

'85/1

bulletin

**Krishnamurti Foundation India**

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,
BRAZIL	p/a: Catoor Monica, Mortierstr II, Poesele-Nevele, 9850. 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-Mizr, h, 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.
SRI LANKA	Krishnamurti Centre, Sri Lanka, Inc. 23/3, Mirihana Road, Nugegoda.

## FROM THE EDITOR

This is the first issue of the Bulletin for 1985 and we wish all our readers a Happy New Year. The Bulletin opens with a dialogue between Krishnaji and others representing different fields of interest and specialisation. In the latter pages Krishnaji answers Questions at Brockwood Park and Saanen.

### NEW PUBLICATIONS

A new book of photographs of Krishnaji at 85 taken by Mr. Asit Chandmal has been published by Harry N. Abrams Inc. New York, U.S.A. Printed in Japan, the book is titled 'One Thousand Moons'. The Foundation has ordered some copies which are expected in April. A handout from the publishers is enclosed. You can book your order with the Foundation.

Victor Gollancz Publishers, of England have just brought out a new book; 'The Ending of Time'. It contains thirteen dialogues that took place between Krishnaji and David Bohm in 1980. The dialogues start with the profound question 'Has humanity taken a wrong turn which has brought about endless division, conflict and destruction'. They explore into the nature of man and his relationship to society. The book is priced at £ 10.50.

### SUBSCRIPTION

Please renew your subscription for this year. Owing to increase in the cost of paper and printing, it has become necessary for us to raise the annual subscription to Rs. 22/- and life-membership to Rs. 250/-. Those of you who have paid only Rs. 15/- may kindly send the remaining amount to ensure that you receive your second issue. For subscribers abroad, the subscription is \$ 8.00 or £ 6.00 per year.

## Krishnamurti's speaking schedule in 1985-86

U.S.A.

Washington D.C. at John F. Kennedy  
Center

: April 20 & 21

California at Oak Grove, Ojai :

Talks

: May 11, 12, 18 & 19

Questions & Answers

: May 14 & 16

SWITZERLAND

Saanen — Talks

: July 7, 10, 14, 17 & 21

Questions & Answers

: July 23, 24 & 25

ENGLAND

Brockwood Park — Talks

: August 24, 25, 31 and  
September 1

Questions & Answers

: August 27 & 29

INDIA — 1985-86

Madras — Talks

: December 28 & 29,  
January 4 & 5, 1986

Questions & Answers

: Dates to be fixed

Bombay — Talks

: February 1, 2, 8  
& 9, 1986

Questions & Answers

: February 11 & 13

For the programmes in Rajghat School and Rishi Valley School,  
please write to the following address :

The Principal,  
Rajghat Besant School,  
Rajghat Fort,  
Varanasi 221 001.

The Principal,  
Rishi Valley School,  
Rishi Valley P.O.  
Chittoor Dt. (A.P.)  
Pin : 517352

## A SEMINAR

Madras, 9th January 1985

*Dr. Visveshwara* : One of the things we thought of discussing with you this morning was: what is knowledge and whether there is anything beyond knowledge.

*Dr. George Sudarshan* : Talking about something which is beyond knowledge one must also ask the question what lies beyond space — usually the question of beyond is in delimited space and then we ask the question what lies beyond it. I would like to ask Prof. Visveshwara what was there before the Big Bang, what happened before the origin of time. So in some ways the question — what lies beyond knowledge — is not very well formed because 'beyond' is also within the realm of knowledge, unless one means by beyond, that which is objectified, which is seen outside. So one must get Krishnaji to define the term — what he means by beyond knowledge.

*Krishnamurti* : All right, Sir. What is behind knowledge, not beyond? Is there anything behind knowledge or outside knowledge? Or is there only perpetual movement of knowledge? I think we should begin with the whole question of knowledge first, what relationship it has to our daily life and what relationship has knowledge to this so-called world of religion, what place has knowledge in science and all the various disciplines of knowledge, the whole spectrum of knowledge.

*Pupul Jayakar* : Krishnaji, why have you used the word 'beyond'?

*K* : What is before and what is behind? Let us put aside the words. Is all our life knowledge? Is our brain conditioned to knowledge, and is there in this process of knowledge, space? And what is time with regard to knowledge?

*Radha Burnier* : If all our life were knowledge the word beauty would have no meaning. Life is knowledge.

*P.J.* : I am proceeding further with this. It may be an emotional response, a sensory response of a particular kind but still within the area of knowledge. When we talk of beauty as it is normally understood, it is very much within the field of knowledge. If we could push this thing a little further, and ask, is there anything beyond, not knowledge but sensory knowledge?

*R.B.* : We are talking of mental knowledge.

*P.J.* : That is also sensory because every movement of thought has a sensory response. Is there anything beyond the senses? Is there anything beyond sensory knowledge?

*K* : First of all, if I may ask, is our brain entirely conditioned by knowledge? Not only the various forms of scientific disciplines, religious disciplines, the whole problem of disciplines based on knowledge, based on experience; and, is our brain capable of understanding knowledge and its limitations? If I can find out its limitations, I would enquire into something else then.

But if I do not know the limitations of knowledge, then the enquiry would be, is there an end to self-knowledge? Or is knowledge a continuous movement in space and time?

*P.J.* : The first part of your question was, is there an end to self-knowledge.

*Vis* : What do you mean by self-knowledge?

*K* : Human self, after all that is the basis of all knowledge.

*Vis* : Knowledge of self?

*K* : Yes. Knowledge of self which means self-knowledge — knowledge of my actions, the whole movement of knowledge in which I live, whether it is sensory knowledge or the various forms of knowledge.

*G.S.* : But is not self-knowledge, a state in which I am aware of myself all the time, myself as distinct from the rest of the world?

*K* : Myself is the world. I don't differentiate myself and the world, apart from the physical world. I am like every human being on earth, suffering, and all the rest of it. To me, there is no individuality, as self, as the soul and so on.

*Vis* : By self-knowledge, do you mean the self? Do you mean the collective entity called humanity as distinct from the physical

world where phenomena take place? You said that by self you don't mean one individual but the entire humanity.

*K* : Is myself, is my consciousness different from the rest of the consciousness of mankind? I don't think so. Of course, I suffer, you suffer, whole humanity suffers. I have separated myself seeking protection, security and so on, but I am like the rest of humanity. So I am humanity.

*Vis* : Is this collective entity called humanity?

*K* : I would like to know what you mean by the self.

*Vis* : That is what I would like to know. Do I understand at least that it is distinct from the physical and all the inanimate phenomena that take place around us? Can we distinguish self from all that surrounds us?

*K* : The self is surely what I have thought about myself, what I feel, what I think, my emotions, my hates, that is the self.

*R.B.* : In other words, the self is the field of consciousness.

