; you don't say that is the noise of the crow calling; you just listen. When you do so listen attentively, there is neither agreement nor non-agreement; you are just in a state of attention not only to what the speaker is saying. Also listen to your wife and husband, which is much more difficult, for you have got used to each other. But fortunately you don't know the speaker and the speaker doesn't know you. So we can both listen without any prejudices, which implies great sensitivity, to have your senses so active that you are listening completely.

If one listens so attentively, there is a certain miracle taking place. It is not a listening of one opinion against another opinion, or one

argument against another argument, however reasonable, however crooked, illusory, but a listening in which there is silence. Listen to that crow, with all your senses awakened; listen to that. Then you don't exist, only the sound. Sound has an extraordinary importance in life—the sound of the sea, the sound among the leaves, the sound of the waves, the sound of a tree which is very still.

The art of learning is not the accumulation of memory. You go to school and there you are cultivating memory—mathematics, biology, physics and so on. You are being informed, your brain is gathering information, storing knowledge about mathematics, geography, history or whatever you like. That knowledge remains stored in the brain, to be used skilfully or not skilfully in earning a livelihood. So knowledge is static; you can add to it, you can take away from it, but the core of it is static. It is not dynamic. That which is dynamic cannot be added to or taken away, it is inherently dynamic, but knowledge is not. Knowledge is mere accumulation of information, the result of many experiences stored up. That which is stored is not dynamic. That which is moving, like a river, is dynamic. So there is an art of learning, that is, to put everything in its right place. One has to learn mathematics; or if you want to be an engineer, clerk or physicist, you must accumulate knowledge—that is necessary. But you are adding to what you already know. So knowledge gradually becomes static, whereas in the act of learning you are moving, never remaining in the same place. You and the speaker are working together, learning together; not accumulating what the speaker has said, and going home and saying this is what he said. That is not learning. Learning is the application now of what is being said and discovering for yourself whether it is true or false. If it is true, act. Theory and action have nothing to do with each other. So learning is something that is whole, not fragmented as knowledge is. It is a movement like a river with tremendous volume.

Then there is the art of perception. Perception is different from seeing. Perception is not of time. But the seeing and the translating of what has been seen into action involves a certain period of time. I see what I should do and I will do it. In the seeing and doing, there is a gap or interval which is time. You see something that should be done and you think about it. You argue whether it is convenient or not convenient, profitable or not profitable, and so on. All that implies an interval of time before action. Whereas perception is the seeing and the doing so that there is no interval between action and

perception. I perceive that I should not be a Hindu because one of the reasons for being a Hindu is security; it is one of the causes of war — nationalism. Tribalism is one of the causes of war. I perceive it to be the truth and so I am no longer a Hindu. But whereas if I say, "Why shouldn't I be a Hindu?", it is convenient, it gives me a certain sense of security, — "I must go with the current, I am rather too weak to stand by myself " and so on. In those arguments and escapes you still remain at the end a Hindu. Whereas if you see the danger of being a Muslim, a Hindu or Buddhist, Christian and so on, in seeing the danger of it you act instantly. You act instantly when you see a cobra; if a cobra was amongst you now, my goodness, how you would act ! So see what is implied in perceiving, which requires attention, care, watching things, to find out.

So there is the art of listening, the art of learning and the art of perception. If one lives with this art, then life becomes an extraordinary thing, for that requires great sensitivity, care, attention.

Having said all that, let us enquire, and in enquiry you must be free to enquire. But if you are attached to your particular conclusion, it is not possible to enquire; your conclusion then directs your enquiry. So to enquire there must be freedom. We are going to enquire together why human beings throughout the world get hurt, psychologically get wounded, carry this burden of pain all their life. When the brain is hurt, it becomes neurotic, psychopathic; it lives in all kinds of illusions, superstitions. And most human beings, from their childhood, are psychologically wounded. Aren't you all wounded? Do be a little honest to yourself. Aren't you wounded in the school when the teacher says you are not as good as that boy? That hurts you, doesn't it? And your father says you are not as good as your elder brother. It awakens jealousy, competition, hurt. And once you are hurt, deeply, psychologically, inwardly, all your life you are fearful, not wanting to be hurt any more. And so you build a wall around yourself, isolate yourself. Don't you all know this? Are you all people who have never been hurt? You are hurt when your husband or wife says something cruel, a passing word stings and that remains recorded in the brain. And that hurt breeds all kinds of fears, anxieties, pain. Most people are not aware of all these hurts. If one becomes aware that one is hurt, and when one sees the consequences of that hurt, we are asking, who is it that is hurt. When I say I am hurt by what you said yesterday, who is the "I" that is hurt? Kindly

listen to this because it is your life, not the speaker's life. We are learning the art of living in which human beings are not hurt at all so that they have a brain which has known no hurt at all, and therefore no resistance.

So, who is hurt? You say I am hurt. The "I" is the image that I have built about myself, right? You have images, haven't you, about yourself—that you are a Christian, that you are a Buddhist, that you are a Hindu, that you are a Muslim, you must be a great man; you have all kinds of images. If you are a professor you have an image about yourself, if you are a scientist you have an image about yourself, if you are a house-keeper you have an image. It is those images that get hurt. And the image is you. Are we clear on this matter? You get hurt because you are the image that you have built about yourself. So, is it possible not to create images at all, not have an image about yourself at all—that you are a great lawyer, that you are a rather shady politician, or that you are a religious man? Have you ever tried it? Because the brain creates these images, because in those images there is security, at least thought thinks there is security in these images. And these images get hurt, therefore there is no security at all. So is it possible not to have a single image?

The image is the recording process in the brain. You say something to me which is pleasant, it is recorded. And when you say something very friendly you become my friend. But if you say something not pleasant you are my enemy; that is recorded. So the recording process goes on all the time in the brain because if you don't record, and you depend on that record for security, where are you? If you have no image, where are you? You are nothing, you are absolutely nothing. And because of that fear of being nothing you create images; all of us want to be something. So you create images, hoping that in those images there is security and then find those images get hurt and therefore security is gone. Now, you have listened to this, and in the listening you have become sensitive to the fact. And you see the truth of it, not the description, not the explanation, but the fact that you are hurt because you have an image about yourself, and as long as you have an image it must inevitably get hurt. If you listen to this carefully, attentively, then there is no building of an image at all because you see the truth of it. It is up to you.

