

'87/1

Bulletin

**Krishnamurti Foundation India**

## KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

Vasanta Vihar, 64/5, Greenways Road, Madras 600028, India

U.K.	Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. 24, Southend Road, Beckenham, Kent, U.K. BR3 1SD
SPANISH AMERICA	Fundación Krishnamurti Hispanoamericana, P.O. Box 1782, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00919-1782
U.S.A.	Krishnamurti Foundation of America, P.O. Box 216, Ojai, California 93023
AUSTRALIA	Mrs. Mavis Bennett, Krishnamurti Books, P.O. Box 655, Surfers Paradise, Queensland 4217
BELGIUM	Krishnamurti Komitee Belgie (French) Comte et Comtesse Hugues van der Straten Ponthoz, Mr. R. Linssen, 20 rue Pére Dedeken, 1040 Bruxelles Krishnamurti Komitee Belgie (Flemish) Monica Cattoor, Mortierstraat 11, 9850 Poesele-Nevele
BRAZIL	Instituicao Cultural Krishnamurti, Avenida Presidente Vargas 418—Sala 1, 109, Caixa Postal 1827-ZC-00, Rio de Janeiro, Estado Do Rio de Janeiro.
CANADA	Krishnamurti Centre of Canada, 1480 Palmerston Ave., West Vancouver, B.C. V7T 2H7
DENMARK	Krishnamurti Komiteen Strandboulevarden 62 B, 4.mf., 2100 Copenhagen 0
FINLAND	Krishnamurti-Kirjat, Eerikinkatu, 26 A 9, 00100 Helsinki 10
FRANCE	Association Culturelle Krishnamurti, 73 rue Fondary, 75015 Paris
GERMANY/AUSTRIA	Mrs. I. von Massenbach, Ganghoferstr. 7, D-8031 Gernlinden Mr. Manfred Schneider, Albert-Schweitzer-Strasse 1, D-6072, Dreieich-Götzenhain
GREECE	Spyros Tsourapas, c/o Petros Hadjipetros, 15, Harkaou Trikoupi 145 62 Kifissia, Athens
ICELAND	Mr. S. Halldorsson, Bakastig 1, Reykjavik
INDONESIA	Mr. M. Dalidd, 14 Djalan Singkep, Malang
ISRAEL	Mr. Avraham Jacoby, Ahneveim St. No. 16 Shickoon- Mirzah, Rishon-le-Zion 75-534
ITALY	Dott. Ing. Giovanni Turchi, Via Garofalo 19, 20133 Milano
JAPAN	Yumiko Shimizu, Kataoka-kata, Kamimeguro 3-42-21, Meguro, Tokyo
MAURITIUS	Krishnamurti Centre, c/o Vishnu Achameesing, 8 Victor Hugo Street, Beau Bassin
NETHERLANDS	Stichting Krishnamurti Netherland, Secretary: Lage Duin 19, 2121 CC Bennebroek Books, Bulletin: Weikamperweg 93, 7351 TG Hoenderloo
NEW ZEALAND	Mr. R. Falla, Charteris, R.D.1, Lyttelton
NORWAY	Krishnamurti Biblioteket, J. Lem, Fagertunun 12 N-4790, Lillesand
PORTUGAL	Núcleo Cultural Krishnamurti, Av. Leonor Fernandes 36, 7000 Evora
SINGAPORE	Mr. Koh Kok Kiang, 104, Henderson Crescent, 079-62, Singapore 0315
SOUTH AFRICA	Krishnamurti Learning Centre of Southern Africa, 113 Ninth Avenue, Durban
SPAIN	Krishnamurti Información, Calle Canuda 45-47 Barcelona 2
SRI LANKA	Krishnamurti Centre Sri Lanka Inc., 23/3, Mirihana Road, Nugegoda
SWEDEN	Krishnamurti Center, c/o Englund, Storskogsvagen 45, 14400, Ronninge
SWITZERLAND	Krishnamurti Freunde der Schweiz (German and Italian) Mr. Franz Haller, Bachstrasse 18, CH5303 Würenlingen Miss Gisèle Balleys (for the Suisse Romande) rue Encyclopédie 6 bis, CH1202 Geneva

## FROM THE EDITOR

Sacred ritual once marked crucial stages in men's lives. Linking the purely transitory moment to the eternal, rituals brought a sense of wholeness to experience which was merely human. 'I am the sky, you the earth/Come let us be together/From us let children spring' — the words of the marriage ceremony no longer carry the same connotation.

The Irish poet W.B. Yeats put wholeness beyond human grasp when he said in one of his poems: 'A man must choose between perfection of the work or of the life.' It is a peculiarly modern sensibility which creates the above dichotomy between perfection in life and perfection in work. The passions which inspire a perfect piece of work, the poet suggested, overwhelm and distort life. In turn the practice of virtue or of goodness, which brings perfection in life, is bought at the expense of passion.

Goodness is a moral quality which is intimately connected with the values and ideals established by society. In some very real sense goodness transcends the ideals of any particular society. It was this latter sense of goodness and its connection with wholeness that Krishnaji discussed with the teachers of the Rishi Valley School in December 1985 on his last visit to the school. He brought a profound empiricism to his subject urging his audience to be sceptical. He observed that the brain 'is a closed thing... closed by conclusions, by opinion, by judgement'; his concern throughout the discussion was to draw his audience away from opinions about goodness to an original awareness of something which is not man-made.

There is a traditional vocabulary associated with moral action: choice, judgement, goals, a weak or strong will, ends and means, and so on. There is also a more modern, psychoanalytic vocabulary: repression and sublimation, transference, and so on.

Both sets of vocabularies postulate a dichotomy between uncontrolled, baser aspects of human nature and more sublime aspects which is a struggle to achieve. The moral process is then seen as a movement towards an ideal away from the given. Krishnamurti rejected this model completely; for him goodness was not in any way connected with its opposite.

Drawing before the audience an accurate picture of the struggle to be good, to change 'what is' into 'what should be', Krishnamurti suggested that the entire process is wasteful; it breeds conflict; it is the mechanism through which the authoritarian past is transmitted; and it makes for fragmentation in life. 'Virtue', he insisted, 'is not a conclusion'. These various themes are explored in two early talks and discussions and one later talk we reproduce in this issue.

Krishnamurti's own life, the way he talked, the way he related to people, the brilliance of his presence even at the age of 91, were testament to a life lived correctly, passionately as well as holistically.

## WHOLENESS AND FRAGMENTATION

*J. Krishnamurti (K)*: May I raise a very difficult question? May I? How would you, if you had a son or a daughter here, want to educate them, or bring about a holistic life?

You've got so many students here — capable, intelligent. Through what means, what kind of attitude, what kind of verbal explanation, would you educate them in a holistic way of living? I mean by holistic, whole, unbroken, not splintered up, not fragmented, as most of our lives are. So my question is, how do you bring about a holistic way of living, an outlook that's not fragmented in specializations?

*A Teacher (T)*: Sir, first we must be holistic ourselves.