*K* : Self is consciousness.

*R.B.* : Self is consciousness. Therefore it can't be identified with inanimate objects around us, because that is not consciousness.

*P.J.* : But the response to the inanimate objects that surround us is obviously consciousness. So in that sense the world is consciousness.

*Vis* : Your consciousness could be in response to inanimate objects also. Therefore they become part of your consciousness. How do you distinguish?

*Scaria* : For me, consciousness is basically an activity, an effect, as a result of, and it calls for a cause and so I am that consciousness. Therefore, this activity presupposes being, which is conscious, which is doing this activity. I don't think that we can really say that consciousness is just a common consciousness. It is my consciousness, his consciousness and the world's, of which man is conscious of; when I am conscious of it the world is also part of me. I feel it is an activity which calls for a basic reality, that it is the self which is conscious of.

*G.S.* : I was going to say, in traditional classification, there are various states of experience and mentation, until at last one comes to the finest of these things in which every action is seen as one consisting of a perceiver, a perception and the perceived. Upto this level there is one kind of experience. The words are changeable as some people use consciousness for a slightly

higher level of function. There is the state of functioning, state of existence which is distinguished from this one in which this triplet is — the perceiver, perceived and the perception. Perceiver and the perceived disappear and only perception remains. So when you talk of self-knowledge it is the first described thing and not the second described thing.

*K* : Sir, is there a perceiver at all? Or, there is only perception? Not go through all these stages? We have divided consciousness as the perceiver, the process of perceiving and the perceived. I am questioning this division. It is really quite artificial. When I perceive, see clearly, there is no seer; there is only perception.

*G.S.* : But at that time, does not the perceiver also cease to be and only perception remains?

*K* : Yes. The moment you introduce the perceiver, he creates the division.

*P.J.* : But you can't eliminate the perceiver, you can't arbitrarily eliminate the perceiver.

*K* : No, we said that there is only perception. The perceiver, the observer is the observed.

*P.J.* : Yes, Sir. But as part of our living we have divided and we see it as two things.

*K* : Why have we divided? Who has divided? Who has divided the world and me — and in me there are various divisions — this constant divisive process? who has done this?

*P.J.* : Is not this something part of my inheritance? Maybe I don't know enough of it. But just as I inherit various capacities one of the things which seems to be inbuilt into me is this faculty of division, of seeing myself as separate from the outside world.

*R.B.* : You are saying that the very nature of consciousness is to be divided.

*P.J.* : It maybe in the very nature of evolution and I say don't know enough about it. I cannot make a statement on it, but we see it as an experimental thing, an existential thing.

*K* : Dr. Sudarshan said that we have divided the perceiver, the process of perception and the perceived. There are these divisions. Why are there these divisions and who created these divisions? Is there only a perception, not the perceiver and the process of perceiving?

*P.J.* : These three divisions you are talking about — the perceiver, the process of perception and the perceived — is it knowledge? Does it not create knowledge?

*K.* : Do you agree?

*G.S.* : It is a matter of definition. We have to agree with that. If the question that you asked, raised earlier, is to be meaningful, I assume it means all experience — where there is this division of the three, this would be called knowledge, and the other level, where there is only perception, would not be called knowledge.

*P.J.* : We are in the field of knowledge.

*K.* : That is what I say but we may be wrong.

*P.J.* : We are mixing this a little too swiftly. The leap is too quick, something like jumping out of our skins.

*K.* : Is the observer different from the observed? Is the thinker different from the thought? Is the experiencer different from the experience? And if there is that division, then the experiencer is the knowledge, and he is projecting his experience, his knowledge on the thing perceived and from that perceiving he acquires more knowledge, information, more experience and that becomes knowledge and this process goes on all the time. I am questioning that process. That is all. It may be utterly false. It may be that there is only perception and not the perceiver and the perceived. I am taking an example: I am envious. I am not different from envy. I am envy but we have divided as 'me' and envy. Therefore the me is the accumulation of knowledge — the past, present and so on.

*P.J.* : So long as the response is from the field of knowledge, the division is there and we are responding to that.

*K.* : Could we say knowledge is always limited — whether it is scientific knowledge, whether it is biological knowledge or whether it is the knowledge of my own learning and so on? Knowledge is always limited because you are adding more and more. Where there is more and more, that more is measurement and therefore limited. Knowledge is always limited, now or in the future and to act upon that knowledge has its own limitations.

*Vis* : I feel that this process as defined by him — the perceiver, perceived, the process of perception is automatically there in that sense. The question is should you look at it that way.

*R.B.* : Can we look at it in any other way?

*R.B.* : That consciousness is mostly memory and because each brain has its own memories, perhaps it appears as if it is a separate consciousness.

*K.* : No. Memory is memory; that memory may be coloured differently but it is still memory.

*R.B.* : Yes. All the anger, envy, jealousy or whatever, is part of consciousness and springs from memory.

*Vis.* : Earlier there was a distinction made between sensory knowledge and other knowledge. I am not clear about it. All knowledge, to my mind, has some sensory component. Without a human body, you can't have consciousness, but what is beyond it?

*P.J.* : Really the question is — what are the limits to knowledge? Is there a limit to knowledge? Krishnaji says all knowledge is limited.

*K.* : Not I say. It is so obvious.

*P.J.* : It is not so obvious that all knowledge is limited. Is that part of the deep comprehension of the human species of which I am part?

*G.S.* : It is always dangerous to imagine what Krishnaji thinks, and what one understands of it. In order to make progress in the discussion let me delimit two different entities: one is the totality of the knowledge of all human beings all over the world plus any other put together.

Krishnaji says this too is limited because knowledge too is acquired, it is gathered in time and space by a finite number of individuals, a lot of knowledge but nevertheless this is limited.

*K.* : That is right. Knowledge is limited.

*G.S.* : The point that both Pupulji and Radhaji are making is, there is a distinction between the knowledge of all the people (i.e.) Encyclopaedia Britannica or its American counterpart put together is more than what one person knows and therefore each person's knowledge is limited. But my understanding of what Krishnaji says is, expand it as much as you want, study all the encyclopaedias and it will still be limited.

*K.* : Yes.

*P.J.* : But inbuilt into the statement of yours there is also the feeling in each individual that he can continue to push the limits; that the horizons can always be extended and therefore in that sense it is not limited because you can continue to push.

*Vis* : Earlier when he was trying to define self, he said all is self. The question is whether I can see all humanity as one, or I am an entity which reacts to all other entities separately? In the same way when I perceive something, is that also part of my being — the perceived, the other person or the object? Is it also part of my consciousness?

*P.J.* : I would say that as long as the movement of the brain as the perceiver, the process of perception and what is perceived continues, as long as any movement of the brain continues, can there be any other process but this? It is inbuilt into our thinking processes, and as long as thought is there, this will be. And therefore there can only be a positing of the ending of this process and not asking any other question.

