

'85/2

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, 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-Mizr, Rishon-le-Zion, Israel.
ITALY	Dott. Ing. Giovanni Turchi, Via Garofalo 19, 20133 Milano.
NETHERLANDS	Stichting Krishnamurti Nederland, Secretary : Lage Duin 19, 2121 CC Bennebroek, Bookorders, Bulletin: Weikamperweg 93, 7351 TG Hoenderloo.
NEW ZEALAND	Mr. Ray Falla, 9, Ulm Place, Christchurch 6.
NORWAY	Krishnamurti Biblioteket, Post Box 1703, Vika, Oslo 1. Norway.
PORTUGAL	Nucleo Cultural Krishnamurti, Av. Leonor Fernandes 36, 7000 Evora.
SOUTH AFRICA	Krishnamurti Learning Centre of Southern Africa, 113, Ninth Avenue, Durban.
SPAIN	Krishnamurti Informatcion, Calle Canuda 45-47 Barcelona 2.
SWEDEN	Krishnamurti Center, C/o. Englund, Storskogsvagen 45 14400, Ronninge.
SWITZERLAND	Krishnamurti Freunde der Schweiz (German and Italian speaking) Mr. Franz Haller, Bachstrasse 18, 5303 Wurenlingen Miss Gisele Balleys (for the Suisse Romande), Rue Encyclopedie 6 bis, 1202 Geneva.
SRILANKA	Krishnamurti Centre, Sri Lanka, Inc. 23/3, Mirihana Road, Nugegoda.

FROM THE EDITOR

After the talks to the United Nations at New York in early April, Krishnaji gave two talks at the Kennedy Center in Washington on April 20 and 21. Both in New York and Washington he was asked, "What if a listener takes your suggestions to heart and does indeed change? What can one person do and what use will it be in Washington, this citadel of power and fear?" He replied: "That is a wrong question. Change . . . and see what happens". The next issue of the Bulletin carries extracts of his talks and excerpts of the write-ups on him from Washington Post and Los Angeles Times.

In our last issue of the Bulletin, the price of the book of photographs of Krishnaji "One Thousand Moons" was mentioned as Rs. 295/-. Please note that it is now reduced to Rs. 245/-.

This Bulletin starts with the dialogue on the second and concluding day of the seminar held in Vasanta Vihar in January this year. A dialogue between Rishi Valley students and Krishnaji is also printed in these pages.

A review of a book on education titled "Things of the Mind" — "Dialogues with Shri J. Krishnamurti" is published. The Foundation will be ordering copies of this book shortly. Please book your orders after a couple of months.

We are happy to inform you that in order to ensure display of Krishnaji's books in at least one or two bookshops in smaller towns, the Foundation has embarked on a scheme of giving one set of books worth Rs. 255/- free of charge to the bookshops for display. Any financial help towards the expansion of this scheme is most welcome.

A SEMINAR

(Continued from previous issue)

Dr. George Sudarshan : In the context of cosmology there is a notion of time. One talks about the expanding universe, about the creation of time. So perhaps we could have Prof. Vishveshvara outline the physical concepts a little bit.

Dr. Vishveshvara : Well, the whole field of cosmology starts with observation as any other physical science. The observation that one made in the twenties was that all the galaxies we see around us were in motion, that they were all moving away from our own galaxy and then people invoked the so-called Copernican principle, i.e. we are not very special in this universe. Some people call this the *principle of mediocrity* because we are very mediocre people; so everywhere such things should be happening. Therefore the entire universe must be in a state of expansion; that all the galaxies should be moving away from one another. This was an observation. So the question arose : if we are moving away today, you can always ask the question what has happened yesterday or million years ago. They must have been closer to each other million or billion years ago and you can go on extrapolating backwards, you can always ask the question what happened million years ago, and so finally you come to the conclusion that there must have been a moment when all the galaxies in the entire universe, were together.

So this is one place where even the language sort of breaks down and you cannot even visualise a universe which is expanding. But anyway if you extrapolated backwards in time, the answer came that may be about 15 to 20 billion years ago the entire universe was sort of contracted — let us say for the simplicity,

to a point — the entire space, and from this infinite density, infinite temperature, suddenly there was an explosion and the universe started. So since everything here involves time and the sense of this whole expansion itself can define time because at each stage you can find that the distance among the galaxies is increasing — so we can define time that way.

And secondly, the space itself, all these things, are supposed to have started at that moment. At that point probably the notion of time and space breaks down, we do not know. And then again the question arises what was there before this moment of creation. Let me quote St. Augustine — he himself asked the question “What was God doing before he created heaven and earth?” and he answered the question himself : He was preparing a hell for those who inquired into such high matters.” Perhaps Krishnaji can say something about it.

Krishnamurti : Is creation permanent, is it something fixed, fixed in the sense once it has been created, and that’s over?

Dr. Rashmi Mayur : As far as physics is concerned, there are two possibilities depending upon how much matter there is in the universe. If the matter is not too much then this universe once created keeps on expanding and expanding and everything dies, the temperature goes down and that’s it. But many people are not very happy with this kind of thing because we always have this yearning for something that can come afterwards — reincarnation, recycling, etc. So if the mass of the universe is more than a certain critical amount, there is a possibility that this universe will expand and then start contracting, come to the original state and then again explode and then go in cycles.

K : Is this creation a constant process? It is endless. It has no beginning, no ending.

R.M. : Such a notion was also put forward some thirty years ago that even this expansion can be going on and that there need not be an end to this or a beginning.

G.S. : I requested Prof Vishveshvara to talk about cosmology because in talking about cosmology things are very similar to many of the matters that Krishnaji tells us, namely, that words really fail to convey the impression; not because one is not adept at language, not because one has not tried but there are certain concepts which simply have no linguistic expression; for

example, the notion of creation that Dr Vishveshvara has talked about. Normally when you think of creation, the background is there and against that particular background which was not there is made to appear, like a magician produces a flower or somebody creates a work of art; you see that the material from which it was taken, from which it was transformed, that the creation is really a transcription, a transposition, a re-making of things which are already there. But in the creation of the universe, the situation is very different because it is not created from some place because the place is also being created. So we see in this branch of physics there is a problem though things are very mathematical and very well defined, talking of what one is doing is very difficult though it is very precise, very accurate.

K. : Is cosmos not order? It is a Greek word. It is well ordered, well put together, a complete whole, not broken up, not disjointed. That is cosmos, opposed to the word chaos. What is the human relationship to cosmos? You are explaining all the universe. You are explaining matter — expansion, contraction, all that. But the universe is not your description of it. The universe, the whole of it, can we understand that at all? Unless we are perfectly in order ourselves, how can we understand this immense order of the universe?