*K*: That's understood, sir. But first of all, you are educators here, including myself (if you will permit me). Parents send me one of their children, and I want to see that they live a life that is whole. 'Whole' means good.

Good, not in the ordinary sense of that word; [not] the traditional word good: a good boy, a good husband — that's all very limited. [The word 'good'] has much greater significance when you relate goodness to wholeness. Good, then, has the quality of being extraordinarily generous; good has that sense of not wanting to hurt another, consciously; good, in the sense that it is correct — not only for the moment, correct all the time. Correct in the sense that it does not depend on circumstances — if it is correct now, it will be correct 100 years later or ten days later. Correctness with goodness is not related to environment, circumstance, pressures and so on. From that comes right action. So, goodness and holistic way of living go together. In what manner am I going to see that the boy grows in goodness and holistic way of living? Do we rely on each other? Is it an individual problem or is it a problem of the

whole school, the whole body? So the action must be comprehensive — not that gentleman thinks one way and I think one way about goodness; it must be a cohesive action. Now, is that possible?

Sir, in the word 'holistic' is implied not the orthodox, the organized, but that quality of religion which we will go into presently. How am I, living here as an educator, to bring this about?

*T* : The first thing we have to do is to make the child feel secure in his relationships. It seems to me that unless the child feels secure in his relationships, with me and the place, nothing can happen.

*T* : I want to find out whether what you say is really what I want to do. If I feel that is really what I want to do, then I must find out what I mean by that, what is the content of my feelings.

*T* : Would it be necessary, if you and I are working together in the school, to find out what I mean by that or what you mean, but rather find out if there is something that is valid for all of us — not because we stick to an idea or come together around an idea, but in the investigation we say together, 'That is it.'

*K* : Sir, do we understand what it means to live a holistic life? Or is it a theory?

*T* : Sir, perhaps we merely understand by contrast. We see fragmentation in ourselves.

*K* : (*anticipating*) If you see fragmentation or breaking-up in yourself, then you have the problem of how to get rid of it, how to be whole. I don't want a problem about it. Then I have already broken it up.

*T* : Despite that, the fact remains that we are fragmented.

*K* : Just a minute. I know I am fragmented; my whole thinking process is fragmented. And also I know I mustn't make a problem of it because, then, that's another fragmentation.

*T* : My feeling of fragmentation is itself a problem — I don't *make* a problem; I *see* a problem.

*K* : I understand. I realize I am fragmented, but I don't want to make a problem of it.

*T* : But, sir, doesn't it mean that when I see that I am fragmented, it is a problem?

*K* : That's what I want to get at, which is — I see I am fragmented: I see one thing and I do another, think one thing and contradict what I think. And I also see very clearly that I mustn't make a problem of it.

*T* : Perhaps I don't see that clearly.

*K* : That's what I want to discuss. If I make a problem of it, I am already further fragmenting.

*T* : But there is an in-between stage.

*K* : (*demurring*) I don't want that. I am fragmented, broken up in different ways. If I make a problem of it, saying to myself, I must not be fragmented, that very statement is born out of fragmentation. Something born of fragmentation is another form of fragmentation. But my brain is trained to [make] problems. I must be aware of the whole cycle of it. So what am I to do?

*T* : You say to that, 'I should not make a problem of it.' Do we have a choice, or is it automatic? When we see the fragmentation within us, we say, 'I would not like to make a problem of it.'

*K* : See the *truth*, not 'I will not make a problem.' I see the fact; if I make a problem of it, it's another fragmentation. That's all. I see it; I don't say, I mustn't get rid of it or I must get rid of it, so what am I to do?

*T* : Is there anything to be done in this case?

*K* : I am going to show you presently. Don't be so eager, if you don't mind my saying so.

*T* : The way I see it, there is nothing to be done [besides] actually watching, observing.

*K* : Just a minute, sir. Don't come to that conclusion. What am I to do?

*T* : Observe.

*K* : Don't tell me, sir. These are words. Seeing that I am fragmented, aware that whatever I do is another kind of fragmentation, what is left for me? You don't put yourself in that position; you have already come to a conclusion. So conclusion is another fragmentation. I have this question: [Is there] a way of living holistically in which is involved the quality of a religious mind — deep goodness, without any mischief, without any duality? Am I making it complicated?

*T* : No, sir.

*K* : Why not, sir? My whole being thinks dualistically. It's always in opposition, in the sense: I want to do this, and yet I mustn't do it; I should do it, but I don't like to do it, and so on. It always takes opposing positions. So, what is left for me? I see all this at a glance, or [through] analysis. Then my question is: what am I to do? Don't tell me you should or shouldn't — I don't accept anything from you; I am very sceptical by nature.

*T* : You are asking the question: what am I to do? When there is observation, no question arises.

*K* : Are you doing it?

*T* : Yes.

*K* : Are you doing it? If you are not doing it and you say, we must try, you are in contradiction; therefore duality, therefore fragmentation, and hence no goodness.

*T* : As soon as you say or think about a holistic state of goodness, you are already in contradiction.

*K* : No, you are not in contradiction. You are only putting it into words. What's your action when you want to educate your student in this goodness?

The school has a certain reputation, a certain eclat — a feeling about it. And there is a certain atmosphere in this valley. And I send you my son, hoping that you will help him to grow in this holistic way of life. I am communicating; I am not contradicting.

*T*: It is in the way I posit the question that the contradiction arises.

*K*: I understand. We are trying to investigate the question, not lay down laws about it. (At least I'm not.) I really want to find out what way I can help the student. I may not be holistic. Don't say: first I must be holistic, and then I can teach. Then you are dead. Then that will take an eternity. If you say, I must first [ be holistic,] then you have stymied yourself. Sir, I am not saying *anything*. I really don't know what to do with these children [whose] parents want them to join the I.I.T., or something or other. And I've got the tremendous opposition of society — the father, the mother, the grandfather wanting [the boy] to have a job and all that. How am I to bring this about? You don't answer me.

*T*: Krishnaji, I am not answering the question how am I to bring this about; I'm looking at fragmentation.

*K*: What does that mean? Follow it out — I am fragmented, the boy is fragmented. Right, sir?

*T*: Right.

*K*: Then what's the relationship between me and the boy?

*T*: We are learning together.

*K*: Don't use phrases quickly. What's my relationship with the student who is fragmented like myself?

*T*: I am not different from him.

*K*: Of course, you *are* different from him — you teach maths, he doesn't know any. Don't say you are not different from him.

*T*: There is no relationship at all if I am fragmented.

*K* : Please, sir, answer my question: I am fragmented, and I am your student; what's our relationship? Or, is there any relationship at all? Or, are we on the same level?

*T* : It can only be a fragmented relationship.

*K* : What is *actually* my relationship?

*T* : There doesn't seem to be any.

*K* : That's all. How can fragments have a relationship?

*T* : Why not?

*K* : Are you really asking me that question?

*T* : Yes.