*G.S.* : The question is always really the same. Krishnaji says I am questioning the reality, the validity of this particular division and what Pupulji is saying is, please look, have compassion on us, we are in this situation and therefore we keep asking is there a way out of this. How are we to get ourselves out of this one?

*K.* : Is that it?

*P.J.* : Yes. Obviously, Sir. One is caught in this eternal labyrinth.

*Dr. Rashmi Mayur* : In this room are certainly a number of brains. Would you say there are separate minds in this room?

*K.* : No. To me the mind is different from the brain. The mind is outside the brain. I would like to discuss this and not just state it. The brain is the centre of all thought which is memory. Memory is knowledge and experience and it is the centre of all action and reaction, both physical, psychological and so on.

It is the centre of all nervous responses, biological reactions. And it is the centre of all our movement of thought, fear, jealousy, anxiety, hate, anger, envy, belief, non-belief and all the contradictions, all that is in the brain as consciousness, and that consciousness is knowledge.

*R.M.* : Is the concept of self distinct from the rest of the world? Is it also contained in the brain?

*K.* : But what is the self then? Is my 'self' apart from the biological, organic structure — man, woman and all the rest of it? Is me, my consciousness different from the rest of mankind? We think it is. Is that so?

G.S. : As long as one is in time, knowledge will always be limited.

K. : That is right.

G.S. : So the question of whether there is something beyond the limited knowledge is really the same question as the one you asked earlier — (i.e.) can we get out of the time limited sequence thing. You said evolution is a time limited thing. As long as you are in evolution, as long as you are in progress, as long as you are in the process of acquiring knowledge or going from here to more knowledge, you are still in the field of the limits of knowledge.

K. : Both time and thought.

P.J. : So it is the ending of movement.

Vis. : How does time come into the picture?

K. : To acquire knowledge needs time.

Vis. : Suppose you are given infinite amount of time — can there be still a limit to knowledge? Then the element of time does not come in. Knowledge, you say knowledge by its very nature is limited. Time element does not come into the picture at all.

K. : I don't know what you mean by time. We will have to discuss that.

Vis. : The question is whether knowledge by its very nature is limited even if you are given all the time you want.

P.J. : All time is still limited.

Vis. : Let me give an example. Prof. George Sudarshan should actually explain it — the uncertainty principle. Within the physical theories there are built-in limitations beyond which you cannot know nature — cosmology or evolution of universe, horizons and so on beyond which we cannot see. So knowledge has somehow built into it certain limitations, certain boundaries beyond which you can't go. This is one thing. Or in principle if you are given infinite amount of time, the more and more you acquire, there may still be something beyond. It is as though you are almost coming near to the point, almost nearing the end but still the horizon is there; you are pushing the limits but still the limit keeps on continuing, the horizon keeps on receding. You mean limitation in that sense or in this sense?

P.J. : I think he means something different. He means that it is not this space-time dimension.

K. : Can we come a little together? We are moving away.

R.M. : Sir, I have the disadvantage of not having read your books, not having studied epistemology which you are discussing. Maybe I would like to ask a few questions. We are all laymen here without basic definitions. Without definitions we could have so many meanings and we could never converge or understand what we are speaking about. If we are speaking about knowledge of what is known, all that is known and the knower is a person who knows through his brain. And whatever a person knows is limited, because he is in time and space. We cannot live without time and space and I don't think I could live without time and space. Knowledge may be without time and space, but I can never be without time and space. As far as I exist, there is a person: I exist as a consciousness then. If that is the case, I would go back to Pupulji's question about knowledge being limited. I think knowing itself is limited. In other words the more you know, the more questions would be asked which means you know less. The number of questions we ask about the universe today, they were never asked about 100 years ago. The reason we are asking so many questions about the universe is that we know so much about the universe. So I think more knowledge leads us to more ignorance because we are all in time and space in that respect. Knowledge by itself may not be in time and space. Can you say what is the relationship between brain, mind, 'I', knowledge and ignorance?

K. : Sir, 'I' is knowledge. The 'me' is put together by thought as knowledge. Thought, memory, experience — thought based on knowledge is limited. Whatever one thinks is still limited. All our knowledge is limited — whether it is 1000 years ahead, million years ahead, it is still limited and wherever there is limitation there must be division: The observer and the observed, the Jew and the Arab, the Hindu and the Muslim and so on. Wherever there is the activity of thought as limited, it must create division, conflict and all the misery of mankind. And thought is essentially based on knowledge. As you said, we did not know what we know now about 200 or 500 years ago. All that is acquired as knowledge during this period is still limited because there is the 'more'. Wherever there is the 'more' it implies limitations. The better is the limitation. And so knowledge is limited. about the universe, about the cosmos and so on. That

is all I am contending. And action within that area will always be limited action and therefore perpetual conflict in humanity, conflict in oneself, conflict in you and this conflict ultimately ends up in war. That is all.

We have been carrying on with this for the last million years or for 45,000 years. I am asking myself whether there is an end to all this or must mankind go on and on, everlastingly in this cycle.

*R.M.* : I would like to ask two questions, since I am an environmental scientist: The 2300 people in Bhopal just outside the factory when the poisonous gas leaked out, some of them died right away and the others did not know whether they should run inside the factory or run away from the factory. If they had knowledge they would run away: if they were ignorant they would go into the factory to see somebody and see what is happening. There is a difference between the knowledge by which they would run away, and ignorance — they would go inside the factory and die. My question here is, is not life the perpetual effort to escape from ignorance or is it that we are simply accumulating more ignorance?

*K.* : Accumulation of knowledge may be ignorance. If you take an example, like people running away or running into the factory, that is a difficult example. If you move away from the example, what is humanity doing — destroying itself environmentally and so on, cutting down trees, you know all that. We all know it is going to destroy us. Any thinking man knows that by destroying the earth we are going to destroy ourselves and that knowledge is not preventing us from destroying the world, because politicians invest power in all that business. I want to question the whole acquisition of knowledge, what place it has in our lives, what place has time which is the acquisition of knowledge in our lives. If I have no time I have no knowledge. So what is time and is time, thought and knowledge — are they related together? Or is there a movement which is totally different from this? Must humanity — you and I and everybody — must we go through this everlasting process? We have killed each other for the last million years and we are still killing each other. Environmentally we are killing everything.

*G.S.* : If you proceed from the earlier statement that knowledge is limited and let us assume it is so, because you were saying

it is in time and he was saying that even if you were given all the time, infinite time, it is still limited. That was his argument. He was saying that it maybe inherent to knowledge itself, that the more we know, the less we know of some phenomena. Has this something to do with the human capability of acquiring all knowledge, unlimited knowledge? Is it inherent in the very nature of knowledge, is it our inability to comprehend all of it?