We ought to talk over together whether it is possible in life—living in the modern world with all the extraordinary things that are going

on and all the brutality, violence, the beastliness that we are all doing—to end sorrow. Mankind has suffered for thousands and thousands of years. We have evolved in suffering. We have had wars for the last five to six thousand years historically, and imagine the people killed, wounded, maimed, and all the people who have shed tears. And in our daily life we suffer a great deal. Suffering isn't merely physical. One has a disease, either it gets cured or it doesn't and you put up with it if you can. But sorrow is much deeper than that; sorrow is remorse, regret, feeling of guilt, pain and the feeling of desperate loneliness. Sorrow isn't something that is casually put aside, like physical pain, but something extraordinary. So we are together going to investigate it, so that both of us understand the depth, the extraordinary vitality of sorrow, the shock of sorrow. Sorrow is a very, very complex affair. Sorrow exists between a man and a woman though they may be married and so on, there is certain intimidation, certain fears. Where there is possession there must be fear. If the wife possesses her husband and the husband possesses the wife, in that possession there is fear and sorrow. Sorrow isn't just a passing, intermittent shadow on life; it is there always with us.

We are talking about your sorrow, not my sorrow. And this burden, the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness, the despair, the depression, the guilt, the remorse—all those feelings, all those reactions, are contained, held in that one word "sorrow". The pain that you can never become the head of something, the pain of your own incapacity, the pain of not being able to do certain things which you want to do, the pain of ignorance, not the ignorance of books, but the ignorance of oneself—all this is sorrow. And also there is sorrow when the husband leaves the wife and the children, the sorrow of divorce and the sorrow of loneliness. Do you know loneliness or is that a strange reaction? You all know what loneliness is: you may be head of some institution or you may have great many friends, but when you are walking by yourself on a beach or in the woods you suddenly feel utterly unrelated to anything, alone, lonely. All this is contained in that word 'sorrow'—the pain, the grief, the tears, and the laughter too. Man has lived with it, is conditioned by it. And after these fifty thousand years since man has come into being, man has carried this burden. He may go to temples, he may try to escape from it, pray, worship, but that sorrow is always there. My son dies and I shed tears for the rest of my life.

So we are asking, not merely verbally, but out of our heart whether

that sorrow can ever end. It can end completely. With the ending of sorrow there is passion; that very word "sorrow" contains the word passion. Where there is sorrow there cannot be passion. Where there is sorrow there cannot be love. Where there is sorrow there is cunning evasion, escape. And with the ending of sorrow there is passion. And that passion is love. Where there is suffering you cannot love another; you may pity another but that is self-pity, self-concern. Then you will ask naturally: "How is it to end?" That is a wrong question, for the word "how" means show me a method, show me a practice, show me what to do. But we are investigating together, learning together, about the whole phenomenon of sorrow, not escaping, not trying to find comfort. Now, sorrow is a challenge and it is a shock, both biologically and psychologically. My son is gone, it is a shock and the fact is he is gone. Hold that sorrow in your hands as you would hold a beautiful flower, with the whole depth and significance and the strength and beauty of that holding, not escaping it. Then you will see out of that holding in your hand, as it were, the whole movement, the reaction, the sorrow becomes something totally different.

And then there is love, then there is compassion. Love and compassion have their own intelligence, not the intelligence of cunning thought, not the intelligence of human beings who can put machinery together to go to the moon. Intelligence is something entirely different. It is outside of the brain because love is not in the brain. Love is not thought.

Also, we ought to talk over together death. Some of us are getting old, aren't we, including the speaker. There are a lot of young people here. Death is common to all of us—the young, the old, the about-to-be-born. At the end of a journey that is there, you can't avoid it. That is one definite fact. Think of all the people who have lived on this earth and have not died: if all the people who existed before lived, what kind of earth this should be! It is a very complex question. Are you interested in it, or you say, please don't talk about a morbid subject. You and the speaker are going to die some day through accident, through disease through wearing the organism out, and the decaying of the brain, the organism, becoming senile.

So death is waiting, and why is it that all human beings are frightened of it? Aren't you all frightened, scared? If you are honest you say: "Look, we are all getting old, terrible war may happen, nuclear war, and the world might cease to exist as it is now". The

scientists have written about it: if there is a nuclear war, that is the end of the earth. If the politicians have their way and if you are nationalists, tribalists, broken up, you are helping that war to come into being, you are responsible for it. Don't escape from that fact. As long as we are nationalists, belonging to different religions, we are inviting this war. So death is a great phenomenon like birth. One asks: "Why have we, living, put death far from us? You are living, acting, going to the office every day, struggling, fighting, angry, bitter, cynical. And why is it that we have separated life as a thing and death as something else? Why is there this gap, long years? What is important—the ending which is death? Living is more important than dying, isn't it? We are asking seriously, not flippantly, not cynically or just for argument: which is important, living or dying?"

So what is living? What is your life? Don't go off to make a theory of it, speculate and quote somebody or the other. What is your life? What is it that you call living? Your sensory responses, your sexual responses, your fears; going to the office from 9 o'clock to 5 o'clock for the rest of your life, for sixty years, think of the horror of it! And you say that is my responsibility, I have got children, wife, uncle and aunt I must support—you know what you all say. Struggle, pain, sorrow, pleasure, laughter occasionally, joy occasionally, concerned with yourself, accumulating knowledge, nothing new, nothing fresh—this is your life. And to you that is far more important than dying. Face it sir, look at it.

So death comes to you, to us, to every living thing, to even these marvellous trees. There is in California a tree, sequoia, which is over five thousand years old, marvellous, full of age, history and beauty; that also comes to an end. We are always beginning and ending. Death is something that is final and ending. But we don't want to end so drastically, finally. So we believe in reincarnation—"I will live next life, I will become the prime minister next life, I will be guru of gurus next life, I will attain enlightenment next life". So biologically there is an ending to the physical organism, and also biologically, as a matter of fact, the brain is being worn out by constant struggle, constant conflict. Knowledge is one of the factors of this deterioration of the brain because we depend so much on knowledge.

We said the art of living is to put things in their right place. You need knowledge to write a letter, to do your business, to go to the temple. Knowledge has created the gods inside the temples, mosques and churches. So one of the factors of the brain becoming old is the

accumulation of knowledge. Listen to it, find out. When you say "I know my wife", you have already created an image about her.

So there is death and there is living. Living is also becoming more and more dangerous, more and more painful, more and more uncertain, confused. This is our life—quarrelling, struggling, anxious, full of sorrow, pain, remorse, guilt and so on. This is what you call living. And we say dying is the ending of all this. And you say there is the "me", something permanent that will go on in next life. But you never examine what is the "me", what is the self actually, never explore it, question it, doubt it but accept the old tradition. What are you actually? Face it, sir, don't be nervous. You are your name, your body, your knowledge, your job, your anxieties, your pain—you are all that. You are the words, the pictures, the images and these words, and the accumulation of this bundle you want to carry on to next life.