*K* : *You* answer it. You ask me a question, and I am too eager to reply to it. So it goes on between you and me: I answer it and then you counter it; then I counter it, and so on. He asks me a question, and he expects me to answer it, and I say: I won't answer it, because in the question itself is the answer. So, can we look at the question and wait for it to flower? My question is very, very serious. The question itself contains the answer if you let it flower, if you let it alone, not cover it immediately with a response. Your response is already conditioned, already personal. So leave the question. If the question has depth, significance, vitality, then the question unfolds.

Now, sir, is there truth? Does truth exist? You don't know, if you're honest; so we leave the question. Let's look at the question, and the question begins to unfold: is there truth, or only active, vital illusion? (I won't go into that.) If the question has depth, if the question has a sense of great vitality — because you are asking the question in great inward searching — let the question answer itself. It will if you leave it alone.

Now I am coming back to my original question.

*T* : I have a child come to me. I am fragmented, he is fragmented. So there is no relationship.

*K* : Are you sure there is no relationship, or are you [just] saying it?

*T* : I think I am sure there is no relationship in the fragmented state, and I find that any response that I give to the student would itself be a fragmented response.

*K* : Yes. Stop there. Then, what will you do? Whatever relationship I have is still fragmented. Is that a reality or a verbal statement?

*T* : It seems a reality to me.

*K* : Either it is real, in the sense that the microphone there is real; that's not an illusion. The *word* microphone is not *that*. I don't know if you get the quality of it.

So we must come back. What am I to do, sir? *You* tell me.

*T* : Am I fooling myself that I can give a holistic education?

*K* : We are going to find out, you and I, whether it is possible to do it or not. The first statement is: we are fragmented. Let's stick to that. We are both fragmented, and I don't know what to do. What does that mean to you? — I don't know; I don't know what to do. Then, I must investigate. When I *say* I don't know, I really *mean* I don't know. Or, am I waiting for somebody else to tell me, so I will know? Which is it?

*T* : At the moment the latter.

*K* : Is there a state of the brain when it says: I really don't know? I am not waiting for him to answer, or expecting someone else to tell me. All these are [states when I am] waiting for an answer. But no one can answer this because they are all fragmented. Therefore I am waiting, watching, looking, observing, listening to the question. I don't know what to do. Then I ask myself, 'What's the state of my brain which says: "I don't know"?'

*T* : At that point of time, it's not functioning.

*K* : 'I don't know.' Or are you waiting for it to know?

T : Waiting for it to know.

K : Therefore, you are waiting to know; you *will* know. Therefore your brain is not saying, 'I don't know.' It's all very logical, you know.

T : The brain doesn't say it doesn't know.

K : That's it, that's the first thing — the brain never acknowledges or remains in the state 'I don't know.'

So, I don't know how to deal with that boy or with myself. Any action I do, any movement of thought, is still out of fragmentation, right? So I leave it alone. May I proceed?

T : Please, sir.

K : What is love? Is it related to hate? If it is related, love then is still fragmentation, right? Do you understand what I am saying, sir?

T : Love is not the opposite of hate.

K : What is love? It has nothing to do with pity, sympathy — all the rest of it. What is love? You don't know. Is that state of not-knowing love?

I don't know what to do with that boy or girl; we are both fragmented. I can teach him mathematics, geography, history, biology, chemistry, psychiatry, anything — but that's nothing. This demands much deeper enquiry, very much deeper. So I say, what is it that is completely holistic? Certainly not thought — thought is experience. It's certainly not sympathy, not generosity, not empathy, not saying: 'you're a nice chap.' Love has — what?

T : Compassion.

K : Love, compassion — that is the only thing that's holistic. (*aside*) I'm just discovering something for myself. I say, love isn't thought, love isn't pleasure. Don't accept; for god's sake that is the last thing you should do. Love is utterly unrelated to hate, jealousy,

anger — all that. Love is completely unbreakable. It's whole and it has its own intelligence.

*T* : I have heard you say this before in different ways.

*K* : To know: I know my wife. Can you ever say about a person — 'I know'?

*T* : You shut off that person in some way.

*K* : Yes. If I say, 'I know Radhikaji' — what do I know about her? So, to say, 'I know', is fragmentation.

Sir, I asked a question, which is: Can I help the student or talk to him? I know I am fragmented, he is fragmented. And I also know, have a feeling, that love is whole, [that] compassion, love, have their own intelligence. I am going to see if that intelligence can operate.

*T* : You say that love has its own intelligence; you say that love is holistic, it's not fragmented. Isn't that just an assumption?

*K* : It's not an assumption. Love is not an assumption — my god !

*T* : Maybe it is, because I don't know.

*K* : Remain [there]. You don't know. Wait, find out; don't answer. I don't know what the inside of a modern car is like. I have, as a matter of fact, stripped old cars. So, I want to learn about it. I go to a garageman and he teaches me, because I want to know how it works. I take the trouble; I take pains; I pay him, if I have the money, or work with him till I know every part of that car. That means I want to learn, but I'm not sure *you* want to learn.

*T* : But Krishnaji, this very wanting to learn ...

*K* : (*interrupting*) Don't translate into fragmentation. I don't know how those cameras work, and you say, learn about it. I ask him, and I become his apprentice: I watch how he does it; I learn about it. Then I say: I know how to work that camera. But human beings are not like cameras; they are much more complicated.

They are like messy machines; and I want to know how their brains work. Either I become a biologist, a brain specialist, or I study myself, which is much more exciting. So I learn how my brain works — there is nobody to teach me.

T : There may be — I listen to you.

K : I don't trust them. All their knowledge is from books or from their small little selves. So I say, I am going to investigate this whole way of living, not just parts of it.

So let's come back: what am I to do or not do? The question is much deeper than merely the boy and the girl whom I'm educating. It might be that I have not really understood what it means to lead a holistic life; [not] understood, intellectually even.

T : If you mean intellectually, I would say yes.

K : No, no, no. Are you sure?

T : I'm sure — intellectually.

K : So you have separated the intellect from the whole. Sir, listen. When you say you have understood intellectually, it means just bananas.

T : I don't just *say*; I've *understood* intellectually.

K : I say, sir, you are not listening. When one says, I understood intellectually, it means absolutely nothing. When you say, 'intellectually', that's another fragment.

T : Yes, sir.

K : So, I don't use the words: 'I understand intellectually.' That's a crime! What am I, an educator at Rishi Valley — understanding partially, verbally even, a holistic way of living, and knowing that he and I are both fragmented — going to do or not do?

I'm responsible to the parents for that girl or boy. They have sent them here because you have a good reputation, you look after them and all that. And he comes along and tells me: It's all right,

but what matters is a holistic way of life, not intellectually but the whole psyche, the whole being, the whole entity which is now fragmented; if that can be made whole, then you have the most extraordinary education. He tells me that and he goes away, and I don't know what to do. I understand the verbal meaning of *whole*: not fragmented, not broken up, not saying one thing and doing something else, thinking something and doing quite the opposite of that — all that is fragmentation of life. And I don't know what to do; I really don't. Deeply, profoundly, gravely, seriously, I don't know what to do. Am I waiting for somebody or some book to tell me, or hoping something will accidentally come along and give me, unfortunately, 'insight'? I can't wait for that, because the boy is growing up and kicking around.