*K.* : That may be it, Sir. Our incapacity, sluggishness or our conditioning, is preventing us seeing the limitation of it. I am trying to find out if there is a holistic view of life. That is all I am talking about, not always divided, divided, divided.

*R.B.* : The difficulty for the average person would be, I think, that if he were not acquiring knowledge, he would not know what to do. He would be in a total vacuum.

*P.J.* : Sir, if you see the state of the world and the state of the human mind today, perhaps it would hold the whole human situation. The human condition has reached a critical point of either survival or destruction. Now faced with such a challenge, a challenge possibly it has not faced ever in its existence, the response which arises out of the mind must be of the same immensity and vitality as the challenge. And I think the problem is that the mind cannot generate the energy to respond with the same immensity as the nature of the challenge demands. The challenge is total. The response cannot be total because it is fragmented by the self, by knowledge, by always the hope of tomorrow. So what is it which brings the mind to this critical point so that it can respond adequately? If you talk of a holistic seeing, this brain has to be holistic.

*K.* : That's it. Our brain has been so conditioned by knowledge that it can never perceive whatever it does in a holistic way. And so my brain which is not my brain because this brain has evolved through immense time, whether the brain can be unconditioned or has it to be everlastingly conditioned. Can it be holistic — look at all life, the whole universe, the whole nature as a whole movement, not as a separate movement?

*R.M.* : Can you explain this further? I don't understand your statement that the brain is so conditioned that it cannot perceive the holistic view of life. I am not able to understand this. The brain actually, if I can understand, as just a student of biology and so on, the brain is only an organic entity inside the skull. So

the conception takes place at the level of mind which is the process of the brain. If that is the case, I can look at you, as a Muslim now and also look at you as a human being, I can also look at you as a life, I can also look at you as a part of the total reality. Why is it that in this process, I cannot have a holistic perception, within the limits of course. But barring all the limits I can still perceive more holistically and less holistically. It is possible for me.

*P.J.* : Is there such a thing as more holistically and less holistically?

*R.M.* : I would say so, but again it is only a question of semantics. We can have a broader vision at each stage depending upon how we view it, the type of telescope we use.

*K.* : Sir, can thought be holistic?

*R.M.* : Thought is one piece of thought. That cannot be holistic.

*K.* : Thought is not a piece of thought, but thought is the whole structure of thought, the whole movement of thought.

*R.M.* : As I said, for me thought is only a telescope. I can never see the whole universe. My telescope could be bigger and bigger and bigger but still the conception becomes bigger.

*K.* : Thought can never perceive or understand the whole. Thought can investigate but still it is limited. So is there a possibility of observing without thought?

*R.M.* : I don't think so.

*Vis.* : I do think so.

*K.* : I am merely suggesting thought is limited. Thought can never under any circumstances see the whole. And is it possible for thought to function at a certain level and be totally silent at another level? Then there may be a possibility. That is all.

*R.M.* : I think the important element is as Socrates said that the difference between me and the Sophists is that Sophists think that they know everything whereas I know that I do not know.

*K.* : Yes, Sir.

*R.M.* : And if I know that my thoughts are giving me only so much of perception, that itself is important in terms of how holistic I am.

*K.* : No, Sir. Can I look at anything without the movement of thought? Is there an observation which is not based on thought? Very simply put, can I look at my wife or husband, or the girl or

boy and so on, without all the accumulated memory and all the imaginations about her or him? If that is not possible, then I cannot look at anything else. Right Sir? Can I not look at the whole environment, not only in India, but all over the world, as in intimate relationship with me, not something separate? And that separation is made by thought. And so I would like to understand or see if there is an observation without thought. If you agree logically, what is the next question?

*R.M.* : I think I would say one thing here. My feeling is that we are continuously terrorised by the past.

*K.* : It is the same thing, Sir. Thought is the past. The past is time. Genetically and as memory, that which I have collected during the last 90 years or 50 years, all that memory is the past. And I am saying, can I look at humanity, my wife or the world without the past. It may not be possible. Therefore I am just creating further memory, the whole movement goes on. As Pupul Jayakar pointed out we have reached a limit. We are really in a great crisis and how does one react through a crisis? Either you act as a whole or partially and the partial response is the immense crisis that is going on to destroy the world. More wars, you know all the rest of it.

*Vis.* : We have assumed in our discussion earlier that somehow knowledge is good. At least I thought there is a positive connection to acquiring knowledge, expanding horizons and all that. At the same time we are saying that today we have reached a crisis which is insurmountable at the moment. We have certainly more knowledge collectively or individually today than what we had ever in the past. So is there something negative about knowledge, or expansion of knowledge?

*K.* : Yes, Sir. I don't say it is negative. Knowledge is necessary at one level.

*Vis.* : Correct, but in spite of the expansion, at least we may not have reached the limits of it — we are expanding our total knowledge here but we still say that today we face more challenges than what we did as human beings earlier. This should have helped us solve it or at least have some comprehension of how to solve it.

*P.J.* : It is perception which uses knowledge, whereas the crisis is obviously in the perceiver.

G.S. : That is what I am trying to say. We are the people who have gained knowledge. Therefore that should have done something to the perceiver also. How do we distinguish again? So this knowledge should have improved us in some ways as human beings.

P.J. : Possibly that is not its role.

K : Thought has not helped us. Quite correct. Knowledge is not helping us.

Vis. : But are you not equating knowledge with wisdom? When you use knowledge — whether you are using it or misusing it — that is the crisis. There is nothing bad about knowledge which you are using. But the process of acquiring knowledge, acquiring wisdom is it part of this process? Knowledge and wisdom are different.

R.B. : But there is a difference in knowledge also because when you speak about using knowledge you are referring only to some part of knowledge. Krishnaji said 'can you look at your wife without the past' which is also knowledge. That is a different kind of knowledge. Does the question of using that knowledge rightly or wrongly arise?

K : Is the crisis in human consciousness?

P.J. : I am translating now knowledge into technology. What is destructive are the many things — not only technology but the fragmentation which comes with over-population, with divisive forces, with violence, everything taken into one basket. It is because of the incapacity of the human mind to deal with the problems that the crisis is there, that the human mind is no longer able to deal with them.

K : Can we introduce the word 'love'? Is love knowledge?

R.M. : I don't think so, according to me, unless we change the definition.

K : I am just asking, Sir. We know what knowledge is now — all the knowledge we have acquired, all the experiences and various disciplines and so on, the tremendous knowledge that humanity has gathered during the last 500 years from Galileo till now. What is the relationship of that to love? Is human crisis not in knowledge but because the other does not exist? Is our crisis because there is no love but only knowledge?

P.J. : Obviously, the crisis is because man is still caught in self-centred activity. You cannot escape it.