Is there a next life as you want it? Or is there no death at all? Live with death—not commit suicide, I am not talking about the silly stuff, but live with death. Death means the ending; you can't take your money with you, you can't take your family with you, you can't take all your words with you, or your house, your property, your knowledge. Death comes and wipes away all that because your brain has not enough oxygen and it withers. So is it possible to live always ending? That is, you are attached, you are attached to your wife, you are attached to your money, attached to your ideas, conclusions, ideals, you are terribly attached. And death comes along and says, wipe out all that, my friend, you are dead. You have to wipe all that out unless you believe in next life. If you believe actually in next life you have to live correctly now, right? Because, you are going to pay for it next life if you don't live properly now. But you don't believe in reincarnation actually, it is just a lovely, conceptual idea. If you really believe in it you will be living a life of tremendous intelligence, saying exactly what you mean and doing exactly what you think. But you don't believe in reincarnation, it is just a theory as so many theories you have. You might ask the speaker: "Do you believe in it?" The speaker has no belief about anything. Where there is no fear, where there is no sorrow, there is something totally different. And that has no death. Compassion is not *my* compassion. Love is not *my* love; love is love. Intelligence is not mine or yours; it is intelligence. So where there is the ending of all this, there is the "other".

Look, you are attached to your wife or husband. Can you tell her

or him that I am no longer attached to you? What would happen if you told her or him? Do it, sir, find out. What would happen? Both of you would get terribly angry or terribly jealous that you are attached to somebody else. But death is going to free you from attachment. So while living, daily end attachment. I am attached to this house, if I am. I am attached to my reputation, if I am. And to live is to end attachment. So I am living and at the same time dying so that the two are never separate. That implies a living which is not of time. Love isn't something put together by thought. Thought is of time. Love is not in the brain; love is something outside of the brain. And to live means also the ending. If you see the truth of this—not say “how do I die?”, “I will get unattached”—then the brain becomes unconditioned. It is now conditioned through attachment, it is conditioned as it is to be a Hindu, to be a Muslim, to be a Christian and so on. A conditioned brain cannot possibly know what love is. You may have sympathy, you may have pity, you may have various expressions of communication of affection. Love is not sentiment, love is not emotion. It is as strong as death. And so, live at the highest level which is freedom—freedom from all the petty things of life. But I have to earn a livelihood; as society is put together, structured, I have to earn a livelihood. I will do it, but that is not the end as you make it—earn money, power, position. Have you ever considered that power is evil—power as a politician, your power over your children, your wife and husband, power in any form? The temples have power over you and so the temples are evil as are all the churches, because they have enormous power over your brain. It is like a dictator, like those totalitarian states where you are not allowed to think and act and be free human beings.

So, when you understand the whole way of living, the art of living, daily art of living—not the theory of living, not the speculation, but the actual living, your daily life, to be not hurt, to end all sorrow and to understand and live with death—then life is an extraordinary thing. You can never imagine or think it out. Life then is something eternal, which has no time, no beginning and no end.

## KRISHNAJI ANSWERS QUESTIONS

Madras, January 1984

*Question:* If there are no ideals, one cannot deal adequately with the psychological crises and the resultant social conflicts. How can a mere individual change affect the whole?

*Krishnaji:* Why do you have ideals at all? Is it a means of avoiding the present and, therefore, giving importance to the future? Or, do ideals actually guide us? This is one of the implications in the question of ideals. Why do we have ideals? What is more important is what is actually going on in our own consciousness, in our own behaviour, in our own attitudes. If I have an ideal, a direction, then the direction, the ideal, becomes far more important than the actual.

Many of you have ideals but they actually don't affect your daily living. It is nice to think that we have marvellous utopian ideals—communist, socialist, religious ideals, ideals of a nation, a group, the whole network of ideals. They have no direct influence or direct relationship with our daily lives. One does not see the point of having them at all. Life is much more complex, much more important, than the projection of ideals which are brought about by thought. So can we put away our ideals and face actual facts?—facts being that which has happened before, which has happened previously and that which is happening now. The future is not a fact. The future may affect, may be shaped by the present. The present is a fact. So can we forget the future which is the ideal, the what should be, the goal, the purpose? All that implies a motive and motive means a movement: movement in a particular direction. If you have already established the direction in which you are going, then you are not facing the present. So can you be free of ideals, that is, the future, and face the present which is a fact? I am not happy and I want to be happy, I am dull and I want to be bright, clever. I don't examine why I am unhappy, what are the causes of disturbance. I have not investigated the causes of my unhappiness, whether the causes can be changed, put aside or demolished or understood. If understood, a change takes place.

So the question is, if there are no ideals, can one adequately, clearly act when there is a psychological crisis in our daily lives? What are crises? What would you call a problem, a challenge? Crises are a product of our past inadequate attention. A crisis, a problem, a challenge, how do you face it? That's more important surely than the crisis. How do we face a crisis, how do we look at a problem? How do we approach a problem? If I have a problem and I want that problem to be solved in a particular way, then I am not meeting the problem. I want that problem solved my way for my comfort, for my selfishness, for my well-being, both psychological and physical. So isn't it important to find out how we approach the problem? Do we approach it with a brain that has been already conditioned to solve problems? From childhood we are trained to solve problems—mathematical problems, scientific problems, biological problems, architectural problems. So the brain is already conditioned to the resolution of the problem. It is not free to solve problems, it is conditioned to solve problems. The etymological meaning of the word 'problem' is 'something thrown at you'. If it is a defensive reaction, then you withdraw, but if you have the freedom to look at the problem and not be concerned with the resolution of the problem, then the brain is free from its conditioning to solve this problem. Therefore you approach it afresh. A brain that has no problems can solve problems, but if it has problems then it cannot solve problems. This is what is happening, politically, religiously. So one must ask, how do I approach the problem—is it with fear or with a desired solution or something that will give me more profit in the business or in the psychological world? If the brain is free from its conditioning, then it can solve any problem without creating more problems in the solution of the problem. So, can we look at a problem, something thrown at you, with freedom? Then you will solve the problem.

Further the questioner asks: How can a mere individual change affect the whole? Which means, if I cannot affect the whole what is the point of my changing? It is a slack way of thinking. First of all, to answer this, one must go very deeply into the whole problem of whether we are individuals at all. I am questioning this. Are we separate human beings? We are separate human beings physically, biologically. You are a man, you are a woman and so on. You may have a separate bank account and I may have no account. Biologically, physically, we are separate: you are tall, I am short, you

are bright, I am not and so on. Psychologically, inwardly, are we individuals? Question this. I know, throughout long periods we have been conditioned to think that we are separate individuals psychologically. We are questioning that—whether we are actually individuals. Your name may be different from mine, your culture may be different, which is only a superficial coating.