G.S. : I believe you're really telling us the answer to the question that was beginning to be raised, namely when words fail, is there still communication and comprehension possible. And if I heard between your statements, yes, it is possible provided you are in order. There is an understanding which goes beyond description.

K. : Yes, beyond knowledge, beyond description. Unless I am in total order, my whole existence as a human being, how can I understand this immense universe which is total order? I can talk about it, I can investigate it, I can say it is time, it has no beginning, no end, new theories arise, old theories are thrown out, it is all a background of disorder of human mind, human brain — how can that human brain understand this immense, incalculable, indestructible order? So where does it begin : there or here?

R.M. : I think that the description that Dr. Vishveshvara just gave is one aspect of our understanding based on our limited

knowledge. I agree that our concepts are limited, our mathematics is limited. Obviously we are working with a finite mind, with limited concepts. Now the question is can we ever go beyond this? What are the processes? Should we go beyond knowledge to something else and if so how do we go there? We may have to take a leap and is that leap through other processes or through the human mind?

G.S. : Perhaps since we have different kinds of sciences here — he described one kind of order, one kind of law. And this is a very cosmic thing in which you talk about equations. Equations are better defined than the experience that we have with regard to it. You are an expert in another kind of science which deals with another kind of order. Perhaps you could tell us about that order and that relationship.

R.M. : In biological sciences which are related to all of us living things and beings, we don't see that much of order which we see in the physical field.

Some of life originated because of certain conditions on the planet and this evolution and the creation that you are talking about continuously went on — maybe it went on before that since the planet is about 4 billion years old, roughly 3 billion years, the last one billion years of evolution has led us to where we are today. Our brain is where it is. It has not taken another leap. Now, if we are talking about another leap either our body has to go through some mutation and something else has to happen or we have to evolve into something about which we cannot be aware because it takes about millions and millions of years, so our time-frame in the creation that you are talking about is again in millions of years. No evolution is possible without millions of years because the mutation itself takes millions of years.

G.S. : I would like to make two comments. One is — you have not yet talked about ecology — environment. An environment and its linking with the thing in some sense is very much like the situation of a human being immersed in thoughts, that there is no beginning, no end and it is a mess and one has to survive and somehow or the other order has to be found in how we live. The other thing is the remark about the brain not having improved. In the case of computers, the first generation, the second generation and the third generation could be very easily

distinguished because the first has vacuum tubes, the second generation has something else and the third generation has something else, but the fourth generation computer is no different from the third with regard to the hardware except that there are more connectivities and the fifth generation will be no different from the fourth except the manner in which it will be used — knowledge-basis, information, and so on. But perhaps by looking at the brain alone one is not fully appreciating the evolutionary changes that are taking place, may be there are changes taking place which are not in the hardware but in the software, in the mechanism of making use of the brain rather than the brain itself.

R.M. : I spoke about the purely biological brain that we have today. The evolution in that brain in the last three million years has not taken place but in thirty years it has expanded so much that in the areas of software there is a tremendous amount of explosion and expansion, but that software increase in our brain is not changing the structure of the brain itself. Coming back to your question about ecology, I am saying as an ecologist, I look at the world as relationship. Everything is in relationship and what we are, are the product of what is happening to the relationship with our surroundings and we find that when this relationship breaks down what happens is what happened in Bhopal. For example, you had no rainfalls here a few years ago. It is because we broke down the relationship between forests and our own living. That led to the changes in climate and the lack of rainfall and so on. But speaking about ecology, what we say is : It is changing continuously — otherwise there will be no evolution. We are always in the surrounding relationships — if there is a positive relationship, obviously we survive but if it is negative relationship, we collapse.

As far as our mind is concerned there are other relationships which go beyond the physical ecology or biological ecology to the psychological ecology of which I am not conversant.

G.S. : I thought we will have different views about relationships, order, creation, etc.

Pupul Jayakar : You talked of the software of the brain, and you made the statement that the brain has remained the same. I would like to know the maximum usage of the brain. Because

we can only talk of any extension if the maximum usage of the brain is today possible. Is there the maximum usage? Is the whole brain operating? Are all the possible connections alive?

R.M. : By any individual the maximum usage of the brain is never possible, nor is it possible in terms of even the future because what is happening is we have so much irrelevancies built into us which occupy our brain.

P.J. : This is where the question comes up. If there are irrelevancies built into the brain and it is software, then the irrelevancies can be removed. Therefore is the software which has been fed into the brain which is causing the distortion, or the incapacity of the brain to use its connections to the maximum?

R.M. : Today, as we exist, is the totality of the possibilities of the brain being reached? Before we go into any question of mutation, extension, has the software and the various connections which are possible, has that been reached? Obviously not.

G.S. : We have an expert on computers here.

A Computer Expert : Is not all our science based on some partial observation and is there one theory which fits the entire gamut of even our limited knowledge? It does not. None of the theories ever satisfy over the range which is already known. So, what I am asking is : is there an observation which is not partial? For example, he says Big Bang theory or any other theory. There are many other alternatives for it and whichever alternative we take, it is not able to answer. This is not necessarily true of just Big Bang theory. It is true of theory. So, there is no theory including Einstein's theory which can answer all the questions. Since all our observations, scientific or otherwise, seem to be partial, it is able to answer only a very small range of questions and even within that known range it is not able to answer. When we talk of totality and when we talk of infinity, I wonder what is the meaning of it.

K. : Sir, are you asking — is there a perception which is not partial but complete, total? What makes our brain, our perception partial? What is the causation of that?

C.E. : It's invariably an interruption of thought. Something you've absorbed in-between and then you say "Oh, this is good."

K. : So, are you saying that thought is partial and is there a perception which is not brought about by thought which is

partial? That means, in observation can thought be silent? Is it possible for me, who is both matter and everything, to look at myself and the universe and nature not from the background of thought, which is partial, but look at this whole universe, myself included and yourself included, without any deviation brought about by thought? Would you agree to this?

G.S. : I would like to make some observations. In the Indian tradition there are two kinds of ideas about differentiated knowledge, about *vigyana*, about science. One is that *vigyana* is very limited knowledge and when you get the real knowledge, all this will be irrelevant — which is a very sad picture of the true knowledge, because science is so pretty, I don't want to abandon it. The second idea is that when you have the true knowledge and you happen to be interested in something, then that knowledge in that particular context would appear fully occupied with that particular interest. Very much like the mind when it wants to be associated with one sense or the other, it would occupy itself with that. I have come across many people who go after higher knowledge, very few of them seem to be scientists, very few of them seem to be interested in science. So I would really like you to say somewhere along the line how would differentiated, specified, discipline-based knowledge be in relation to this total knowledge?