So what shall I do? I know one thing absolutely for certain: I don't know. All my inventions, all my thinking, have collapsed. I don't know whether you feel that way. I don't know, so the brain is open for reception. The brain has been closed by conclusion, by opinion, by judgement, by my problems; it is a closed thing. When I say, I really don't know, I've broken something. I've broken the bottle — I can drink the champagne.

I begin to find out — when the bottle is broken. Then I find out what love is, what compassion is and that intelligence that's born of compassion. It has nothing to do with intellect.

Sir, we never come to the point when we say: I know. You ask me about god, I've an immediate answer. You ask me about chemistry, out comes the ... the tap is open. Sociology, anything, I'm ready to answer.

[The brain's] like a drum, sir. It's all tuned up. When you strike on it, it gives the right note.

*Discussion with teachers*  
*Rishi Valley, December 7, 1985.*

## FREEDOM AND CONDITIONING

When we last met, we discussed the question of freeing the mind from its own conditioning. We said that it is important to free the mind in order to understand, because any conditioning perverts thought. I do not know if you remember that we said we have to differentiate between the thinker and the thought. If there is a division between the thinker and the thought, then the thinker can control his thought, can dominate, manoeuvre, change, transform, and so on. And is conditioning inevitable? If one is aware of one's own conditioning, how is one to set about freeing the mind from it? We are going to discuss this evening how to set about, what is the way, what is the right approach to free the mind from conditioning — is it possible to uncondition the mind through suppression, through discipline, through sublimation? These are the ways we are accustomed to. At least we *think* we can free the mind by suppressing its conditioning or through sublimation — the mind identifying itself with something greater — or through substitution. Let us examine these three points.

We know that to experience truly and profoundly, it is necessary to free the mind from its own limitations — conscious or unconscious, which means that the mind must be free from its preconceptions and from its background which is accumulated memories. Can the mind free itself from its conditioning through suppression? First we said that if the mind is conditioned, it is incapable of understanding, experiencing, directly and deeply. So our question is, can the mind free itself from its own conditioning through discipline and control? I think this is an important question to discuss; does understanding of any psychological factors come through any hidden or open kind of compulsion, or gross or subtle form of regimentation? Or does understanding come when we see facts as they are, things as they are, without distortion? And to perceive things as they are, it is necessary to have a mind that is not perverted, that is not made crooked, that is not prejudiced,

distorted, is it not? And does not freedom of the mind come through understanding our relationship to things, to people and to ideas? And does this understanding demand compulsion, suppression? This is what we are going to discuss.

First, let us see the difficulty in which we are caught. Things that we have been doing may be wrong; and perhaps by seeing what is false we will see what is right. This way, by not approaching the problem positively but rather negatively, we shall see what is true rather than merely conforming to previous knowledge and accepting and following it. Without self-knowledge, without knowing oneself, there is no true basis for action, for thought; and this discussion, if taken seriously and purposefully, will help those who intend to understand themselves and therefore to think and act truly:

Freeing the mind from its conditioning is necessary and essential because the problems that confront each one of us are so vital, so living, so subtle, that we need a fresh mind to understand them; and to have a new approach the mind must free itself from the old patterns of action. Does this freedom from conditioning come through any form of conformity, through any compulsion, through discipline? Can this freedom from environmental influences, psychological perversions, thought that have not been completed, come through any kind of suppression? Suppression implies discipline, does it not? Suppression implies denial; suppression implies resistance; that is, you build a wall round yourself in order to resist the temptation. But through disciplining, is there freedom of the mind, so that the mind understands itself? As I said, by seeing clearly for oneself what is false, one begins to see what is true. One cannot understand what is true without first understanding what is false. It is like seeing the rope as the rope and not as the snake out of fear of the snake. So one must first see very clearly, objectively, without any sense of perversion; and to see things very clearly — does that demand discipline?

And if we see our problems — economic, social, religious and otherwise — very, very clearly, without any distortion, then surely the problem is solved. It is because we are not capable of looking at a problem very clearly that the problem increases, brings its pain and misery. So, to see the problem very clearly, we must have a mind that is not conditioned, and as our minds are conditioned

— racially, climatically, socially, religiously, and, in so many ways, consciously and unconsciously — we ask: is it possible to be free of this whole contact; is it possible at all? Some of you may say it is not possible and I may say it is possible. Now, to find out if it is possible, you should experiment with it. If I say it is not possible, I say it out of the desire not to experiment; so I put it aside. But to find out if it is possible, I will have to experiment with my conditioning, which means I will have to become conscious of the various influences, the various currents, motives, compulsions that are conditioning my mind — both conscious as well as unconscious. So, to be *aware* of the conditioning is the first necessity, not accepting any conditioning as being true or false. Everything is to be recorded — every feeling, every instinct, every movement of thought.

Now, first of all, to become aware of our conditioning, we must surely see, understand, analyse or look at or probe into this question of suppression. This method of disciplining the mind to achieve psychological results is one of the factors of repression because a mind that suppresses, that merely regiments its thoughts to a particular pattern of action, is obviously encouraging and sustaining the existing conditioning. So, shall we examine carefully this question of suppression, this whole moral condemnation of a society, of religion? Because, perhaps if we understand the implication of that suppression and see what is false in it, then we shall be able to approach the problem of how to free the mind without compulsion.

Sir, is understanding a matter of discipline? I want to approach it in as many ways as possible. Do I understand a problem, a conflict, through discipline, through compulsion? Do I understand violence through compulsion? Or am I free from violence through compulsion? Compulsion or suppression or regimentation or discipline arises only when I do not understand something. Let us take the problem of violence and see how to be free of it, because violence is obviously one of the conditionings of the mind.

As long as a mind is violent, obviously it cannot deal with any problem. Can violence be put aside through any form of discipline? Those of you who have disciplined yourself against violence, what have you found? Have you found yourself to be free from it? What

do we mean by disciplining against violence? — surely we build a wall of resistance against the idea, the feeling of violence. Therefore, violence is always on the other side of the wall. Do I understand violence through discipline or do I have to discipline myself to understand violence?

What is required to understand violence? Surely, attention. How does one understand anything? Obviously, by paying attention. Now, is attention the result of distraction? Those of you who have practised paying attention through discipline, have you been able to understand anything? What is the process of disciplining myself in order to pay attention? When I have created a resistance against something, what happens to my mind? What happens when we resist? To find the truth of that matter, we must look at ourselves in operation. What do we mean by the word 'resistance'? To resist implies a denial, a putting away; and to do that I must exert. When a part of my mind is keen on resisting, how can I give full attention?