K. : Man is caught in self-interest. Whether it is the highest politician, highest priest — they are all caught in self-interest. Can that self-interest end? Put it in ten different ways. That has been the function of organisations, religions, to destroy the self but we have never done it.

Scaria : Would that be the energy that we require to face the present crisis, the immediate crisis — would that be love?

K. : I feel love is something beyond the brain. It is not within the realm of the brain. Love has nothing to do with knowledge, thought, desire and pleasure and so on.

Audience : Is love the same as selflessness?

K. : No. Not quite. I can work at being selfless, practise day after day, be aware, say I will not be selfish but that is still within the realm of the brain, because I am determined to reach selflessness.

R.B. : That is not selflessness. It is the thought of selflessness.

K. : So let us come back to knowledge, time and space. What to you, Sirs, is time and space and no space? Is space within the sound or is space within the concept of space? Or is there space in our brain at all because it is filled with memory? I can imagine there is space but it is not space. Sir, I have to enquire into knowledge which is limited, which requires certain space to accumulate, and what is time and what is space, are they related together or are they separate? And is man going to be everlastingly caught in the process? That means we are always living within the limitation of knowledge.

Vis. : By looking at these objects we can have an idea of the space we are living in. That would be the space used in the ordinary sense of the word but you are asking something more because you are asking whether there is space inside the brain. Obviously you are talking about some other kind of space.

K. : There is space between him and me. In order to see him properly I must have little space; otherwise I can't see. And in my relationship to him I acquire certain knowledge about him and he acquires certain knowledge about me. So I recognise him and he recognises me. That is memory. Is my relationship based on memory or is there a relationship which is not divisive? And knowledge is 'I know him, I know how to operate, I know how to talk'. It is all based on knowledge and I can expand that knowledge immensely — biology, chemistry and so on. Now all that requires time, and time is knowledge in that sense. So what

is time? Is time different from thought? Time according to scientists is a series of movements — the past, the present modified, and going on. The whole of this movement is called time. And this time is the past, present and the future. For me all time is contained in the now — the past, present and the future.

*Vis.* : Again it depends upon how we define time.

*K.* : I am telling you sir. The past is time, memory. All the background which I have, which humanity has, which you have as a scientist, cosmologist, technician and so on; that requires tremendous spending of energy on a particular subject as much as you can, but that knowledge is limited, stale. So to me the background is the result of time, 1000 yesterdays, and that past is modified in the present. By talking to you I change, modify it and the future is the continuity. That is space in time. I am the past. I meet all of you and I modify the past and that past modifies and goes on in the future, obviously. What I am today is what I will be tomorrow. So all time is now, all that time is contained in the present.

*Vis.* : Does that mean there is no time? Time conventionally is viewed as a stream — the future. You have compressed everything.

*K.* : No. I have not compressed but it is a fact.

*Vis.* : But if you do that can we think or talk any further about anything at all? As soon as you say today and the past, you have made a distinction.

*K.* : I am saying, sir. I am violent today. I will be violent tomorrow. Right?

*Vis.* : As soon as you say tomorrow, then you have . . .

*K.* : Tomorrow means the movement of violence in the future. Would you agree? Unless there is a complete change now, the future will be the same, what I would be. That is the crisis. The crisis is unless human beings radically change now, they will be exactly the same tomorrow modified.

*R.M.* : I have put down certain queries in my book. I would seek your comments on them : you were saying all time is now.

In my book I have said that the past does not exist, the present is momentary and only the future exists.

*K.* : Sir, what is the future - what I am now?

*P.J.* : We are mixing up certain things here. There are various models of time — of the scientists, of the physicists, the futurologists and so on, but human beings experience time as past, present and the future.

*K.* : Love has no time. That is the only state.

*P.J.* : His question is — is it possible to see this instant, this present as containing both the past and the future and so act now because there is no action in the future, there is no action in the past. The action, the transformation, of change, of perception is now. In that context we have to view this aspect of time because all the other models of time which may exist are not experienced by human beings however complicated, however, scientifically proved they may be, they are not experienced. I experience the past, present and the future

*R.M.* : As you act now, you actually act in the future. after you complete your sentence.

*P.J.* : That action which he is talking about is not the ending of my sentence.

*K.* : The question is, we human beings are violent. If we don't change now, tomorrow will be violent. Is it possible now to end violence in me? Otherwise I will be the same tomorrow. The world has been going on like that. That is all. We can have all kinds of theories of time but the fact is I am violent, aggressive, envious and so on. Can all that end now?

*G.S.* : I think Krishnaji said some things which seem not to have been noticed. He said that love is not in time and to the extent that love is part of our being, not all of us are circumscribed by knowledge because knowledge is in time. So there is part of our being, not really part, but there is our being in something other than knowledge-based, knowledge-restricted, temporal sequence. What Pupulji said is how to get out of the time-bound situation, of the steps that may be taken, of the motivations, of the courage one may derive in passing from the time-bound situation into the non-time situation. That is not getting later into the thing nor even is it getting into the past in a short time or in a long time but it is the gospel, it is the good news which says that in fact part of our being is not circumscribed by time. If there is a result, if we conjecture mathematically, the result, you can try to prove it. If you are not even sure whether there is a solution, it will be a very foolish thing to attempt to prove it. Similarly, once we know that in fact it is possible, then it becomes a question only of asking is there a temporal means, step by step means, is there a total means of recognising or of being in that

particular aspect of being. And the statement about time — the past is only a conditioning of the present, future is only conditioning of the present, future is only an expectation of the present — both are therefore time-bound because in both the memories of the conditioning is interpreted, arranged in terms of a sequence and the expectations arranged in terms of a sequence — both of them are in some sense part of the mischief, so that there is only the present. Yet one has to act and the statement is that action has to be now.

*Dr. Dirck Dimock* : There seem to be different kinds of future as well — the future in the sense that I will take a plane to Delhi tomorrow. I agree that I will carry the same violence to Delhi that I carry today. In that sense there is no future. But what I have always thought is that there is a gradual reduction in violence, some gradual transition. But I hear you say that you don't agree to it.

*K* : Our conditioning is to achieve something gradually. I am violent, gradually I will become non-violent. That is impossible. Because in the meantime I will be sowing the seeds of violence all the time. Either there is the ending of violence now or we go on perpetually being violent. Sir, they are destroying in India the trees, the environment, destroying with gas — what is happening in the country, you all know. It is the same in the rest of the world. Are you going to gradually stop it?

*R.M.* : I think I do agree with you. Looking at the immensity of the crisis which Pupulji is talking about and you are talking about, that we may need major transformation.

*K* : Transformation means transforming from this form to another form. I don't think so. Mutation is a better word, a scientific word.

*R.M.* : I hope we can have a mutation so that we can become something other than human beings; if we have all the love and no violence that we are speaking about, but I think as I look at your concept of time, I also would like to add here that the future is also an opportunity for creativity and it is here that we can stop destroying trees, water and other things.