So are we separate individuals psychologically? In investigating this very complex question of whether we are individuals, you are learning. In the process of learning, you yourself become the guru and the disciple. So we must find out whether we are individuals; that means, one must have a sceptical attitude about individuality. Now, our consciousness, both the conscious and unconscious, is what we are. Your belief, your tradition, your despair, your urge to fulfil, your gods, your fulfilment, your pursuit, all that is your consciousness. That is what you are essentially, to which is added a name, K or Y or X. Now, that consciousness is shared by all human beings. They suffer, whether they live in Russia, China, America or in other parts of the world. They are anxious like you, they have their own beliefs like you. They are frightened, shed tears, laugh, see the beauty of the world, just like you.

So your consciousness is not yours; it is shared by all human beings. I wonder if you see the fact. I am educated abroad; my learning, my superficial acquisition of a different culture, different education, is all a coating outside. But inside, inside the skin as it were, I suffer as you do. I am anxious as you are, I am frightened as you are, I am seeking security as you are. I quarrel with my wife and she quarrels with me; and this is happening the world over, whether in Japan, in China or in Indonesia. Everywhere human beings are unconsciously sharing the same thing. I may go to the temple, but I still suffer by going to the temple or the mosque or the church, and you suffer because your wife may be turning away from you. So we both suffer. Suffering is shared by each one of us. So, where is there individuality in suffering? Do you understand my question? I like to think it is my suffering, it is not like your suffering, and in suffering I feel isolated.

Sirs, we have had thousands of wars; historically there have been five to six thousand years of wars. Imagine, if you can, how many people have suffered during these five thousand years—maimed, shed tears, lost their sons, their husbands—and we are still pursuing the same path. So we share the common suffering of the whole of mankind, and therefore we are mankind. Do you understand the

beauty of it? It is not a theory, it is not a speculative appreciation of something, of the whole, but it is a fact. So where is there individuality—except that you may have a bank account, you are darker, taller, shorter? Inwardly our consciousness is similar, with modifications depending upon environment, culture and so on. But essentially it is shared, common to all of us. When one realises that, not as an idea, a theory, an ideal, then you become tremendously responsible. Probably, we don't want to be responsible. Therefore we talk about our own individual growth and individual achievements, individual ambitions, which is tearing the world apart. I don't know if you have noticed all this. We are so terribly conceited about our own individual existence that the world is broken up into little groups, little individuals. There is no feeling about the whole human existence. Now we have answered the question, that is, we have investigated the question, and therefore the answer is in the question, not outside the question.

If there is a fundamental change in consciousness, are you stepping out of that consciousness—greed, envy, all that? Are you affecting the whole? When the brain steps out of that, it affects the quality of the rest which is: Hitler has affected the whole world, Jesus has affected certain parts of the world, the Buddha has affected. Atilla, Napoleon, your own kings, have affected the world. Do you understand? They are all so-called separate individuals. They have had tremendous effect on human consciousness. So it is foolish to ask what effect has my change, will it change society? Society is created by you, by your greed, by your envy, by your desire to compete, by your ruthlessness, brutality, and that is what the society is. And the socialists, the communists and even the democrats try to change the environment, hoping that it will affect human behaviour. But it does not. So to step out of the stream of our daily consciousness is to change consciousness. Right?

*Question:* Is mutation purely a psychological happening? Is there any chemistry involved in the happening? Is there a psychological change in the brain cells themselves?

*Krishnaji:* Mutation means complete change, not change of form which is transforming; transforming means changing forms. When you use the word 'mutation', it means complete change, that which has not been before. And the questioner asks also, is there a chemistry involved in it? Is there change in the very brain cells

themselves? We are going into this rather complex question.

We are enquiring, is there a mutation in the very brain cells? Is that possible? Can a brain cell which is conditioned—brain cells which carry the memory, the experience, the knowledge—can that be radically, fundamentally, mutated? Is it possible for the brain cells themselves to bring about a mutation, not through compulsion, not through pressure, not through reward and punishment? These are all our motives. If there are such motives, then it is not possible; then you are merely pursuing the old pattern.

First of all, do we see the point that our brain cells carry the memories, the knowledge, the experience? Our brain is the instrument, is the storehouse of experience; from experience is knowledge, from knowledge is memory, and from memory the reaction is thought. Do we see that first—not verbally, but do we see the fact? That is, you have an experience of any kind, sexual, a car accident; any kind of experience becomes knowledge. The scientists, step by step, for the last two hundred years, from Galileo and on, have gathered information, knowledge; and the future scientist learns from them, stored in the brain, which becomes his knowledge. So the brain cells contain all the past knowledge, all the remembrances, memories and thought. Thought is a material process because thought is born out of memory, out of knowledge, out of experience, which is physical, material.

Now the questioner asks, can there be mutation in those brain cells which have carried all the past, all the experiences of humanity, all the experiences which have brought tremendous knowledge stored in the brain cells? Have you understood the question? That is, I am going north, I have been going north for the last thousand years. That's my direction. And you come along and tell me, 'If you go along that way, there is nothing there; turn east or south, then you might find, discover something.' So, when I turn, I have already brought about a mutation. It is as simple as that. I wonder if you understand this. I have been thinking all my life I am an individual. You come along and show me the fact and I say you are right and I have changed. The moment I see, there is a perception of truth, there is a mutation taking place. Then I have left the north. Then there is a mutation taking place. It's not an action of will, it's not an action of desire, but it is an action which comes when you perceive that which is true.

*Question from the audience:* What is it that perceives the truth? Who is the perceiver?

*Krishnaji:* The good old question: Who is the perceiver? When you look at that tree, who is the perceiver? Look at that tree, look at it carefully. How do you look at that tree? You have used the word 'tree'. So the word has become more important than the tree. If there is no word, the tree, and you look, what happens? Do you understand my question? I have looked at that thing, calling it a tree for the last fifty years, and you come and say, don't look at it with the word 'tree'. And I say I can't look at it that way because I am so used to that word 'tree'. And you ask me, don't do that, look at it without the word; look at your wife without the word or your husband or your girl-friend, whatever you have. So our brain is a network of words—I am a Hindu, I am communist, I am a socialist, I am Jew, I am a Catholic. Now, who is the observer who is watching all this? That is the question you asked just now. What's the observer, who is the observer? Answer that question, sir.