Again, do I understand anything through habit? Is not resistance, discipline, habit, itself a distraction? And to pay full, complete attention, all distractions must cease. Therefore any sort of discipline is only detrimental to understanding. Do you suggest that at the beginning discipline is necessary in order to pay attention? .But, if the mind once enters the wrong groove, it must obviously pursue that same groove, and therefore the beginning matters as much as the middle or the end. Will a wrong means produce a right end?

So, in order to understand, there must be full attention, and that full attention is really spontaneous; there is no effort. The moment you bring in the action of *will*, there is no understanding. This is so simple. The action of will impedes understanding, and the action of will is discipline — will to understand, will to gain, will to deny, and so on. After freeing the mind from the desire to gain, to be, there comes about much greater creative interest, pleasure and happiness.

*New Delhi*  
*16th November 1948*

## DISCIPLINE AND HABIT

We were discussing, when we last met, the question of discipline and habit. I would like to go into this whole problem of what we mean by discipline and habit. Surely there is a vital difference between understanding and the result achieved through discipline. Understanding, it seems to me, is not the outcome of a mind that is in the habit of a particular pattern of action. Surely, a mind that is trained, specialised to function in a particular habit, is entirely different from a mind that is capable of swift adjustment and is expansive, and has vision and understanding. Surely, there is a difference between the two, is there not?

The world at present is certainly full of imitation. There are vast numbers of people who merely copy — either follow a particular political, religious, pattern or follow a particular authority. Their minds are regimented. You can see throughout the world that the vast majority of people are merely imitative. And I feel that is one of the calamities of modern civilization, where education and the general process of regimentation are making man utterly incapable of real, creative living — in the sense of being free and able to think originally. We see that very few people are capable of being creative. Surely that is what is needed in the world — people who are creative, not merely regimented to follow political, religious or social action. And is creativeness the result of training along a particular technical line? I can learn a technique — how to write a poem, for example. Will that make me a poet? But if I were capable of having-poetic feeling, then I will express it in whatever metre, rhythm or step I want; I will create my rhythm. In other words, I will find language suitable for the thing I want to say. Most of us have nothing to say, but have the technique, and for that technique we think discipline is necessary.

Let us take the problem of violence and see if one can be free from violence through discipline, or if there is only freedom from

violence in understanding violence. To understand violence we must understand how we should approach the problem.

I am violent. How am I to be free from it? I find a substitute for violence — which is merely childish; it is like putting a toy in front of me and attracting my attention away from the other toy. But to be free from violence is my concern, because I see violence is anti-social, is disruptive, it destroys relationship — violence not only physical and sensual but the violence of the mind that twists itself to a certain pattern of action. All these forms of violence are obviously detrimental to creative being which can only take place when the mind is capable of being extremely, intrinsically, quiet.

*Question:* Why should anyone be free from violence?

*Answer:* There are various forms of violence — greed, anger, jealousy, the desire for power and so on.

What does it mean to be free from violence, instinctive or acquired, through sublimation? Now, what do we mean by 'sublimation'? You say by 'sublimation' it is meant that the form of violence is to be changed — if it is violence in the shape of desire. But on the other hand if I am instinctively violent, how am I to be free from that? You say, find a substitute for it — which is a form of sublimation. When we talk about sublimation, we mean, do we not, substituting a greater value; substitution would be the adoption of an ideal — the ideal of nonviolence. I am violent and I sublimate it by following the ideal of nonviolence. Do we not mean by sublimation the act of giving importance to a greater value than violence? That is, I am violent, and to get rid of it I follow, practise, think of nonviolence, the ideal which is of greater value than violence.

Take any other example: take anger. I want to be free from anger. How am I to be free? You suggest that I will be free by sublimating it, which means I find something of greater value. There are three well-known ways of getting rid of anger: to think of its opposite or the ideal which is the opposite, to resist or discipline ourselves by continual habit not to be angry, or through analysis. Let us examine these.

There is the ideal. Anger, which is definitely anti-social, is obviously one of the causes — not only anger but the whole sense of being violent — of war. How are we to be free from violence in the shape of anger? I have been told it is bad, morally, socially, etc. And you say, to get rid of it is to think of the opposite which is nonviolence.

Before I practise the ideal or look to the ideal in order to get rid of anger, for the ideal to act as a lever, I must find out if the ideal exists. Before I can get rid of something which is bad, I want to know the instrument with which to do it and know whether it has got any value or validity. Has nonviolence any value? Is there any truth in the ideal?

*Question:* Is there a difference between righteous indignation and indignation, that is, justifiable anger and non-justifiable anger?

*Answer:* You want to discuss whether righteous anger is justifiable? But I don't want to be angry under any circumstances!

After all, if I have to live with my wife intelligently, in right relationship, the causes of anger and anger itself must disappear. You say I may get rid of it by thinking of the opposite or the ideal which is nonviolence; think about it; meditate on it; practise it. I say to myself, to think about something I must find out its validity, if it has any truth behind it. So I have to investigate into this whole problem of an ideal. Is there an ideal or is it a thing made up by the mind, and therefore equally capable of being twisted by the mind? Is there such a thing as ideal apart from the mind? I want to know the truth of that, because then I can say it exists; I can practise it; substitute it; and get rid of my anger.

You believe in an ideal, in an ideal state, in an ideal marriage, an ideal society, and so on. Of course, the ideal differs with everybody. We believe in an ideal as a means of getting rid of anger — anger which is actual, which is very real — and we must find something equally real to get rid of it, not something fictitious. I must find out whether the ideal is a real, true thing. Now, is an ideal a fact or a fiction of the mind — merely an escape? When I want to get rid of anger, I am thinking of non-anger. And if I can understand this one problem of how to get rid of anger, I can understand the whole

world strung upon opposites — thesis, antithesis and, out of these two, synthesis. That is, man grows through conflict of the opposites. We are going to find out whether thesis, which is anger, can be got rid of only through antithesis, which is the opposite, and that opposite becoming synthesis and so on.

We are discussing this so as to know ourselves, because when we know ourselves, we know we have a basis for thinking, feeling, living; if we do not know ourselves, we have no basis for anything. So these discussions are not intended for any academic knowledge, but to know ourselves, to go into ourselves. I am going to discover myself through this one problem; I am going to find out the way my mind is operating. I am violent; I want to be free from violence, and you say, use nonviolence as a means of getting rid of it. Now, when I do that, what is actually happening? The gentleman suggests that I am disciplining myself to a particular and different type of reaction. To put it very simply, what is the actual state? Do please watch yourselves. At the moment of anger there is no desire; that is, you are simply angry. When the anger disappears, then you think of nonviolence. Now, what is actually happening? Why are you doing this? You are doing this because you want to get rid of anger. The mind is not thinking about anger, but how to change anger into non-anger. So your mind is occupied not with anger but with the desire to become non-angry.

When I am pursuing the ideal, I am only concerned with the ideal and not with 'what is'. This is so simple. I am only concerned with the ideal of nonviolence and not with anger, which means, I am violent and the ideal only helps me to escape from violence; it has not solved violence. Most of us accept the ideal as a means of getting rid of anger. This is a fact. When you look at it a little more closely you discover that the ideal helps you to escape from the actual. So, by thinking about calmness, I haven't solved the question of agitation, have I? So you, who have worshipped the ideal, are obviously indulging in escapes.