K. : If I can start with a clean slate, if it is possible, I feel there is a perception not based on knowledge, either complete knowledge or partial knowledge, a perception in which there is no perceiver. It is the perceiver that brings the partial knowledge.

G.S. : I think one of the luckiest things is that when one has at least a fleeting moment where, as you say, there is not a perceiver, perceived and those things, the three things, are not taking place at all. But what I'm saying is when you are in that state, is it possible at all to communicate or to institute a science or understand? There is nothing to understand. There is no entity at all to understand.

K. : I am just asking, is it possible to observe without the observer first? The observer is the background, the conditioning, the accumulated memories which distort our perception. Is it possible for thought to be in abeyance and not bring a screen between observation and the thing observed? That means, is it possible for thought which is itself limited, because it is based

on knowledge which is always limited, is it possible without effort, without discipline, without a motive and a goal, to observe or perceive without all the turmoil of the brain?

R.M. : Can I respond to both of you from my own field? I think it is possible to perceive without the perceiver, and I would like to take the example of Darwin. Charles Darwin went round the world collecting information and using logic to find the relationship among all different types of species. For many many years he couldn't discover what the relationships were until one evening he was doing nothing, he was totally out of all his science, something flashed in his mind, and all of a sudden he saw the total order. Now here at the moment when he discovered this, he was absolutely not in any kind of thinking or logic; he was just beyond being an observer.

I could take the example of Nietzsche even, when he completed his book. This is what he felt — the whole idea came to him before even he wrote it. It is possible for us, with our finite minds and times, to go beyond our observations, perceptions and logic and I would put them in the form of intuitions, imaginations or may be other spiritual experiences about which I am not aware. But I feel that there is such a thing as when in any science we use, the logic we use, we are by definition making everything very definite, and so the total observation through science is never possible. As you say, most of the scientists will not see bigger things, because we are confining in our logic, terminology and methodology which actually confine us to only the finite processes which we study, they don't take us beyond what you are saying.

P.J. : I don't know if that would be an accurate observation. The smaller is contained in the larger. It is not that the smaller has no existence. In that sense everything would be finite.

R.M. : I never said that. I said that perceptions of science by definition are finite.

P.J. : Even though they are finite, within this total perception they can be contained. That is, the smaller can always be contained in the bigger.

R.M. : But another difficulty we must face is the contradiction of knowing. When you know more and more finite things, you are becoming more and more finite because more and more questions will come out in relation to the totality.

P.J. : But is this total perception which Krishnaji is talking about, does it negate and deny the facts of nature, investigations into nature or the outer world of designs?

R.M. : It doesn't. They are not contradictory.

Vish : Just a comment on what Dr Mayur said. Regarding the instance which you gave about Darwin, I don't think it really proves that there can be perception without the perceiver simply because if he had been collecting all these data, and suddenly one evening it occurred to him about the universe as something else, then you would say that he has perceived something which is totally unrelated to what he had been doing all along. So it was already there perhaps, till then it has not occurred in his conscious mind how these various relations took place. The mathematician, I think it was Poincare, who talks about the same kind of process. By looking at all sorts of things, you have all the data stored in your mind but they have not fallen into their proper places. There is an incubation period in which the mind probably goes blank as far as you are concerned, but within the mind these changes, mutations and also interrelations are being perceived and suddenly it comes to the conscious mind and then you perceived what has happened. It is in relation with all the data that he has already collected. It is not independent of the data that he has been looking at. That is one thing.

Secondly, maybe the fact that we don't try to have a total perception is perhaps the strength of science. For example, if you want to build a model of the universe which you have been talking about as an ordered thing, the whole cosmos is order but when you look around you see total chaos also not just in politics but if you look at a cup of tea where there is heat going on and the molecules running around, jumping around or if you look even on the larger scale at the stars, planets or the gases, plasmas, and so on, there is total disorder.

There is disorder to a great extent where you cannot really say that this entire thing is according to some fixed pattern. But only when you are going to suppress these things, at a higher level you start seeing the order. For example in the realm of astronomy, when you look at the stars exploding and things going on, you do see immense amount of variety which apparently

lacks a sort of unifying order, harmony but only when you leave all that and start looking at the galaxies — each galaxy as a point, as a molecule, and the whole universe is a jar of gas, perhaps then you see the order. But if I was going to say tomorrow “I’m going to explain the entire universe including all these little, little things,” I will never go anywhere. It is different people looking at different scales of times, different scales of spaces, and different phenomena, only then you can make any kind of progress in science. I feel that this total perception may be good in certain realms, for our own improvement and so on, but as far as scientific, analytical discovery is concerned, probably it is just impossible to do that.

K. : I am asking this, sir, very gently, very humbly. Are we first human beings and then scientists or are we first scientists and not human beings?

R.M. : We are first human beings, obviously.

K. : Let us deal with human beings as we are, not as scientists, not as philosophers, not as experts in computers not gurus, disciples, but as human beings. Could we start with that? After these thousands and millions of years we are still what we have been: Violent, angry, jealous, anxious, and all the rest of it. We have hardly changed. We are barbarous.

Can we start from that? I am asking for myself — I may have lived on this earth; human beings may have lived on this earth millions or billions of years, and during that long period we have hardly changed at all psychologically. We have acquired tremendous knowledge about everything except oneself. Could we start from that? Is it possible for me to change radically, bring about mutation in the way of living? To me that’s the first question, not whether the universe exists or the universe is this or that. I want to know for myself as a human being when I have gone through all kinds of turmoil — jealousy, death and sorrow — is it possible for a human being to change all that? Or will it take another billion years to change? Do you understand my question?

R.M. : Can that happen to individuals, to all the people?

K. : Are we individuals? Or we are a part of a whole conglomeration of human existences? Or your consciousness is almost similar to the consciousness of all mankind? All mankind suffers, all mankind goes through hell, wars, torture, and we have been

doing this for the last billion or million or 45,000 years and, as a human being I see that if my consciousness is similar to the consciousness of mankind, then I am that mankind. Is that an idea or actuality, in the sense as actual, as my sitting here? Because I am mankind, can that mankind change radically? And because I am mankind, how will I affect mankind?

G.S. : How does this process take place? The concept that I am humanity — how do I start? I think of myself as humanity.

K. : No, you are humanity.

G.S. : I am humanity. All right.

K. : You must be clear on the point. The idea and the fact. We are apt from the fact to deduce an idea. We are not talking about ideas or opinions or say "Yes, I agree with that", but it is a fact. Thought has divided mankind — religious, economic and so on. Are we the entire humanity? I think I am humanity.

G.S. : But how does this process work? As you said does a particular individual rising to a certain level in terms of his order, does he bring about order for humankind?

K. : If I may point out, is that a right question, sir?

G.S. : May be not. I am trying, with confusion, to communicate.