*K* : Is love the result of thought?

*R.M.* : I don't think so.

*K* : Then thought cannot use it. So you can't bring love through thought into action. Love acts. That is all.

*R.M.* : Are love and thought separate processes?

*K* : Thought is not love. And thought cannot use love but love can use thought.

*R.M.* : Many prophets and saints have talked about love for millennia and yet they have not brought about the mutation.

*K.* : Many have talked about it. The Church has talked about it, religions have talked about it, but we are still carrying on without that, killing each other, killing nature. We are trying to achieve or understand through thought what love is. You can't do that. Love can use thought but thought cannot use love.

(To be Continued)

## KRISHNAJI ANSWERS QUESTIONS

*Questioner* : Can there be absolute security for man in this life?

*Krishnamurti* : This is a very serious question because we all want security, both physical, but principally psychological security. If we were psychologically secure, certain, then we might not be so concerned with physical security. Please follow this : the search for psychological security is endangering physical security. We will go into this. The questioner asks : Is there absolute security for us, human beings? We will answer at the end — but follow it up step by step.

We want security — right? Like a child hanging on to its mother's hand. The child must feel secure, otherwise something goes wrong. They have discovered this. If the mother and the father don't pay enough attention to the baby, give it affection, etc., it affects the brain, the nerves of the child. So it must have security — physical security. Why do we demand psychological security — you understand the difference between the two? Both the psyche and the physical demanding security — this is obvious. Now is there psychological security at all? We want it — we want security in our relationship, with the wife, the children, a sense of the family unit, though that unit is now breaking up. In that there is a certain psychological security — right? So one is attached to the wife, to the girl, and in that attachment there is security — at least we think there is security. And when there is not security in that person we soon break away and find it in another. This is happening — right? And we try to find security in a group, in a tribe, that glorified tribe, the nation — and so there is one nation against another — you follow? So you are looking for security in a person, in a country, in a belief, in your own experience. All these are forms of

wanting, demanding psychological security, as one demands physical security — right? And in demanding psychological security we have divided ourselves — the Hindu, the Moslem, the Jew, the Arab, the Christian, the believer in Jesus, the believer in something else — in all this is the demand for security. And this security is founded on illusions. Right? Do you accept that? Being secure in Catholicism, in Buddhism, Hinduism, in Judaism, Islam and so on has created an illusory security because they are fighting each other. I wonder if you see this. Do you? The moment you see it you don't belong to anything.

So the demand for security creates illusions, it may be in superstition, in a ritual, a dogma, a nation, in an economic system, in totalitarianism, but none of these give man security, as you may observe, because you have had two terrible wars. You want security but you create wars which destroy your own security. So when you see the truth that the mind, or thought has sought security in illusions, that very perception that you are seeking security in illusions brings you intelligence. It is like seeing danger. A man who is blind to danger is an idiot, neurotic or there is something wrong with him. And yet we don't see the danger of this. But for the man who sees the danger, intelligence is in operation, and in that intelligence is absolute security. Have you got it? Do you understand? That is, the mind, thought has created various forms of illusions, nationalities, class, me and you, different gods, different beliefs, different dogmas, different rituals, the extraordinary religious superstitions that pervade the world, in all that one has sought security. You may say, 'I don't believe in any religions, I have no beliefs, I have no this, no that', but the me is in operation, which has created all this, and you are opposing all that by another word, another idea.

When one sees the danger, not as an idea but an actual fact, that intelligence is the supreme form of absolute security, which means to see the truth in the false. Have you got it?

*Questioner* : Is it possible ever to be free of self-centred activity? Is there a real self apart from the self-created image?

*Krishnamurti* : I wonder what we mean by the self. How would each one of us describe in words the self, the ego, the personality, the centre, the basis from which we act, from which we think

from which we feel. Could we clearly define, not only verbally as an idea, but actually, what is the self? If you ask somebody : What is the self? they would say. It is all my senses, my feelings, my imagination, my romantic demands, my sense of possession, of a house, of a husband, a wife, my qualities, my struggles, my ambitions, my achievements. Also my aspirations, my unhappiness or joys — all that would be the self. Would we agree to that? You can add more words to it, but the essence of it is the centre, the me, my family, my children, my impulse to do this or that. 'I am impelled to go to India to find truth', and so on. Would we agree to that verbal description of what we call the self: Not only the verbal description, but the feeling, the me and the you, we and they, in which is included nationalities, the family tradition, the name, the form, the psychosomatic approach, and the intellectual capacities, the desires to have more clarity.

And from this centre all action takes place — right? All our aspirations, all our ambitions, our quarrels, our disagreements, our opinions, judgements, experiences are centred in this. It is not only the conscious self acting outwardly, but also the deep inner consciousness which is not open, not obvious. So all this is the me, the I, the ego, the person, the different levels of consciousness, all that is me — right?

Now the questioner asks : Is it possible to be free of this centre? Why does one want to be free of this centre? Is it because the centre is the cause of division, me and you, my country and your country, my belief and your belief, my god and your god? And where there is division there must be conflict. That is, when the me is the active element that is operating all the time, and in you the same me but with a different name, a different colour, a different job, a different position in the hierarchical social structure. — you are Lord so-and-so and somebody else is a servant, and so on — it is the same me dividing itself into different categories, socially, economically, religiously. Right? I think that is fairly clear.

And one realises that where there is division there must be conflict — the Hindu, the Moslem, the Jew, the Arab, the English, the Americans, the French and the Germans, etc., etc. That is obvious, and that has brought about in the world tremendous wars, great agony of people, brutality, violence — the self identifying itself with an ideal, noble or ignoble, and fighting for

that ideal. But it is still the ego trip — like those people who go to India — I don't know why but they do — trying to find spirituality and putting on a different fancy dress, saying, 'I am going to find spiritual things there'. They have only changed the garb, the clothes, but it is essentially the me which is operating all the time, struggling, endeavouring, grasping, denying, deeply attached to one's experiences, to one's ideas, one's opinions, to one's longings. And as one lives, one observes that this centre, this me is the essence of all trouble, and also of all pleasure, all fear, all sorrow. So it says 'How am I to get rid of this centre?' The questioner asks: Is it possible to be really free, absolutely free — not relatively, which is fairly simple. One can be a little unselfish, one can be a little concerned with social welfare, with others but the centre is always there, biting hard, brutal. You all know this.

So is it possible to be free of that centre. First of all, the more effort is made to be free of the centre — please listen to this — the more one makes an effort to be free of the centre, the very effort strengthens the self. Those people who go off into meditation of various kinds, trying to impose something upon themselves, and the me then captures that, identifies with that, and says, 'I have achieved'. — but it is still the centre. Right? So, first, to understand whether it is possible to be free there must be no effort — which doesn't mean doing what one likes. That is clear, isn't it? If we don't need to make an effort, then let's do what we like — which is still the movement of the self. Whether you put on a yellow robe, or a purple robe, or join a monastery, it is still the self, identified with an ideal, and pursuing the ideal through great effort. But the movement is from the centre.