So, if the ideal does not help me to get rid of anger, then the ideal goes. You cannot solve this problem of anger if you do not see the falseness of the ideal. Therefore, when we say the ideal is not helpful, is false, fictitious, do we see that the ideal does not solve the problem?

If I can solve the fundamental problem, the outer issues will be resolved. But if I merely resolve the outer issues, the fundamental issues will crop up in another direction. Are we, all of us, concerned with the fundamental desire to get rid of anger or merely the superficial ways which produce certain results? In fact there are no superficial things at all; they are all interrelated. In other words, a fundamental revolution is essential; but mere superficial reform is a deteriorating factor.

What we are discussing is this: if I can find a way of eradicating anger, then perhaps I shall know how to behave — all round. You have told me, the gurus and the *mahatmas* have told me — worship the ideal. But by worshipping the ideal, have I really got rid of anger? Is not my mind worsening, becoming less effective? So, if all this is a fact, can you throw away all your books, your gurus?

If the ideal is not helpful, then I must free the mind from all sense of the conflict of the opposite, because the ideal is the opposite: I am this and I want to be that. When I want to be that, I introduce a new factor which brings a new conflict. So, in pursuing the ideal, I am multiplying conflict all my life.

I am angry for whatever reasons. I am not concerned with the immediate results of anger. I see that if I can get rid of anger from the mind fundamentally and radically, then it will not only have an outward result, but it will have a radical transformation. How am I to bring about that radical transformation? All the books and the *mahatmas* have taught me the ideal; but before I practise the ideal I want to look into the ideal. What is happening to my mind when I am practising the opposite, the ideal? Obviously I am covering up what I am. I have not solved my problem, but I am escaping from it. It may be in escaping that I am pushing it back; but what I am still remains. Therefore I must always live in escapes. What is happening then? I am this; I am living in an escape, with the result there is always a battle. In the act of getting rid of anger which is conflict, I have introduced other conflicts. Is that a solution to the problem at all?

I question a person who offers an ideal as a solution. He is only sitting upon a volcano. I may sit on it, I may cover the fact with the

ideal, but it is still there. So I have never looked into it.

The gentleman asks if even the ideal of freedom from desire is not also bad. I say, of course. Any ideal is bound to be an escape from 'what is'. If that is so, if the ideal is not true, then that has gone out of my system. I am no longer thinking in terms of the ideal; I am no longer interested in the ideal. I object to the whole process of creating an ideal; it is such a false thing.

The next is discipline. What do we mean by discipline? I am angry; I am disciplining myself not to be angry or violent. What does that discipline mean? — it tells me to resist anger, practise calmness, thinking of the Buddha as the calm man, the ideal. What does all that mean? That is a distraction from what you *are*. Therefore, discipline against anger is distraction; it does not get rid of anger.

I want to subjugate anger. But see the implication. When I discipline myself, the implication is that I am conforming to an idea; the idea is the opposite of what I am; and therefore I am resisting what I am; I have not understood what I am; I am merely resisting it. What happens when you resist something? I build a barrier between myself and violence. The wall is there, but the violence is on the other side; and the more I practise, in the form of resistance, the more dull I become; we are bound to. When we are practising discipline against anger, we are suppressing anger. The anger is still there; only it may not be on the outward surface; it is inwardly rotting. Therefore discipline is a form of suppression and it does not solve anything.

*Question:* What do you mean by anger?

*Answer:* I mean by anger violent response, either outwardly or inwardly. I want to be free from that violent response.

I see that while the mind is in conflict it is incapable of creative thinking. Don't you know, sir, that to create something your mind must be empty? The problem is so vast, so delicate. For violence, anger, to be radically eradicated, the ideal is not helpful; nor is discipline.

Now let us take analysis; this is a little more difficult. To analyse something, you need to have a mind that is not biased. To analyse something I must be incapable of distortion; to analyse something and to understand what I am analysing, my mind must be able to look at it as it is. That is one difficulty.

Then to analyse something fully, I must not miss any step in the analysis, because if I miss one step, the conclusion will be wrong; it will lead me in the wrong direction.

And to analyse, I must find out who the analyser is. To analyse clearly there must be no distorting factor; secondly, I must not miss a step; obviously, because the moment I miss something, the conclusion may be wrong. Thirdly, I must know and find out who is the analyser. Therefore, I have to find out if the thinker is separate from the thought. Hence the implication is: are the thinker and the thought separate? or are they joint phenomena? I must see the difficulty, this enormous difficulty of freeing the mind from any distorting factor in analysis. In analysing I might find something which will be very disturbing and therefore I do not want to analyse. These are the difficulties in analysis.

The ideal is not the way; discipline is not the way; and you think analysis is the way. But it is the most complex way, is it not? Therefore, there must be another way of resolving anger altogether. You will find the way only when you discard the above three ways. How do you discard the three ways? Only by seeing their falseness. To see that these ways are false, you must have a very sharp intellect. After looking at these paths, travelling on these paths and discovering that they lead nowhere, the mind is much more agile, much more quick, much more subtle.

What is the way to dissolve anger? What I can say will have no meaning unless you have travelled the three paths and discarded them. I have to go very carefully and subtly, as I would to understand my child — I do not condemn him; I do not judge him; but I observe, I study all his moods. And I can only study when my mind is very alert, not condemning but watching. Similarly, I see that it is possible to be so aware of my anger.

*New Delhi*

*25th November 1948*

## THE CORRIDORS OF DUALITY

There are so many things that one has to talk about, so many complex problems that one has to observe and learn about. And, as we were saying the other day, to learn is to observe.

The scientist observes through his microscope. He doesn't bring in his personality, his idiosyncrasies, his prejudices and his conclusions. He looks through the microscope very carefully, and he has to prove what he sees to other scientists. The scientist and the other scientists must see the same thing; otherwise it is not a new discovery, a new understanding.

This evening, we are going to observe very carefully, as the scientists do, the many problems that we have — not with our particular prejudices or our conclusions or what we have already learnt or will learn — but merely observe, and that's one of the most difficult things. Just to watch so that we see things as they are, not twist them to suit our particular inclination, our particular fancy, but to observe, is to learn and to act.

And one of the major problems is this question of violence that exists throughout the world — that man is violent. You have had in this country, quite recently, the appalling thing that went on in a town nearby, the murdering of children, racial prejudice, religious prejudice, bigotry. There's violence everywhere, and with violence goes aggression and all the brutality, the ugliness of life. It is an evil thing — if one can use that word — to be really violent. Man apparently has not been able to rid himself of this aggression, brutality, cruelty, violence. He has preached and talked a great deal about nonviolence, the ideal which has led him into a great many hypocritical activities. So why are we violent? Not as an idea, but actually, why is a human being, who is so extraordinarily clever, so capable of doing the most astonishing things technologically — you and I and the rest of the world — why is it that we are violent? One can give many, many explanations; that one has

inherited it from the animal, the social structure, education, the division between man and man, the division brought about by nationality, religious dogmas, beliefs, the religious propaganda, the innumerable divisions which inevitably do bring about conflict and therefore violence.