K. : I am just saying as K is the entire humanity, whatever he is, he is the rest of the mankind; he is saying I am mankind not superficially or casually or as an idea, but the depth of it, it is in my blood. It is not a concept, it is not a logical explanation or a logical conclusion. It is so. The sun rises, the sun sets, it is a fact. Scientifically you may explain all that away but as a human being, I am mankind, and from that I ask myself if I change, if there is a radical transformation in this one person who is humanity, it affects humanity.

G.S. : That's my question. If one person transforms, how does it affect the rest of humanity?

K. : Of course it does. Hitler affected the entire humanity. Buddha has affected. Napoleon has affected; all the so-called war heroes have affected mankind, all the saints have affected mankind, the pope is affecting mankind. It may be limited, but he is affecting mankind. So if one human being fundamentally changes, it affects the rest of the mankind because I am mankind. And I ask this question of myself and everybody : is it possible to change this barbaric attitude towards life, this self-interest, can all that end psychologically first, not the other way round?

R.M. : May I take this question a little further? I think what you are saying is that there is a fact here that you are the humanity, I am humanity, everybody here is humanity. This is a fact. Is that what you are saying?

K. : That's a fact. You suffer, the American suffers. You are angry, the Russians are angry, greedy, envious, self-centered. It is common to all mankind. So I say I am mankind. This is not a theory, a concept, an opinion, a judgement. It is an ordinary fact.

R.M. : The fact also is that even though we are humanity, we are still atomic humanity in the sense that 'you' are the humanity. Now the question which arises is that this 'humanity' has anger and all these things which are negative : now how do we transform that or mutate it so that all of us become part of the humanity which will be beyond all these negative points?

K. : If I am bad, then what happens? You and I, do we actually realise we are the entire humanity, with all the immense significance involved in it? I wouldn't kill you, I won't get angry with you, because you are me. If both of us lose self-interest which is an immense problem, then we would live in peace with each other. It is not a thing to be achieved, a thing to be logically explained, but you can see logically every human on this earth suffers in one way or the other, is insecure, uncertain, confused. So you are humanity.

R.M. : I would like to ask you there is the fact of self-interest, which comes, which divides us. It is a fact. All must know it. Self-interest is the primary thing and that is the divisive factor. That's the veil which comes between me and the perceiving without the perceiver.

P.J. : There has to be some way of dealing with that. Let us discuss the way of dealing with it. You have said that the teaching is a way of negation. Could we explore into this perception of negation which extinguishes or destroys the elements which come in the way of my perceiving without the perceiver?

K. : Pupilji, if I may go back to the point, is it an actuality to you, not a theory, not a concept, not a supposition, a thing to be achieved, but the actual fact that you are entire humanity?

P.J. : No, it is not.

K. : That's the whole point. Let's start from that.

P.J. : You can't start from that.

K. : Please listen. Are you, except biologically, are you separate from other women?

P.J. : Logically I understand you.

K. : Logic has nothing to do with it.

P.J. : It does not give me that inward sense that I am humanity. Now how do I deal with that?

K. : I am sure all of you professors, will agree that there is such a thing as insight. Insight has nothing to do with memory, nothing to do with time. There is immediate perception. It is not I perceive. That insight can be very logical, of course, but insight has nothing to do with personality, with egotism, with selfishness, time and so on. There is such a thing. Would you agree with that?

R.M. : I personally doubt whether insight is a subconscious thought process. It becomes expanded, then it becomes all logical.

K. : Yes. Is that subconscious desire? Subconscious urge to find a new method, subconscious way of saying I want, I would love to get it, it is a good thing. But that is motive. Insight implies something you perceive without any logic, any sense of pressure, without any motive, immediate perception. Would you agree to that?

Just look. You see how religions have divided mankind, you see organisations, the hierarchical structure of religious movements, you see what it has done to mankind — separating — and you see that in a flash. It is not logic. There is such a thing as total insight, and immediate action. Insight is action.

R.M. : It is not clear to me how insight is action.

P.J. : That is understandable. If you have an insight of religions dividing man, then you are free of denominational religion.

K. : And you are no longer a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Christian. And You're out of it?

P.J. : You've raised this question of religions dividing man. That's a thing which one can get in a flash. But to see yourself as humanity is a different thing.

K. : It is a tremendous flash. It is a mighty fact.

Scaria : Are there gradations in insight?

K. : No sir.

R.M. : It is a fact that religions have divided humanity. It is a fact that millions of people are caught in it.

P.J. : I cannot concern myself with the millions. I am concerned with this entity. It certainly becomes an insight into the fact that religions have divided human kind when it frees you from the denominational religion.

K. : That division is part of my self-interest because in those religious structures I seek security, safety, protection. As I belong to a small community I feel safe. See the fact that there is such a thing as total insight.

P.J. : Insight is free of any kind of background. How does insight arise? Is there not a need for asking questions of the mind, challenging the mind so that the ground for insight is possible?

K. : All that implies preparation, subtly or consciously or unconsciously. If you prepare, what you prepare for is already there.

P.J. : Right, sir. Remove the word prepare. Is there not a ground for it?

K. : All right, I'll make it clear. It is a matter of great sensitivity. If the perceptions are active and not partial, then that sensory perception which is not partial, in that sensory perception there is no element of self-interest. And therefore there is no 'I' as the 'me'. In that moment there is insight.

G.S. : But this sort of connects with the earlier comment that you had made, sir, in which when I raised the question, "What do we do when we need to communicate that which cannot be communicated by words?", you mentioned about order, cosmos, the inner order; you said that when one is in order, you are the universe.

K. : It's a tremendous thing. And is it possible for us to be in total order without a single conflict?

G.S. : I think for the professionalists, the problem is that we are required, expected to think, we are expected to be disciplined, think about specific kinds of problems, toil on those things and arrive at different answers. Also we recognise that the insight that Poincare had talked about functions; that if a lot of other people got on to the same bus and get the same insight, they

wouldn't even recognise it. It required a kind of mind which had a certain kind of order, and certain kind of competence to be able to express that particular thing. I mean I am a consumer of music and I cannot sing a bar worth anything. There are sounds inside me and the music that I hear but I cannot even hum it. Any effort of expressing it would be completely lost but there could be an even more primitive stage in which you hear the tune. You hear the song and you do not even comprehend the beauty of it. So there seems to be some level of perception of the ground of awakening of a particular faculty which expresses itself. When any of us think about Pythagoras theorem, there is no self-interest in it. Having seen it, even if anybody tortured me, I could possibly not forget it. There are a thousand ways of arriving at the same result. But there are a lot of people I recognise, some of my best friends, who don't worry about Pythagoras theorem and certainly don't know how to prove it. So there is in some sense amidst us who devote our lives, earn our living through one discipline or the other, there is a certain feeling that somehow or other insight expressing itself in a certain area is both startling and valuable — not only for us but for the society while there are other insights which are also total, leave us happy but do not express themselves in terms of any professional statement.