Now, who is the observer? You say I, the I, the witness, the one who is observing. Who is the observer? Is it not your past knowledge, your past remembrances? So the observer is the past. It is a fact, sir. Look at the fact. The past is the observer, looking at the present. So there is a division between the past and the present. Look at it logically first and then you might see the reality of it actually. The observer is always the past and that which he observes is still the past, and he is looking at it from the past. That is still the past. So the present is the past and the present contains the past, the present and the future. I won't go into it, it is too complex, let's leave that for the moment. I am angry. Is the anger different from me? I am jealous. Is that jealousy, that reaction which is called jealousy, different from me? Or is it part of me? Anger is part of me, jealousy is part of me, the sexual urge is part of me, ambition is part of me. I am all that. So the observer is all that. There is no difference between the observer and the observed. I observe that tree. Fortunately I am not the tree. And my anger is me. I separate myself from anger, and then I say I have been angry. There is a separation taking place immediately: I have been angry. But anger is me. So the observer is the observed. Logically it is very simple. But when you begin to apply it, then the rub begins. Because if anger is me, what can I do about it? I can't do anything. But I have been accustomed to do something about it. Therefore I have a conflict, whereas if anger is me, which is, I and

anger are the same, there is no duality, no separation. Then there is no conflict. Conflict exists only when there is separation—between the Jew and the Arab, between you as a Hindu and Muslim because you are separate, conditioned as a Hindu, and he is conditioned as a Muslim. So, wherever there is a division, there must be conflict. That's a law. The experiencer is the experience, the thinker is the thought. The thinker is not separate from the thought. Naturally, this is something new you won't accept. But look at it please, kindly find out—not because the speaker says so. Whatever the speaker says doubt, question, tear to pieces, but find out, don't say, Oh I don't know what he is talking about, or he is talking advaita, vedanta or some other thing, but find out. That means, to enquire whether conflict can end. We live in conflict and can that conflict end? That can end only when there is no division, no me and you. I know it is extremely difficult for people to do this because they are so caught up in their own self-centred activity.

We said there is a radical change, mutation, when the chain of conditioning is broken, and that chain is broken not by volition, but by observing very attentively, not through analysis, because the analyser is the analysed. Right? So there is a mutation when you see the fact and pursue the fact step by step giving attention, giving care. Sir, if you love something, you care for it. So, a mutation can take place so completely that you have a different brain.

Have you ever enquired into the degeneration of the brain? Have you ever thought about it, asked why the brain deteriorates? Are your brains deteriorating? What are the factors of deterioration? It is conflict, isn't it? The brain is an extraordinary instrument. Look at what it has done in technology for the benefit and destruction of human beings; in that area there has been tremendous advancement. So, the brain has an extraordinary capacity, infinite capacity, but we have taken one direction; we have not taken another, which is the inward direction. When one understands conflict, repetition, pursuing the same old tradition like a gramophone, the gramophone plate deteriorates. Our brain has become a gramophone record that keeps on repeating, repeating. That's one of the factors of the brain degenerating. It is like my saying there must be justice in the world. I keep repeating there must be justice in the world and if I am a politician I pass laws to bring justice. I never question if there is justice at all. Is there justice in the world?

*Audience:* No sir.

*Krishnaji:* No, of course not. You are tall, I am short; you are bright, I am not; you are well born of a rich family, I am not; you have got the world before you and I live in a small little village, uneducated, poor. You have all security, and I haven't got one meal a day. Where is there justice? Come on sirs, look at it. Where is justice?

*Audience:* God could have done justice, sir.

*Krishnaji:* God! God is created by thought. Whether you like it or not, that's a fact. If you have no fear, there is no god. You won't go to temples if you have no fear.

Sir, love has no time. But we don't love anything. You don't love your wife, do you? Do you love anybody in the sense of having no attachment? Love has no jealousy. Do you love anybody that way, your children, your wife? You don't even love your gods because you are so frightened of them. So, is love an ideal? Answer this question, sir. If you loved your children, loved them with your heart, would you have wars, would you have this appalling poverty in this country? Love has nothing to do with self-centred activity. So, where there is love, there is no observer. Because, love is not past remembrance of sexual excitement or any other form of remembrances.

*Question:* You claim to have love and compassion. What have you done about poverty? You live in style.

*Krishnaji:* The gentleman says you seem to have love and compassion, you claim to have love and compassion. The speaker has never claimed it. It would be shockingly absurd to claim something; which means, I am better than you, I am something different from you. So I am not claiming, the speaker is not claiming a thing. And the gentleman says, what have you done about poverty? But what have *you* done about poverty? Not what *I* have done but what have *you* done about poverty, each one of us? There are different kinds of poverty, physical poverty and psychological poverty. Which is more important first? We always say solve poverty first. This has been the cry in this country—the social reformer, the social worker, the rural educator—first solve that, the rest is all nonsense. Now, why does poverty exist in this country? Whose fault is it? Is it for the government, or for each one of us, to resolve this enormous poverty, overpopulation? Is it the function of good government? I am asking you all these questions. Or, as a human being who is separate,

starting a little village school, rural school—will that solve the problem? Or, has a whole psychological change to take place before we solve this problem? You understand my question? There is poverty in Russia, poverty in America, tremendous unemployment in Europe, in England. How is this going to be solved? Poverty, which means lack of food, lack of clothes, lack of housing—who is going to solve that? You and I separately acting in a little place or is it a universal problem? It is the problem of the whole of the world. And the whole world does not deal with it because we are nationalistic, separate—economically, socially. So, the solution lies not in mere individual activity but in putting an end to this economic, social, political division, racial division. It is a problem to be solved by the whole world, not by separate individuals or by separate governments. This is logical. And also it implies a sense of affection, care.

*Questioner:* You seem to live in luxury and style.

*Krishnaji:* What do you mean by that word 'style'? One must have style: the way you walk, the way you look, the way you gesture, the way you talk, the way you behave. There is a style in it; like a good dancer, he has a style. Why do you object to style? Because you haven't got style?

*Questioner:* Because of the luxury that goes with style.

*Krishnaji:* Luxury does not go with style. Style does not mean luxury. Style means living in a particular way which is not selfish, which is not personal. Sir, if an architect who builds a house, has got style, he makes the most beautiful thing. If you love somebody, it has got marvellous style of its own. And because most of us are so shoddy, both inwardly and outwardly, we have lost all the style and dignity.

## THE MOMENTUM OF FRAGMENTATION

(A dialogue)

*David Shainberg:* How can a fragmented mind or the mind which is caught in fragmentation, identifying with itself and caught up with itself, appreciate fragmentation or further more see it? What is that with which we are always more and more identified, each step, along the way? There is an accumulation and a centering, each thought postulating itself and projecting itself further into greater realms and connections so that it has a certain momentum. Another question is: what about this momentum of fragmentation? As this goes along, then there is what we talked about—control and the controller. Somewhere along the line things are moving so fast that the controller asserts itself. You then enter into another aspect of fragmentation. The question is one of momentum and how we see this momentum. Who is seeing it?

*Krishnaji:* Sir, how can a fragmented mind, fragmented action, see itself as a fragment? What do we mean by fragment?

*D.S.:* Something that is caught up, that is in pieces, and they are parts of fragmentation.

*K:* First, how does fragmentation take place and what is the cause of that fragmentation, and what do we mean by a 'fragment'? Are we aware of this whole process—the causation, the effect which is a fragment, and that fragment having its own activity, its own action, its own continuity? Can all this be seen as a whole?