Why is it that we are violent and why is it that we cannot be completely, totally, free of it? This is a very important question. Man has fought with this question for millions of years — violence as opposed to peace, aggression as opposed to compassion, goodness as opposed to evil. We have lived amidst this duality, this conflict, all our lives. And yet, with society becoming complex, technology advancing so rapidly, why is it that we remain as we have been for thousands of years? We must answer this question not verbally, but in our own hearts, not explain it away or justify it, but see that we are violent in our speech, in our gesture, in our activity. When we are ambitious, when we are competitive, we are violent; when we are trying to conform to a pattern, forcing ourselves to think in a certain way, we are violent. And we ask ourselves why, and whether it is possible to be free of it. You are not going to be told by the speaker how to be free from violence, but rather, we are going to observe why there is this enormous weight of violence with its guilt.

You know, one of the things that most of us lack is the sense of beauty. Beauty implies great sensitivity, not only organically, physically, but also a great sensitivity of the heart and the mind, because to be sensitive implies being intelligent, not intellectual. Intelligence implies an understanding of the whole, total movement of life. Not the broken-up life, not the fragmented parts of life, but the whole movement of living. And unless one is aware of the extraordinary beauty of the earth, of nature, of the clouds, the light on the water, the beauty of a solitary tree in a field, the beauty, the richness of a rice field, the beauty of a face, the beauty of a smile and the sadness of tears — not only your tears but the tears of another — to the squalor, to the dirt, to the poverty, to the brutality, the utter callousness, unless you are aware of all this with passion, sensitive to all these, you will never understand what violence is and be free of it. See the relationship between violence and beauty. And we are going to learn this evening what this beauty is; not only the visual beauty, the beauty that the eye sees,

but also the beauty of clear, unspotted perception, to see things exactly as they are — not according to our temperament.

In India they have divided — I don't know why — the human mind or human intelligence into the various types of *yoga* — *karma yoga*, *bhakti yoga*, *gnana yoga* and all that business, and so we think man must approach life through action only, and so he sees life only through action. The devotee, if there is such a person — which I doubt very much — is sentimental, emotional, but that's not devotion. The devotee thinks he can see through or observe very clearly only through devotion. Or they understand this whole movement and the beauty of the movement of life through knowledge. Surely these divisions of the human mind not only create exterior contradiction, opposition, but also bring about conflict within the mind itself. Such a mind is incapable of observation, of seeing things exactly as they are. If you see as a devotee, or as a very learned, intellectual man of great knowledge, you'll only see that particular, narrow pattern of your existence.

So, to observe, one must abandon all these divisions. If the scientist observes with a conclusion, then he doesn't see what is actually taking place. So, if you will, this evening, put aside your particular little conditioning, your particular little temperament, the fact that you are very clever, very learned, you are a great devotee. You know, the devotee is the most cruel person because there is a division between himself and the thing he is devoted to. So where there is division, there must be cruelty. He may cry, he may be over-emotional, sentimental, put garlands round somebody's neck or round an idol, or go into a dithery state of emotionalism; but such a devotee not only destroys himself, he also spoils that word 'devotion'. Similarly the intellectual, because he also sees life only through that little pattern of intellect.

So, we should put aside all that and observe that human beings are violent, not the American or the Hindu or the Muslim, but human beings. And the human being, as he is violent, angry, jealous, having a competitive spirit, obviously doesn't see the beauty of life. He only knows sorrow, guilt, the terrible loneliness of life and existence — the life that has no meaning whatsoever as it is lived. So to understand, to observe, there must be this sensitivity of the mind, the heart and the brain, not only physical sensitivity. And

most of us have not even physical sensitivity because we overindulge either in sex or in our appetite for food. How can you have a very delicate, sensitive body which is tremendously alive? So we are going to enquire, learn together — which is really to communicate — about what love is. Please bear in mind all the time that the description is not the described, the word is never the thing. However much the speaker may explain, what he explains is not the explained, the thing that you see.

So, to understand this word 'violence', the meaning of that word, what lies behind that word, one has to be free. And you cannot be free of violence if there is no sensitivity to the beauty of everything about you, sensitivity to the world. So there must be freedom to find out what love is. You know that word is a dangerous word. Freedom for most people is to do what they like to do. Driven to fulfil their appetites in different ways, they demand freedom, freedom from social restrictions, social morality.

Social morality — please listen carefully — is immorality. Do you accept that? Social morality is respectability and nothing else. You can be socially moral and yet deceive your neighbour, go to war, be ambitious, greedy, envious, angry — and all that is tolerated, admitted. As long as you comply, conform, imitate the pattern of established morality, you are considered moral. So social morality is immorality. It's not what the speaker says. Observe it in your life and you will see how immoral you are. You may be respectably married, go to the church or the temple or the mosque, but inwardly, deeply, you are not only ambitious, greedy, violent, but you are everlastingly in conflict within yourself.

So freedom is necessary to learn together what love is. Freedom *from* is one thing and freedom for itself is another. Freedom from something is not freedom; it is only a reaction to have freedom. Freedom from anger is not freedom. Freedom to do what you like is not freedom. But to find out the extraordinary implications of freedom, to learn about it, means to have a mind that has never a conclusion, never a formula. Only to such a mind that is free through negation of what is not freedom is there freedom. You cannot have freedom as a positive act.

By understanding what disorder is, learning about it — learning,

not saying this is disorder or order; learning, which means enquiring, studying, observing, watching, listening to your own disorders within yourself and outwardly — there is order. Learning about disorder and denying that disorder, there is order.

You know, order is virtue. Not the virtue that you have cultivated; virtue cannot be cultivated. Virtue is not a conclusion. It is that quality of mind that has put away disorder, has understood it, has completely learnt what disorder is, which is effort, conflict, struggle — and, through the negation of that, comes to the movement of order.

That order is a constant movement, a living thing: therefore it cannot be put in a pattern, into a framework. So freedom is that quality of mind in which there is the total sense of the negation of everything that man has put together psychologically, which means all his conclusions — that there is god, that there is no god, that this is moral, this is not moral, that a man of god must not look at a woman; those are all conclusions. And through the negation of that, which means you in your daily life deny all that, that your mind is no longer pursuing or acting or living according to a conclusion, there is real freedom.

So, with that, we are going to learn what learning is, what love is. To learn, that is, to communicate with each other. You are not learning from the speaker; he is not teaching you what love is. Love cannot be taught. You cannot cultivate it. But again, to find out what it is, you have to find out what it is not. Through negation there is the positive, but if you pursue the positive, you will never find it. And your positive is always based on a conclusion. So, together we are going to learn. And to learn means to observe, not according to your temperament, not according to your particular prejudice, conclusion or even your experience or observation. It means to observe without a conclusion, so that you and the speaker see the same thing at the same time, with the same intensity, which means with the same pattern; otherwise, communication ceases, there is no learning.