R.M. : Are these two different things we're talking about?

G.S. : My question is: are they really different? Because in some sense at the height of creativity in a particular discipline, a very narrow problem, you get the same ecstasy, you feel the same breathlessness that you find with regard to insight.

R.M. : I don't think that you will put yourself and myself above the creativity of a barber.

G.S. : No, not at all. We were talking last night about the question how to express the inexpressible and how to ask this question. I raised the question to Krishnaji and he started talking as usual about something which sounded irrelevant, namely, total order and then I suddenly realised that he had actually answered the question before it could be raised, namely, how you are asking to communicate or comprehend that which cannot be expressed in words. He said that when you are in total order you are the whole universe and cosmos is that particular thing. And I suddenly realised that he had answered a whole

question which we had been struggling with. But I can equally well see that the same kind of awe and joy can come from understanding something in a very restricted area. For example, if I were to talk to Dr. Vishveshwara, and at a certain point he explained a certain specific point which has been bothering me, he explained it not so much in words but by his presence somehow or other an insight illuminated the whole thing one could feel equally happy and equally awestruck. So I'm asking is it possible that the functioning of creativity, of being in total order expresses at different times in different things? Like Krishna said (in Bhagavadgita) "Aham aatmaa sarvabhootaasayasthitah", i.e. I could be in the one this and in that one that. Is it possible that total order expresses itself in disciplined music in the context of music and disciplined scientific insight in the context of science?

R.M. : Is it possible for me to be in order in my own science and still have the order that Krishnamurtiji is speaking about? The bigger order I think is of a different level of order and for a different purpose and I find there is a leap that is required. I don't know whether I can take that leap.

G.S. . What I'm submitting is somewhat more ambitious. I would like to say that when one is in total order and one also happens to be trained as a barber, then that insight, that order could also express in the barbering. If one is a cosmologist, it could express itself in the cosmology in addition to in life itself. Because I cannot comprehend, I really would not want an enlightenment which requires abandoning differentiated knowledge.

Somehow a blessing out of the world in which the beauty of the world disappears, seems to be too much.

R.M. : You require the two of them separately.

G.S. : How could they be separate if one of them is total order? We are really floundering, sir.

K. : As I said, are we scientists first and then human beings or are we human beings first and then scientists? If we are human beings first and then scientists and biologists and barbers or carpenters, then as a human being I am the entire humanity. That is to me not a theory, not a supposition, but a fact, as I am breathing, as I am sitting here; it is in my blood, in my guts, and with all the implications of that. Therefore if one person who sees this is not in order, he is not in entire, complete, order.

The whole thing is in disorder and my relationship with another is in disorder; with my wife, with my family, with my nation, with my group, with my community, there is this division which creates disorder. And is it possible to be free of that disorder? Not order — because if I am free of disorder then there is natural order.

G.S. : Is the division, software or hardware in terms of what we said? In computers you have the hardware which is the machine and then you plan instructions; the instructions are changeable, anybody can put in any amount of instructions, that is called programming the software. So, this division, is it the software or hardware?

P.J. : But are we computers?

K. : We have studied biology and so on for the last fifty years or more, we have been programmed for that. I am a Catholic for the past 2000 years, I have been programmed. This is a fact. If I become a Hindu, that is another programme. So we live in a programme. Our life is programmed. No?

Dr. Dimock : I am confused about the nature of order and disorder. To some extent, disorder is simply an admission of ignorance, that things are not simple enough for us to understand. When you say nature is disordered, it seems to me not true.

K. : It is in order, we make it into disorder.

Dimock : That is the disorder of our own ignorance. To a scientist, the question of order and disorder — it's in one sense you're saying; we don't understand it.

K. : I see that point. Then?

Dimock : When we speak of ourselves being in disorder, are we also saying then that it's just that we don't understand ourselves?

K. : Yes, we don't understand ourselves. We first become professionals and then that carries us away miles from us and thus contact with ourselves. I don't know myself. I have to find out who am I. Socrates and the ancient Hindus talked about knowing oneself. We never start with that. We start with all the outside things.

R.M. : Who am I?, 'I' as a human being, 'I' as a scientist.

K. : Look, I am a human being first. Then my life is in disorder. I am envious, I am angry, I am jealous, greedy, frightened, insecure — that is disorder. And is it possible without deliberately setting

about to destroy all that and find something else? Can all that be put in a single word 'Self-interest'? Can I live without self-interest? I need food, clothing, shelter, that is not self-interest. I am talking about psychological self-interest, not biological self-interest.

P.J. : Is it possible to see this whole process without creating the opposite and so conflict, and so disorder? Is it possible to perceive this as it is?

R.M. : Can I take it then that whole life is a search for order?

K. : What do you mean by whole life? Is it not in disorder?

R.M. : Yes.

K. : And if I don't put my house in order how can I understand the universe which is total order? So as a human being, that's my first concern; profession afterwards. My question is, sir, as a human being, is there a possibility of living in this modern, wretched world without a single shadow of fear, of anger, violence and all that? As a human being that's my first question, not as an expert at something. It may be presumptuous or idiotic to say it is possible, not theoretically but actually.

Dimock : As a scientist, I am used to thinking in terms of states — things are in a particular state. One of the concepts that goes along with this is whether a state is accessible, whether there is a path that leads to that state, if there is a state of knowing oneself, or a state of love, or a state of anything of human being that is different from the state that I am in? Then I have to ask, how could I reach that state?

K. : You can't reach it, Sir.

Dimock : There is no hope then that I'll live that state?

K. : No, you're putting a wrong question. 'I' is the very essence of self-interest, and self-interest cannot reach that which has no interest or self.

Dimock : But it sounds then as though you are saying that the one state is inaccessible from the other.

K. : That's all.

Dimock : But I am in that.

K. : If I'm blind, I can imagine light, I can imagine every kind of light but I'm still blind. So first, I see that I am not different from mankind. That is the first thing in my blood. That means

tremendous compassion and that compassion is intelligence and that compassion has its tremendous beauty.

Intelligence can live with disorder and change that disorder. That's all I am saying. So I want to find out, as a human being, first, why I live in conflict, why I have these fears, the endless sorrow of mankind — naturally I want to understand it, I look at it, I feel it in my blood, how it is operating and is it possible for a human being to step out of all that. That's all my question. And I happen to see that one can. So, as I am humanity, if I change, is it that the entire humanity has another quality?

R.M. : Could I understand then that ultimately it is the order within us that matters and if that is the case that order comes only through insight?