*Pupul Jayakar:* What makes us state that there is a whole?

*K:* First of all, one sees the total movement of causation, the fragmentation and the fragment acting, and that fragmentary action continually going on.

*PJ:* But for the mind to even concern itself with fragmentation, it must postulate something which is non-fragmented.

*D.S.:* Does it?

*PJ:* Otherwise what is fragmentation? It is the very mind which is causing the fragmentation which says it is fragmentary.

*K:* I understand that, but I am asking, what is fragmentation? The fragment has its own continuity of action. What brings about fragmentation?

*Questioner:* Thought.

*K:* What do you mean by thought? What do you mean by fragmentation? You said just now that fragmentation takes place when there is movement of thought. What do you mean by thought?

*Q:* It is a ripple in consciousness.

*K:* When you use the word 'ripple', it is a movement, and the ripple is the movement of thought in consciousness. Is that so? What do you mean by consciousness? We live and act in fragmentation, and we are asking what is the cause of that fragmentation. You just now said thought. What is thought which brings about fragmentation and from that fragmentation all action takes place—the we and they, the Hindu and the Muslim. The cause of fragmentation in the world is division as nationalities, religious divisions, class divisions, divisions of ideologies, beliefs and so on; an actual world of fragmentation—geographically, historically, economically, socially and so on; it is all fragmentary. Now we are asking: what is the root of that fragmentation?

*PJ:* Isn't it that capacity, that faculty which is within me which says I can direct, I can choose, I can quote, I can do? Is it not that which sustains this momentum of fragmentation?

*D.S.:* Where does that come from?

*PJ:* The whole point is when one says that is a fragment, does one really see it as a fragment?

*D.S.:* If I see the fact that I am a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Muslim, then I am outside of it. I see fragmentation from the outside. I am on the other side of it. What is the effect of being fragmented and of knowing it from the inside, from this side? I can always see fragmentation in society from the other side, but can one see the inside of that fragmentation and know it?

*Achyut Patwardhan:* Don't you think we are born with a brain whose primary perception is of itself as the perceiver and the world, the I and the non-I, and I am not aware that there is anything wrong?

*K:* I am not quite sure.

*Sunanda Patwardhan:* I see fragmentation. The moment there is identification with personal experience or and collective experience, there is fragmentation. So long as there is identification, I can't see fragmentation from the inside.

*Questioner:* Surely selfishness is the root cause of fragmentation?

*K:* What do you mean by it? Explore it a little bit. You said selfishness. He says thought. But what is the truth of the matter?

*Q:* It is a division between what you think on the one hand and what you do on the other that causes this. Why should not a person do exactly what he thinks or feels is right? Somewhere there is an element of this self-interest or selfishness that intervenes and says 'good, bad, not this'.

*D.S.:* The question 'why this', what is the causation of that?

*PJ:* In that 'why', you can find a number of things—selfishness, envy, put it all into compartments, and say that is the cause, but if you draw them all in, what is the 'in' which makes that possible? What is it within us which is breaking up and refusing to see anything except through the breaking up?

*Q:* Sir, aren't we all divided by our perceptions?

*K:* When you use the word 'perception', what do you mean by that?

*Q:* From the way you are conditioned to look at things.

*K:* How will you see this microphone? Do you see it as an idea, as a picture, or do you see it without the word and then say it is a microphone? You see the difference? May I go into it a little? Is all the senses always the factor of division? Do not senses function fragmentarily?

*D.S.:* I think there is a sense in which we perceive totally and then we break it down into fragments and then I say I see it.

*K:* No. When you see a flower, do you see it totally or do you have the sensation first, the visual sensation, the contact and so on? I am asking whether the senses are not one of the factors of fragmentation?

*AP:* I am afraid not. It is not the senses.

*K:* The sense, singular, is the cause of fragmentation.

*PJ:* The sense, and in the singular?

*D.S.:* I think when you walk across a room, you are perceiving in a certain global sense this room; you will be perceiving different relationships, the on-going change of relationships with all the proportions, light and shade. So that is a total thing. Once I see with my eye, then I enter into fragment.

*K:* So, when you walk into a room, see the whole room, all the proportions, the light, shade, the pictures, carpet, the chair, you take it all with one glance?

*D.S.:* By using the word 'seeing' you have already fragmented. I think this is an act of perception which is so quick, so fast that it has nothing to do with division. Then when division enters, it is fragmentary.

*K:* The sense or sensation is one of the causes of fragmentation. If we

think it is, then, is there a perception which is total involvement of all senses?

*PJ:* Yes, there is.

*K:* But, first of all, what do we mean by the singular 'sense'? I touch, smell, taste, hear, see. They are all so rapid.

*PJ:* In all that, there is subject and object. When you use it in the singular, in all of them there is subject and object.

*K:* I see, there is seeing. There is no 'I', there is no subject.

*PJ:* Then the field of sense does not operate.

*D.S.:* I think this is discovering something new because seeing as he used it...

*PJ:* That's a very different thing. But is it a single sense then? You started with the single sense. Now in terms of the single sense, the word, is it applicable at all? Can you, in terms of the single sense, introduce 'seeing'?

*SP:* But you also spoke about object-subject relationship.

*PJ:* All these words are traps, but in 'seeing' is the single sense operating?

*AP:* It is a single sense operating.

*K:* Achyutji, we ask you, what is the cause of fragmentation. Let us go back to it. We are asking what is the root cause of fragmentation. Somebody suggested 'a sense', and when you look at something or hear something partially, then fragmentation takes place. When you hear somebody, say something totally, with your ears, with your nerves, with your heart, with your mind, there is no fragmentation. That's all we are saying for the moment.

*PJ:* We know only seeing as fragment, seeing in which there is subject-object, recognition and registering, all taking place simultaneously. That is all we know and now the question that is posed is why does this fragmentation take place at all. Even the enquiry into the nature of the subject which causes fragmentation, you say, is single sense.

*K:* But I question whether there is a subject at all in seeing.

*AP:* Does it not start with naming?

*Q:* If we are to open up the discussion a little, I think the problem we are facing here is not just the problem of understanding, trying to comprehend, but it is also the problem of communication among ourselves; there is great difficulty in terms of terminologies and the exactness of words and I wonder whether you would like to share your feelings, attitudes towards the word 'communication' with us.

*K:* Sir, the word 'communication' means, according to the dictionary, to share, to partake, to think over together, to observe together; all that implies communication. Now, I want to tell you something. I am speaking ordinary English language. I want to tell you what is fragmentation. Now, how do you listen to that question? Do you first listen to that question or you have already an answer to the question?

*Q:* I have no answer when I listen to the question.