So what is one to do? you are not going to make an effort because you see the truth that the more effort you make the greater the travail of the centre. It is the self that is making an effort to be free of itself, and therefore it is still involved in it, imagining that it will be free. It is still the activity of the centre, the me. Then what is one to do?

Before we go into that, is there a real self apart from the self created by thought with its images? the questioner asks: Is there a real self? Many people feel that there is. The Hindus have said that there is the highest principle which is the self, and we have also imagined that there is a real self apart from the me. You all,

I am sure, feel this — that there is something else beyond this me, which is called the higher self, or sublime self, the supreme self. The moment we use the word 'self' or use any word to describe that which is beyond the self, the me, it is still the self. Is it possible to be free of the self — without becoming a vegetable, without becoming absentminded, somewhat lunatic — which means what? Is it possible to be totally free from attachment? That is one of the attributes, one of the qualities of the self. I am attached to my reputation, to my name, I am attached to my experience, to my opinions, and so on. So is it possible to be free of all attachments? Work it out, Sirs. If you really want to be free of the self there must be no attachment. That doesn't mean that you become indifferent, callous, shutting yourself away — which is another form of the self — you understand? Before it was attached, now it says, 'I won't be attached', but it is still the movement of the self.

So is it possible, without effort, to be free of attachment, to your wife, to your children, to your name? That means not to be identified with anything, with your country, with your god. Therefore, when you are really, deeply, basically not attached, free from your own experience, from your own knowledge, from your accumulated perceptions, then from that deep sense of no attachment comes responsibility. Not your responsibility to your wife, children, nephews, nieces, but the sense of responsibility — right? Will you do it? That is the question. We can talk everlastingly, put it into different words, but when it comes to testing it, acting, we don't seem to want to do it. We prefer to go on as we are, the status quo, slightly modified, but carry on with our quarrels, with all the conflicts that are happening in the world.

It is possible to be free of attachment. And it doesn't take time. That is one of our excuses — that we must have time to be free. But when you see one of the major factors of the self is attachment and you see what it does in the world, and what it does in your relationship with another — quarrels, separation, divorce, all the ugliness of relationship — when you see the truth of attachment, then that very truth is actual. Then you are free from it. Your own perception sets you free.

*Questioner* : Emotions are strong. Our attachments are strong. How does looking and seeing reduce the strength and power of these emotions?

*Krishnamurti* : Trying to control, suppress, sublimate emotions and attachments in no way reduces the conflict, does it? Are we generally aware of our emotions, of our attachments? Do you know that you are attached? Go on, Sirs, find out. Are you closely attached, are your emotions so extraordinarily strong that they act? First you have to be aware, conscious that your emotions are strong, and recognise that you are attached, and when you are so aware, what takes place? Do you understand my question?

I am conscious of my attachment, or my strong emotions of hate, jealousy, antagonism, like and dislike. I am conscious of it — right? Are you? Please, we are sharing this together. Now are they so strong that they overshadow, control my action? I am looking, observing these emotions and attachments which are apparently so strong, and they act as barriers to clear thinking, to clear action. Am I aware of them or do I take them for granted? Do I say, 'Yes, I have very strong emotions, I am terribly attached, but it doesn't matter. It is part of life. I don't mind struggling, I don't mind having quarrels with everybody'

Please examine it yourself. Are you aware that you are attached, just aware, know that you are attached to that person, or to that piece of furniture, or to a belief, a dogma and so on — attached to something. Now when you say that you are aware what do you mean by that? You know, recognise. Is thought recognising the attachment? You follow? Is it the activity of thought that says, 'I am attached'? Go into this, please, with me.

When you say, 'I am attached', is it an idea, or is it a fact? The fact is not the idea. This microphone, I can create an idea of it, but the microphone is a fact — I can see it, touch it — right? So is my attachment a concept, a conclusion, or is it a fact that I am attached? You see the difference? So when you are observing the fact, not the idea, not the conclusion about the fact, but the fact and you are aware of it, is the fact different from you who are observing the fact? Is this clear? Am I observing the fact through an idea, or through a conclusion, or because I have heard someone talking about this, and therefore I look, which means I am looking through a screen of ideas, and not at the fact. So now I am looking at the fact, I am not verbalising the fact and looking at it. How do I look at it? As something separate from me, or that is part of me? The microphone is

separate from me, but attachment, emotions are part of me. Attachment is the me. If I have no attachment there is no me. Your emotions and attachments are part of your nature, part of your structure. So you are looking at yourself. There is no division — me and attachment — no duality, there is only attachment, not the word but the fact, the feeling, the emotions, the possessiveness in attachment. That is a fact, so that is me.

So what am I to do with the me? You understand? Now please follow this step by step. When there was division between me and attachment, I could do something about it — right? I could control it, I could say 'No, I musn't be attached', suppress it, do something about it all the time — which we do. But if it is me, what can I do? Follow this closely. If it is me, I can't do anything, can I? I can only observe. Do you see the difference? Before I acted upon it. Now I can't act upon it, because it is me; it is like my arm, it is part of me. So all that I can do is to observe — right? So observation becomes all-important, not what you do about it. You see the difference?

So there is observation, not I observing, there is only observation. In that observation, if I begin to choose and say, 'I musn't be attached', I have already moved away, saying that it is not me. So in observation there is no choice, there is no direction, just pure, absolute observation. Then the thing that is being observed dissolves. Before you resisted it, you controlled it, you suppressed it, you acted upon it. Now in that observation all energy is centred. It is only when there is lack of energy there is attachment. I wonder if you see this? That is, when there is complete observation there is no interference of thought. Why should thought come in? You are just observing, as you would a fly, just observing in the same way your emotions, attachments, and then there is the gathering of all energy in that observation. Therefore there is no attachment. It is only the unintelligent, the people who do not see the full implications of attachment, who are attached. And they pervade the world; they are the stronger element in the world, and we are caught in that. But when you come to examine this closely, look at it, then you are no longer caught in that. Therefore you are no longer dissipating energy on something that has no meaning. Your energy is now centred completely in observation, therefore there is the total dissipation of attachment. Test it, do it, and you will find out. But you have

to go step by step, don't jump into something or other; you have to examine the thing very, very closely so that your mind is absolutely clear in the observation. It is only the unaware who jump over the cliff. The moment you are aware of danger, move! Attachment is a danger because it breeds fear, anxiety, hate, jealousy, possessiveness, the whole of that, and that is tremendous danger. And when you see danger you act — no, not you act, there is action.