K. : Insight into self-interest, and the ending of self-interest.

R.M. : That's the lesson I got.

G.S. : So, now to respond to Dr. Dimock in his own terminology, in physics — one is normally used to change from one state to another state and one asks the question, is there a trajectory connecting these two states? If I comprehend what Krishnaji says and transcribe it into his language, the statement is 'You do not change the state of the system, you change the system'. That's all.

K. : That's right, Sir.

Madras, 10th January 1985

(Concluded)

A talk to the students at Rishi Valley.

Krishnamurti : What do you like me to talk about?

Student : Sir, you may talk about anything.

K. : Of course, that's the easiest, isn't it? If I was married, which I am not, and if I had children, which I haven't what would I want my son or daughter to become, to be in life? Do you understand my question? Suppose I have a son or a daughter. I would like first of all that he should be highly sensitive. You know what that word sensitive means — to have all your senses, your touch, your seeing, your hearing — highly developed. Unless one becomes very very sensitive and you touch, feel, see, your brain will not be greatly active. The senses are part of the brain. What would you want to be, to become, to flower into?

S. : A great man.

K. : I don't know what you mean by great man. Either he is a great scientist, a great archaeologist, or a great professor. Do you mean a great national hero?

S. : Yes.

K. : I thought so. (laughter). A national hero is the last person to be great. I would like a boy or a girl for whom I am responsible to be highly sensitive. The brain is capable of most extraordinary things, to be sensitive, to have a brain that is highly active, not suffocated, atrophied by so-called modern education.

And also I would have a boy or a girl an excellent body, a very sensitive body, pliable, swift, strong, eating right food, right exercise, clothed properly with good taste. You know we have an extraordinary body which has evolved through thousands upon thousands of years. It is an extraordinary instrument. If we don't abuse it, if we don't overeat, overexercise, overindulge,

then it can last for a very very long time, over 100 years. And to have a good body is essential. Right? You agree to all this? Will you have a good body? Eat right food, exercise, walk so that your body becomes extraordinarily alive, not just rotten?

And one must have a very good brain, apart from the body, apart from having good sensitive appreciation of nature. You know all the trees around you. Have you ever looked at any of the trees, have you? Go on, answer it. Have you looked at trees or you pulled the branches off?

S. : We do both. Sometimes we look at them and at the same time pull out some leaves.

K. : I know. It is like pulling your hair out. But have you looked at it actually? Look at the tree one day after you leave here. How extraordinarily beautiful it is, the last highest leaf has extraordinary vitality. Look at it and don't do anything on the tree. Have you ever looked at the sky? Not just casually look at it and go off for something else, but actually take time to look at the sky, the clouds, the light in the clouds and the shape of the clouds and the moving clouds, how they cast shadows on the hills and how the shadows move? Have you watched all these?

Students : Yes sir.

K. : No. I am afraid you have not. Probably you are too busy pulling out somebody's hair, too busy talking, chattering, and so never have time to look at the extraordinary world we live in, the beauty of this valley, the ancient hills and the flowing river, the stream. Have you looked at all this, everybody, as though you are looking at it for the first time? You can't look at it as though it was for the first time if you say you know. If you name it, it is not new. So, I would have that child, that boy, that girl, highly sensitive, and that helps the brain to be also very alive, sensitive, active.

You know modern education right throughout the world is making the brain dull because it has stuffed a lot of knowledge, information, specialised career as an engineer, as a doctor, as a chemist or devoting time to research so that the brain becomes conditioned, shabby, by the study you do. Right? Are you understanding some of these? Have you noticed how your brain is conditioned? You call yourself a Hindu. It is a conditioning. You call yourself a Muslim. That is conditioning. Or a Christian

or a communist or a Marxist. Do you understand? Our brain is programmed as a computer. Aren't you programmed, haven't you been told from the very beginning that you are a Hindu, that you have your own gods, that you have your own particular rituals?

So by constant repetition of that, that you are a Hindu, that you are a Christian, a Muslim and so on, your brain gradually becomes conditioned, shabby, and all the rest of your life, you say I am a Muslim, I am a Hindu, I am a Christian, I am a Catholic, I am this or that. That's conditioning.

S. : Whatever we do, aren't we in some way or the other being conditioned? You look at a tree, something, without naming it — otherwise we feel we become conditioned. If we learn to look at it that way aren't we being conditioned?

K. : Suppose I want to be a good carpenter. None of you do that. Of course you all want to be lawyers, engineers, right? But none of you want to be a good master carpenter. I watched one of them in California. He was really master, extraordinarily skilled person. Now, if I want to be a carpenter, I have to study the nature of the wood, I have to study the nature of the implements and the grain of this wood and so on. I have to familiarise myself with the various types of wood. And also the instruments I use I must handle them properly. Right? Now, that actually makes my brain somewhat conditioned in a particular direction as a carpenter. If I want to be an engineer, the same thing happens. Or a scientist or a philosopher or a religious maniac. Please listen. Does knowledge condition the brain? Don't say yes immediately. Think of it, talk it over. I go to school, pass examinations if I am lucky or if I am fairly brainy, fairly good at memorising. Then go to college, university and then a career. I have acquired knowledge about mathematics. But knowledge, is it conditioning my brain? Enquire into it.

S. : Conditioning will mean your thought process is going in a particular direction.

K. : Surely. So, if I specialise in one subject, does that condition my brain? Apparently it does. A surgeon, a very good top surgeon, he has had ten years or fifteen years of medical study, gets a degree, practises till he becomes a top surgeon. And such a surgeon obviously being a specialist, his brain is conditioned.

Right? Some of you are going to be engineers and some of you are going to be lawyers and so on. Your brain is already being conditioned by the idea that you will be an engineer, a doctor and so on. Would you agree to that?

Now I am asking a further question which is does knowledge condition the brain? Go on sir, answer it. That's why you are acquiring knowledge in this school, getting a lot of information and you have stored up in the brain, in the very brain cells, you study mathematics, whatever it is, you study and it is stored there as memory. So, memory of a particular subject does condition the brain. Do you see the fact?

S. : You said sometime back look at anything without naming it, otherwise you become conditioned. Even when I look at something, as you are asking us to do, in that process also there may be conditioning.

K. : Now, when you look at a tree, you name the tree.

S. : I don't because I don't know the name.

K. : Right. You don't know the name. So you look at it. When you look at it without using the word tree or a special kind of tree, then you are looking at something very alive. Does that condition you? Obviously not. The moment you name it, the moment you recognise it as a particular species, then with that conditioning you are looking at the tree. Go into it further. Can you look at your friend without the word, without the picture you have built about the friend, without the image that you have carefully gathered, can you look at your friend? The word, the picture, the image is the conditioning. So, can you look at something, look at your friend, or look at the speaker, at me, without the image, without the picture you have built about him or the name or the word? Just look? Can you do that? because if you name it, you have an image about him, or the picture you have about him put together through reputation; then that is your conditioning.