*K:* So, are you listening to the question and therefore you are sharing, partaking in the question? We are not both of us saying there is an answer. We are sharing together the question, we are together at the same level. That is communication. Communication implies sharing together something. You make a statement and I listen to that; I listen to it without any distortion. The moment I distort that, I am not communicating. So I find out how I am listening to you. Have I already twisted what you have said to suit me according to my belief, conditioning; or I am actually listening to it without any distortion? Then there is perfect communication. Is that what we are doing now, at the moment? Shainberg asked a question which is, what is the cause of fragmentation? I am listening to his question. I am not answering, I am not discussing, I am not saying there is, there is not, and so on. I am just letting the question enter into my brain. How do I receive the question? I think it is rather important. We are investigating, which means there must be freedom to investigate, which means there are no conclusions. There must be freedom of opinion, judgment, evaluation, comparison in order to investigate. Are we doing that?

*PJ:* It really amounts to asking what is the state of one's consciousness, one's mind. When a question is put like what you said just now that it is only one sense that operates, where do I receive that question? The next step will only come if the receiving is without obstacle, the obstacle being an answer to what you are saying, a further question to what you are saying.

*K:* Pupilji, look, he asked me that question. How do I receive the question? That is really important. How do I receive it? Am I receiving with a fullness or am I already fragmented? So if I listen to the question without any ripple, there is no fragmentation.

*PJ:* If one observes one's mind, if one is in the state of observation, if one hears a statement like that, what happens? Let us see for oneself what happens.

*K:* How do you receive the statement when I say 'I love you'? How do you receive that? Do you receive that as you receive this question? You follow? Somebody says to me 'I love you'. Do I listen with the same intensity, with the same beauty, to that question what is the root of fragmentation? Or is it an intellectual, verbal, reception? Or is there only registration, not a conclusion? Now, is thought the root of fragmentation?

*PJ:* Is it thought or the thinker?

*K:* Is there a thinker without thought?

*PJ:* This is one of the crucial things in all this. You keep on saying, is there thought? Is there the thinker without the thought? Inwardly, deeply from this side, do I ever come to a point when I am in that state? Can one go into why thought is fragmented without going into the problem of thinker?

*K:* Are you saying, without a thinker is there fragmentation? Is it the thinker that makes for fragmentation? If there is only thinking there is no fragmentation. It is only when there is the thinker, and the thinker steps in and says 'I think' and so on; the thinker may be the root of fragmentation. Then we have to find out what is the structure and the nature of the thinker.

*PJ:* No statement will dissolve the thinker.

*K:* But I must know how the thinker has come into being, what is its nature, what is its structure. Thought, thinking — does it bring about fragmentation? Or does the thinker bring about fragmentation? Or the very act of thinking is fragmentation? Or thinking and the thinker both bring about fragmentation?

*PJ:* I am asking you a question: A poem goes through my mind. It is words, it is thought; in fact, it is the act of a poem going through consciousness. If you say all thinking brings about fragmentation, then a poem going through my mind would also be fragmentation, but is it fragmentation?

*K:* I want to find out what is the root of fragmentation; and I see from everything we have discussed so far that thought is the root of it. Pūpūljī says, without investigating the nature or structure of the thinker, merely investigating thought will have no consequence.

*PJ:* Is it a question of investigation or is it a question of observing the thinker in operation? Is it possible for there to be an observation of the thinker in operation?

*K:* That's a wrong question; which is, 'is there a thinker without thought?' Thought has created the thinker.

*D.S.:* Where is thought? Thought creating the thinker — let us go into that.

*K:* Yes. Because thought is in a flux, always changing, modifying, thought realises itself as unstable. There is no stability. There is no continuity. It is broken up all the time. So thought creates the thinker as something positive, something that is enduring, something that is lasting which is the past. The thinker is the past. That is stable. There is no uncertainty about it. Whereas thought by itself is constantly modifying, constantly changing, being pushed around, this and that, whereas the thinker is always stable.

*PJ:* You have said thought creates the thinker. Can there be thought if there is no thinker?

*K:* Yes, of course.

*D.S.:* You were saying something about the act of stability.

*K:* There is no security. Thought is insecure. Brain cannot stand insecurity. Thought then creates the thinker to give it a security so that the brain can function rationally and all the rest of it because brain needs security. So the thinker is the past, in that there is security; my knowledge, my belief, my conviction, the past, my memories, remembrances, the pictures and images, the sexual pleasures—the whole of the past is the thinker.

Let us first see one or two obvious things—which is, thought is in a flux, and the brain cannot stand or act effectively unless it is completely secure. A baby, a child, needs security. Your own brain demands security, safety; it demands order. Otherwise it can't function. If I am a businessman, and I have got a business brain, it must function in order which is security. A computer is very orderly.

*PJ:* I can't still understand how thought can exist without the thinker.

*K:* You haven't understood how there can be thought without the thinker? Can you not have a dialogue without the thinker? Can you not think of your opinion, your judgment, your evaluation, your tradition, your past, all that—just think clearly?

*PJ:* Thinking is word formation, thinking is the movement of the past. That's why I am asking: if it is a movement of the past, that movement which is going to create word formation, and if the thinker was not giving strength to thought, to the past, if the thinker was not, what would be the momentum?

*K:* Momentum is the past.

*PJ:* Which is the thinker.

*K:* Which is also thought.

*PJ:* Which is also the thinker.

*K:* No, thought has divided itself as thought and the thinker.

*PJ:* But you are saying that the past will flow irrespective of the thinker.

*K:* Wait a minute, let us get this. Thought, the past, is in constant movement without the thinker. That is, the past only comes into us, past meeting the present, challenging the present. Then the thinker arises. The past, which is thought and the thinker, when that movement is challenged or blocked or questioned, then the thinker says I have this opinion, I am right or wrong and so on. If there is no thinker, what happens? There is only the movement of the past meeting the present, modifying itself and going on.

*PJ:* If the thinker is not present, is not in operation, is there a modification of the present?

*K:* Pupul, look I am a Catholic or an Arab.

*PJ:* The thinker says I am an Arab.

*K:* My brain is conditioned to think I am an Arab, a Catholic. The brain is conditioned from childhood and that is a movement of the past. It meets the present and the movement is challenged, then I say I am a Catholic. Then I say I don't believe in anything except Jesus.

*PJ:* What happens when the thinker is not?

*K:* Thinker has already come into operation.

*PJ:* But you say thinking can be without a thinker.

*K:* That can only be when there is no conditioning as the past, conditioning as the thinker. You are neither a Hindu, nor a Buddhist, you are merely thinking, observing.

*PJ:* Here you are putting thinking and observing together.

*K:* There is only the movement of the past as thought. That movement is based on knowledge, experience, memory. That is a stream that is going on and on. That stream is always meeting the present and modifying itself.

*PJ:* You mean without the thinker it is modifying?