Brockwood Park — 1979

### **Krishnamurti answers questions in Saanen**

*Question* : How do we tell the difference between observing ourselves, in the sense you mean, and merely thinking about ourselves?

*Krishnamurti* : We know what it means to think about ourselves — it is really going round in circles, either expanding the self, the ego, or contracting the ego. "I am the world, I am God, I must be more kindly, I must live, I must be more intelligent, I must meditate in order to achieve" whatever you want to achieve. So we are caught in that, thinking about oneself all the time. But observing oneself is something entirely different. Right? Then let's find out what it means to observe. First of all, do we observe anything without the word? Do we observe the mountain and not call it a mountain? Can we observe the evening light on the cloud with its extraordinary colour and beauty without using a single word? That is, can we look at anything objectively, the trees, the water, the evening star, this extraordinary world we live in, the natural world, can we look without a single word? To find that out we have to go into the question of why the brain is caught in a network of words. We are asking : can we look at anything or anyone including the politicians, the various gurus and the priests, and all the circus that goes on in the name of religion, can we look at all that without a reaction first? Can we do that? have you ever tried? Can you look at your wife, your husband without all the images, all the things that you have accumulated about her or him, just to look? One has to find out why the brain is so caught up in words. When you say of a

person : he is a communist or a totalitarian, you have wiped him out, put him in a category, in a cage, and that is the end of it. Just as when you say he is French, or British or Indian, this or that. See what is happening to our brain — it has been caught in words, not the significance and depth of the words, but just words. This requires careful watching, which is observing. There was a balloon in the sky this morning, you must have seen it with its gondola slowly going up and up. Then did you say to yourself, "I wish I were up there!" or "How dangerous!" and so on — we never look at anything without words, without reactions.

*Question* : I understand that inner silence cannot be practised or sought after, but what is the ground on which it may come about?

*Krishnamurti* : The questioner understands that silence cannot be achieved, cannot be practised through meditation, cannot be controlled. I don't know why you accept that, but apparently you do. But what is the ground on which it may come about?

When you observe something, clouds, the mountain, the river, or the tree, your wife, your neighbour, or some uneducated person, can you observe the whole phenomenon of life silently? Not say, "Yes, I think so". That is, to look, to observe, without the reaction of opinion, because we are full of opinions about everything — right? Why do we have opinions? Go on, Sirs, tell me why do human beings have such deep-rooted opinions; beliefs, or very, very superficial opinions — why? My guru is right, better than yours — and ready to fight over it. So these opinions, conclusions, concepts, ideals, divide human beings. This is obvious. There is the totalitarian idealism and the democratic idealism and they are dividing people. Ideals divide people. And the questioner says, "I understand that inner silence cannot be practised". When he uses the word 'understand' what does he mean by understanding? I am asking you this question : What do you mean by understanding?

I understand how this tent is put together, how it is going to be dismantled. I understand the distance between here and Geneva. I understand what someone has said. I understand the internal combustion engine, and so on. Is that understanding intellectual, verbal? Is your understanding of what someone has said just the meaning of the words? Or when does real understanding take place? That is : I see something instantly, and

that very perception of the truth changes my whole existence. Which is it? Because it is important to grasp the significance of the word 'understand'. Do I understand something intellectually, or have I grasped it emotionally, sentimentally, romantically, imaginatively? Or do I really not only see the depth and the significance of the words, but also, in communication with each other, I see the truth of what you are saying? See the truth of it, not draw a conclusion or form an idea of what you are saying, but see the truth of it, the perfume, the depth, the taste of it. Then that understanding is a revolution. But you say casually: "Oh, yes, I understand what Krishnamurti is talking about" — which is nonsense. The questioner says, 'I understand that inner silence cannot be practised or sought after'. But don't you all seek some kind of inner quietness, some kind of peace sometimes? You are all seeking. Don't say, 'We are not seeking'. We are seeking food, comfort escape from this terrible turmoil one lives in. But to say casually, "I understand that inner silence cannot be practised or sought after" — if you will forgive the speaker for saying this — then you really don't understand what you have said. But what is the ground on which it may come about? That is the real question — right?

What is necessary for the state of the brain to be utterly silent? Why do you want to be silent? When you observe, perceive something, if you have no reaction to it, no response to it, when there is just observation, that observation itself is silent. Right? Naturally. I am watching you and you are watching me. If the speaker has reactions in watching, he is not really responding, he is not watching your reactions, your feelings, and all the rest. And if you are watching the speaker, and you have reactions, you are not watching him, you are watching your reactions.

So the ground in which silence can come about is not through practice, not through determination, not through will or desire, but it comes naturally when there is freedom, freedom from conflict. So you have to understand conflict, not say, "I must have silence" — which is nonsense. So the ground on which natural, clear, beautiful silence, the immense depth of silence comes is when there is complete freedom. So one should ask not how the quality of silence comes about, but can one be free? Free from conflict, free from being hurt, free from fear, anxiety, loneliness, sorrow, all that. Then the house of silence is immense.

Now you are sitting there looking at the speaker, and you have already put him into a category. You already have an image of him — you say he is this, or that, or he is some kind of idiot, or whatever you like to say about him, so you never look at him as though for the first time. You understand? Have you ever done this kind of thing, not just for a minute or an hour, or a day, but with the freshness of a mind, of a brain which is not caught in words, in reactions? To look at everything as though you are looking at the world for the first time. And in that observation you watch yourself, never allowing a single thought to escape without watching it, being aware of it, giving your whole attention to that one thought, and as another thought arises keep at it, so that your brain is tremendously active. You understand? That watching is not an egocentric movement. Whereas thinking about yourself is egocentric, self-centred activity.

Now, just a minute. How do we move from this to that? Suppose one is egocentric, self-centred, all one's outlook is personal — I am not loved, I must love, all that kind of turmoil, silliness that goes on. How is one to move from that to the other? You are asking that question aren't you? But is that a right question? Obviously it is wrong, because moving from here to there is the same movement. Do you understand this? If I say, "I am selfish, I must not be selfish, I must observe", the 'must' is still in the same category, the same movement as thinking about oneself.

So the question is answered, the answer is in the question, not outside it. That is, by observing the question itself it reveals a tremendous lot, because, if I can put it differently, observing, perceiving has no time. The other is caught in time, thinking about myself — "I will fulfil one day, I have no roots but I will establish roots". All this is time-binding, and the time-binding quality is essentially the self. I am finding all this as I speak. Whereas in watching — if you just watch that bird — there is no time in that at all. So the word and thought create time.

Saanen — 1984

## 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

### **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**

Within the Mind	40.00
The Seer Who Walks Alone	1.00

---

Annual subscription Rs. 15 or \$ 6 or £ 4.50. Life membership Rs. 200.

Cover Design : Kiran Khalap