S. : I can't do it. How do I decondition my mind?

K. : Let's slowly proceed. How do you do it? Why do you ask that?

S. : Because I am interested in it.

K. : You want to achieve that, you want to have that kind of look?

S. : Yes.

K. : So you are asking how. Now, watch your brain, how it operates. When you ask how, you want a system.

S. : Yes.

K. : That's your conditioning. You understand? The 'how' is your conditioning, but to see the fact, to see the truth, that is entirely different. The conditioning operates only when there is the naming, the picture, the image that you have built about her or him. That's your conditioning. Just be aware of this fact. Don't say how am I to get out of it. Do you understand? Are you aware of all the trees, of the hills, the shape of the hills, the rocks? Are you aware of all that? If you are not aware of all that, it is very very difficult to be aware of your conditioning and to see how that conditioning acts. So one has to be aware of the whole environment around you.

S. : How do you get along with him, with that person, if you don't have a name, or if you have no image about him?

K. : Have you tried it? Then why do you ask that question?

S. : I cannot try it.

K. : Why can't you? Look, how many years have you spent in a school or college or university? many years, Right? And to do this you do not even spend half an hour at it, you don't spend even ten minutes to find out whether it is possible or not. So, your brain is conditioned by your flabbiness, by your laziness. The moment you pay attention it becomes alive.

S. : Our brain itself naturally seeks conditioning and can't help it.

K. : Sir, our brain has evolved from the ape till man, which is about 40,000 years ago, and that's what the scientists say. It has passed through every kind of experience, every kind of incident. Right sir? So, it has gathered enormous information, experience and the brain itself is conditioned. Now, we are saying the conditioning is the word, the picture, the memory, the accumulated information stored in the brain as memory. These are the factors that condition the brain; There are other factors but there isn't time to go now into the various other factors like fear, greed, pain and so on. And these are the contributory causes of the conditioning. So, we must ask the question: is it possible to uncondition the brain? There are many scholars, many professors

and writers like the existentialists and so on — they say it cannot be unconditioned, that it can only be modified.

S. : Logically speaking, those people who say it cannot be unconditioned are right.

K. : Maybe, but I have to find out. Why should I accept it?

S. : No, you yourself said so.

K. : I said that sir. It has evolved from the ape till man, and there is a great deal of ape in us. Now the fact is it is conditioned. Is it possible to free that conditioning? Otherwise, evolution has no meaning. If I am violent from the ape till now, I will be violent till the very end of all time. So, is it possible to change the whole psychological structure of the brain? Is it possible for you to be completely free of fear? Because, that is one of the factors of conditioning.

S. : It is awesome.

K. : Of course it is awesome. Why do you call it awesome?

S. : Sir, you want to decondition the brain. There is a whole lot of things to get rid of.

K. : We ought to discuss this very carefully step by step going into it. Not just intellectually spin off, but actually step by step go into it and as you take a step finish it so that at the end there is total freedom from fear.

The next question is, our knowledge which we are acquiring through conversations, through dialogues, through reading various books is making our brain full of knowledge without having an original experience. You understand what I am talking about? I happened to know a very great writer, a literary man. He is dead now, he was a great friend of mine. One day on a walk in the hills he said: "Look, I can speak about science, I can speak about painting, piano, music, I can talk about Vedanta, I can talk about Buddhism — Tao and all that; I am full of knowledge. My brain has studied, acquired knowledge about so many things — encyclopaedic knowledge. And I wonder if I will ever have an original experience". Do you understand what I said? So your brain is now overloaded and you will never have something totally original. Then you are just a mediocre human being. You know what that word mediocre means? According to the dictionary, it means going up the hill half way, never reaching the top but always going a few steps up. That's what it means by

mediocre. And most of us are mediocre. We never go to the very end of anything. So, look at what is happening to you. You are being educated to be mediocre — to have a job, to get married, children and for the rest of your lives — 50, 60 years — go to the office, to the factory or tilling the land. Then you will say how am I to earn money, I must have my food and cloth and shelter. Naturally.

S. : Do you mean to say we must reach the top of the hill? Aren't we ambitious then?

K. : No. To reach human excellence, that's the top of beyond the Everest. You understand? That does not mean ambition. Ambition destroys love. You don't know. But to have a brain that is excellent, that means say exactly what you mean, not have double meaning. Not to be cynical, not to be bitter, not to hate. Are you interested in all this? Or we just have a talk on a weary morning when we ought to be out in the sun, with the green leaves and the beauty of the earth?

S. : If I may go back, as you said knowledge leads to conditioning.

K. : Does knowledge lead to conditioning? I ask a question. I don't say it. I want you to find out.

S. : Knowledge does lead to conditioning, but knowledge is important in life.

K. : Of course.

S. : Where do we draw the line?

K. : Find out. Do you want me to draw the line and then you accept it? I drive a car. To drive a car I must be taught: How to put on the brake, the accelerator and so on. I learn. Through learning about driving I become a good driver and I drive. That is, I acquire knowledge to drive a car, I acquire knowledge to speak English or Hindi, whatever it is, I acquire knowledge to be a good carpenter. Otherwise you cannot live. So find out for yourselves where knowledge is necessary and where knowledge is not necessary. Find out where knowledge is essential, where it is necessary, where it is important, and also find out where it is not important. That's all. So, you have got this problem. Now what's a problem? Do you know the meaning of that word? It is something thrown at you, that's what problem means. The actual meaning, the etymological meaning of that word means something thrown at you, something that you are challenged with.

S. : But that's my problem sir; no one has thrown it at me.

K. : I say, sir, find out where knowledge is necessary and where knowledge is not necessary. May I help you to find out? Not direct you to find out. You understand the difference? By talking together, having a dialogue together, let's enquire into it. Will you accept that? So, knowledge is necessary, isn't it? Physical knowledge — how to ride a bicycle, how to ride a car, how to write, what to do if I am an engineer, carpenter. There it is necessary. The whole social structure is now built on that, that I must work to earn a livelihood. To work I must have knowledge about whatever I do. Now, where is it not necessary? Probably you have never asked this question. Now I am asking you where is it not necessary. Come on sirs, You have all studied, you are good, clever, come on sirs.