*K:* No, the thinker is beginning to operate when that movement is challenged. Then the thinker modifies it. The moment the past meeting the present is questioned, then there is a modification.

*PJ:* I understand that. But we are thinking of a state when the thinker is not. What is that state?

*K:* We must go into the problem of what is thinking. Thinking is the response of memory, experience, stored in the brain which is the past. All thinking is the movement of the past. That movement

which is thought feels there must be stability somewhere.

*PJ:* But you made a statement that thinking can flow without the thinker.

*K:* Which is happening now. Where are we? Have I left you behind?  
(Pause)

*Q:* I wanted to raise a question. Dr. Shainberg talked about fragmentation and the cause of fragmentation. I want to know where this question sprang from, whether this question is something which troubles you or whether it is something which you just want to know because you feel we have been discussing a lot of things which have been interesting to know, which might expand our awareness a little more; but how fundamentally do they affect our lives?

*K:* I will tell you, Sir. Dr. Shainberg asked a question: Can there be an end to fragmentation? He says we are living a fragmented life. Suppose one says I live a fragmented life, I see daily life all broken up, that it brings a lot of problems, pain, suffering, and the question then is, 'is there an action in daily life which is non-fragmented? Is there an action which is so complete that there is no remembrance of it?'

*PJ:* If such an action is there, what happens to all our problems?

*K:* Wiped out. So, I am asking, in my life I know what the consequence of fragmented action is like and I say, for god's sake, tell me if there is a way of living which is non-fragmentary. Not as a theory, but actual, as actual as a toothache. Can we discuss that? You cannot discuss that unless you understand the whole movement of fragmentation. Or you can see the whole thing instantly, have an insight into the whole of fragmentation and that very insight frees you from fragmentation, so that every action is complete. That is very rare. This is really an immense question. I have to find out why my life is fragmentary. To find that out, I have to actually realise the fragmentation. Or is it an idea which I accept and work out that idea? There is a difference between knowing that you are hungry and being told that you are hungry. Now, which is it here? Do you know that you are fragmentary or are you told you are fragmentary? Which is it? Is there a realisation that you lead a fragmented life?

*Q:* Yes.

*K:* The next question is, do you see the whole consequence of a fragmentary life.

*Q:* Not the whole.

*K:* Why not?

Q: Because I have not been deeply troubled by fragmentation to that extent.

K: What does fragmentation mean to you actually?

Q: For me it is the division between knowing what I should do and what I do.

K: Yes, why is there this division—know what you should do and do the opposite? Why is there this division, which means you have the choice. Why do you have a choice?

Q: Because of preconception or because one is easier than the other.

K: No, sir. If you saw clearly or if you know the road to some place, there is no choice. It is only when you are confused which road to take then there is choice. So, out of confusion you choose. If you saw clearly then there is no choice.

I question if there is an opposite at all. Look, I am angry, I am violent and there is the opposite which is non-violence. Why do I create an opposite, why is there the opposite? The fact is I am violent. Why should I have an opposite? I have an opposite because I don't know what to do with this. That is one of my conditioning to say: Yes, when you are violent, try to become non-violent. That's a traditional approach. Whereas the fact is I am violent. That is the only fact and everything else is non-fact. Then the problem is, is it possible to transcend, go beyond what is, not into the opposite. If the mind is capable of understanding and going beyond, what is the necessity of non-violence? When I am free, there is freedom from both. Whereas I lead a fragmentary life. I don't know what it is to lead a life which is non-fragmented. I don't know. Then it becomes mere speculation. That is useless. The actual fact is my life is fragmented which is contradiction, comparison, imitation, conformity; all those are forms of fragmentation. So, can I live a life without comparison, not compare myself with anything? Then face it. If I say to myself I am a liar I can deal with it. But if I say I am a liar because of this and this and this, then I am running away from it. If I don't run away from it, then I can deal with it.

Bombay,

7.1.1977

## CATALOGUE OF BOOKS

	Rs. P.
The First and Last Freedom (Hard cover)	97.00
Commentaries on Living	18.00
Commentaries on Living II Series	18.00
Commentaries on Living III Series	20.00
Freedom from the Known	9.00
The Only Revolution (Hard cover)	102.00
The Urgency of Change (Hard cover)	102.00
The Penguin Krishnamurti Reader	41.00
The Second Penguin Krishnamurti Reader	37.00
The Flight of the Eagle	25.00
You are the World	20.00
The Impossible Question (Penguin paperback)	46.00
Beyond Violence	12.00
The Awakening of Intelligence (Hard cover)	146.00
Tradition and Revolution	25.00
Krishnamurti's Notebook	20.00
The Wholeness of Life	24.00
Truth and Actuality (Hard cover)	60.00
Exploration into Insight	20.00
Meditations (Hard cover)	30.00
Poems and Parables (Hard cover)	60.00
Krishnamurti's Journal (Hard cover)	60.00
The Network of Thought	75.00
Questions and Answers	45.00
Mind Without Measure	25.00
Inward Flowering	3.00
A Dialogue with Oneself	2.00
Core of the Teachings	1.00

Rs. P.

**Books on Education**

Education and the Significance of Life	10.00
This Matter of Culture (Hard cover)	97.00
Life Ahead (Hard cover)	35.00
Krishnamurti on Education	25.00
Beginnings of Learning (Penguin paperback)	42.00
Letters to the Schools	16.00

**Books on Krishnamurti**

Krishnamurti: The Years of Awakening— Biography by Mary Lutyens	16.00
Within the Mind	40.00
The Seer Who Walks Alone	1.00

Statement about ownership and other particulars of  
'Krishnamurti Foundation India Bulletin'

FORM IV

1. Place of Publication : Krishnamurti Foundation India,  
'Vasanta Vihar',  
64f-65, Greenways Road,  
Madras-600 028.
2. Periodicity of Publication : Once in 4 months.
3. Printer's Name : Nagaraj & Co.,  
Whether Citizen of India : Yes.  
Address : 152 A, Lattice Bridge Road,  
Madras-600 041
4. Publisher's Name : Dr. (Mrs.) Sunanda Patwardhan.  
Whether Citizen of India : Yes.  
Address : Krishnamurti Foundation India,  
'Vasanta Vihar'  
64-65, Greenways Road,  
Madras-600 028.
5. Editor's Name : Dr. (Mrs.) Sunanda Patwardhan.  
Address : Same as above.
6. Names and addresses of : Krishnamurti Foundation India.  
individuals who own the : Address as above.  
Newspaper and partners  
or shareholders holding  
more than one per cent  
of the total capital.

I, Dr. (Mrs.) Sunanda Patwardhan, hereby declare that the particulars given are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Date : 1st April, 1984.

(Sd.) SUNANDA PATWARDHAN,  
*Signature of Publisher.*