S. : Do you have fear?

K. : Do I have fear?

K. : I am glad you ask. There is an excellent question at last. Do I have fear? What do you mean by fear? Passing examinations, snake biting me. You all fear something. Now, there is physical fear — which is, I walk in the dark, I may be bitten by a snake. That's why I have to be careful when I walk. It may be the other kind of fear, which is, I might not succeed in my career. Right? I want to be a good doctor, but I might not be capable of being a good doctor, and I am afraid of that. So when you ask me are you frightened, have you fear, I say to you in actuality that I have no inward fear of any kind. You understand what I am saying? I am not afraid of my reputation. I am not afraid — what people say about me. I don't care, Right? What else? I am not afraid to die. What are you afraid of — of your wife, of your husband, of your father and mother? I have no father, no mother, nor a wife. I am not frightened of family. You understand?

Now, Sirs, we have got ten minutes more to finish the subject you have raised. It is important for you to find out. You may become an engineer but you have to find out what it is to learn about this also — where knowledge is necessary, important, helpful; to go from here to Madras you must know the route you follow, you must have knowledge. Now where is knowledge an impediment?

S. : Thought.

K. : What do you mean by thought?

S. : I am limited by knowledge.

K. : That is all. We agree to that. I am asking a different question Sir. We agree that we must have knowledge to go from here to there. You need knowledge to write a book, knowledge to drive a car. Right? To become a good chemist, good scientist you must have great deal of knowledge. Just now we are asking a question where knowledge is not necessary. Is there any place where knowledge is an impediment?

S. : Knowledge is not necessary when you want to be considerate to others.

K. : Are you saying where there is love, knowledge is not necessary? Have you understood what I am saying? Are you saying that where there is affection, care, love, compassion, knowledge is not necessary? -

S. : Yes.

K. : I will indicate something. It is for you to proceed or not, as you wish. Knowledge is not necessary in a relationship. And if I am married I have a wife, I have built an image about her. Haven't you? Right Sir? Don't be shy.

S. : Right, Sir.

K. : Good. You have a picture about her which you have built, since you have been here. So your picture, your image about her is not the actual her. She may be different. She may have contributed to that picture. There is much more to investigate. We won't go into it now. I am pointing out, if I may, that in relationship knowledge is a detriment. Knowledge is what divides people, man, woman and all the rest of it. It is knowledge that is dividing the Hindu and the Muslim. Agreed? It is the knowledge that says I am a Jew, you are an Arab, and because of this division, we kill each other.

Is that enough this morning? Yes Sir? Now, before we go, will you sit very quietly for a few minutes. Close your eyes and see what your thoughts are doing. Will you do that?

Rishi Valley

8.12.82

Book Review

Things of the Mind : Dialogue with J. Krishnamurti.

The book is put together by Dr. Brij B. Khare, a member of the faculty of social and behavioural sciences at California State University, San Bernardino. It consists of four discussions: Krishnamurti with High School and University students and with teachers and professors.

In the second chapter, the place of knowledge is discussed with the students. The acquisition of skills and knowledge becomes necessary in any society. Does one know oneself after going through the school and University? Unfortunately it is not the case, for the system turns out stereotypes that can only compete and conform. What is the place of knowledge in human relationship, and is there a different kind of learning without accumulation and memory burden? The Socratic dialogue deepens and the students are confronted with a new experience and insight.

We live in a corrupt society geared to nationalism and war. Krishnamurti points out that the observer is the observed. Greed is me. If we separate the two then you have to control it. Where there is division there is conflict. But if I am what I observe what shall I do? You cannot go to the doctor and ask for an aspirin as when you have a headache. You are with what is, without an escape, and this is a state of intensity and learning; the non-dualistic approach has a penetrating quality and there is an unfolding of the problem.

Listening with complete attention has a remarkable quality and the students begin to appreciate a new turn in learning. Krishnamurti points out that one has to learn the art of inquiry for oneself, without being dependent on anybody. In the third

chapter, observation and learning are discussed. It is indicated that there is an observation without the word, without the hindrance of memory and past images and symbols. This would be a refreshing way of approach in learning and living. Living is relationship with people and nature, with ideas and things.

What is the vital function of a teacher Krishnamurti asks of the University men? Apart from the acquisition of knowledge, is it not his responsibility to bring about a new generation of human beings flowering in goodness and intelligence? A holistic education. As the dialogue with the professors progresses we come to look into meditation and love.

Krishnamurti points out the meaning of the Sanskrit word 'Mantra'. It is "to ponder, meditate upon not becoming", and also implies the dissolving of all self-centred activity. You cannot buy it from a guru for \$ 50,00. A humorous situation, but sad.

To understand oneself you cannot be a follower of any system, however glorified. You have to be a light unto yourself. The participants say: "New thoughts, new challenges and a re-awakening of feeling per se were common to us all." Many of the participants have stated that the experience helped them to obtain a new perspective on the purpose and function of education. Dr. Brij Khare has written a prologue to each of the dialogues. It is hoped that the freshness and depth of meaning of education as life will permeate the reader in his search for a new pedagogy for our modern world. Teachers and educators will find the book of considerable interest. Published in 1985, by Philosophical Library, New York, the book is a library edition.

G. Narayan.

Please note :

A colour, feature-length documentary film on Krishnaji "Challenge of Change" is now available on video cassette. This film, which took five years to make documents his life from boyhood to the present. Video tapes of this film in the VHS PAL format are sold at Rs. 600/-. Packing and forwarding charges will be Rs. 15/-.

EXTRACT FROM LETTERS TO THE SCHOOLS

15 December 1982

Intent is far more important than to achieve a goal, an end. Intent is not just an intellectual and ideologic conclusion but rather an active, living present. It is the wick that is burning in a bowl of oil. It cannot be extinguished, no breeze can blow it out. The wick is stout and the oil is not fed by any external influence or source. It has no cause and so the flame, the wick and the oil are ever-enduring. This is my intent as a dedicated teacher and it should be yours too as parents and of all humanity, for we are all concerned. The vital flame of intent is to bring about a good, intelligent, extremely capable, free human being. You cannot escape from this intention. You are involved in it as much as I am. You may shy away from it, disregard it, neglect it, but you are as much responsible as I am. The future is our responsibility so this is our immediate problem. My problem and yours is to cultivate the comprehensive intelligence from which all other things flow. I can see this in my mind's eye as the central factor, for no intelligent person, in the sense we are using that word, would ever want to hurt another intentionally. Such a person would treat all humanity as he would treat himself, without this terrible destructive division. I can also feel in some vague way, not sentimentally, that this intelligence is totally impersonal, neither yours nor mine. I can feel its tremendous attraction and its truth.

From letters to the Schools: Volume two. (To be Published in India soon).

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

FORM IV

1. Place of Publication : Krishnamurti Foundation India,
'Vasanta Vihar',
64-65, 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 : 153 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, 1985

(Sd.) SUNANDA PATWARDHAN,
Signature of Publisher.

Annual subscription Rs. 22 or \$ 8 or £ 6. Life membership Rs. 250.

Cover Design : Kiran Khalap