One also has to find out, learn, what fear is. Because where there is fear of any kind, obviously there cannot be this quality, this extraordinary thing called love. And to learn about fear requires a

very subtle mind. If you say you must get rid of fear, you must have courage, you will never be free of fear. Because, to say you must be courageous is a decision based on a conclusion, and a mind that acts according to a conclusion is the most destructive mind. It's like a mind that says 'I am a Hindu' — the most stupid mind. Because, the moment you have said you are a Parsee, Hindu, Muslim, you separate yourself and therefore create a division and, therefore, conflict.

So you must understand fear, understand it, learn about it, not from the speaker, but through your own observation as you are sitting there, looking at your own fears, whether they are hidden or open, not only physical fears. There is the fear that you may fall ill again and have pain again, and there are the hidden forms of fear: losing a job, fear of your husband, your wife, fear of death, fear of what the neighbour might say about you, fear of all the incidents, experiences of the past, fear of the future, you know, the fear that each one has.

To learn about fear you must also learn about pleasure, because these two go together; they are two sides of the same coin. Pleasure is entirely different from joy, from ecstasy. This is very important to understand, because we are going to go into something which you won't like. What is pleasure? You have had the experience of a delight yesterday, looking at that sunset or the pleasure of your sexual expression. You see that sunset and you remember that sunset. You have had sexual pleasure and you remember that pleasure. When you see that sunset, at that moment there is no interference of thought. Then thought comes along and says, 'What a lovely thing that was! I wish I could have it again.' Thought gives a continuity, nourishment, to that particular experience, to that particular incident, to that particular sensuous delight, thinking about it, creating images, chewing it over.

So thought cultivates pleasure as thought cultivates fear. Something happened yesterday which gave pain and is not to be repeated again tomorrow. Thought, thinking about that pain, not wanting it tomorrow, is the same as thought thinking about that incident which gave pleasure, thinking about it, hoping for it to happen again tomorrow. It is the same thing as having had physical or psychological pain yesterday, thinking about it, not wanting it tomorrow. So, thought breeds both fear and pleasure.

Human beings throughout history, morally and physically, have pursued pleasure. Your gods, your rituals, your morality are based on pleasure, and pleasure has become extraordinarily important. We are not saying pleasure is wrong. We are not condemning it; we are looking at it. Therefore we are not saying it's right or wrong, to be encouraged or discouraged. We are learning about it. So we are pursuing pleasure; the pleasure of a physical sensation; pleasure of a flattering word, pleasure of possession, whether it is a piece of furniture or a bank account; the pleasure of a position; the pleasure of being highly respectable, which is highly immoral, which doesn't mean you can do what you like; the pleasure of having a good meal

And you say a religious man must have no pleasure. That is, he must be chaste; he must have no sexual relationship. You clothe him with a peculiar garment of a peculiar colour and you hang this around his neck; and he, the poor man, accepts that as the way to find God — if there is such a thing — and becomes highly respectable. And you, who are also highly respectable, say that a man of god must not touch a woman. This is the conclusion, right throughout the world: to find god you must be chaste; you mustn't touch a woman or a man. Just think what you have done. *You* can have as much as you like, but the religious man can't. And if a religious man with that robe does have, you condemn him, you boil up. And the poor man is also boiling inside: he wants it. So his religion, his conditioning, says, 'Don't look at a woman, don't have pleasure; therefore, don't look at the beautiful sky, don't look at the lovely movement of a tree, don't look at the squalor, filth on the road, don't look at the light on a leaf, because all that might give you pleasure.' This is the standard morality of the so-called man of god. He shuts his eyes to everything and inwardly he is tortured because he is a human being, a physical organism, his glands are working, his mind is twisted, and you expect a mind that is tortured, twisted, distorted, to find reality. How childish it is! How murderous you people are!

There is violence. All your *mahatmas* and your saints have said no. And they live in torture, and a tortured mind cannot look. What it sees is distorted and, therefore, its gods are distorted.

And why has sex become so extraordinarily important in life?

Have you ever asked yourself? Or do you just shut your ears to all this? Why? — not only in Europe, America and her, but everywhere. There it is more open, here it is all under cover — don't talk about it; don't look at it. And you ask why throughout the world sex and love go together? why it has become extraordinarily important? Not only has it become important because it is pleasurable, but also because intellectually you are slaves. Intellectually you repeat what other people have said. You are very good at quoting, very good at memorising, and that's your education — learning by heart what somebody says. You pass an exam, get a job, and that's the end of it. So intellectually — which is the capacity to think clearly, independently, logically, reason objectively, and therefore without fear — you are dead. You may have a technique, or have learnt a new technique: how to run a computer or go into big business; but as far as the quality of the mind goes, as far as investigating, searching, asking, looking, doubting goes, you are utterly immature. And emotionally you live within a pattern — what is right, what is wrong; this is good, this is bad; and you are frightened.

So, intellectually, emotionally, you are not free. You are second-hand human beings and, therefore, you have only one thing left — sex. And that too you are frightened of because you are living in a pattern, saying that if you want to find truth, don't look at a woman or a man. And that you call love. You understand what you have done? Sex and love go together.

And is love pleasure? Is love desire? To find what love is, you have to see what fear is and what pleasure is, not condemn it, but understand it, feel it with your heart. So to learn about pleasure and fear is the first thing — to learn how your mind lives in pleasure and therefore invites fear. If you can't have your pleasure tomorrow, you are frightened, angry, you are brutal. There begins violence, there begins your defence, your resistance and thereby your fear.

So one has to understand this quality of mind that looks and learns, that doesn't function in formulas, in concepts. So what is love? *You* are asking the question, not the speaker. In your life, if you observe, you have no beauty. You may hang a picture on your wall if you are fairly rich, or you may go to an art gallery and talk

endlessly about art or go to a concert and talk about music, and the more you talk about it, the more empty your heart is. So, what is love? Surely love is the dying to everything that man has put together as the formula of what love is — dying to the past. It means that to love is to live in the movement of the present.

So, we are living as human beings in the past *all* the time. We are the past, aren't we? When you say 'I am' or when you say 'I will be' or 'I will become', it is always in terms of the past, of what you have been, what you were. So a mind that lives in the past doesn't know what love is. The past may be the past experience of your sexual pleasure which thought thinks about, builds an image of and, according to that image, getting excited and acting. So love not the description, don't learn the description by heart, but see what love is, see that a mind that is caught in the net of the past doesn't know what it means to love. Therefore, to love, die to the past, die completely, don't fight it. As long as the mind is caught in the image of the past, how can the heart live in the present? And love *is* the present, not tomorrow. Therefore, it cannot be cultivated; therefore it is not at the behest of time. So the mind that is free of time comes to that feeling, to that movement of what is called love. So, to find out, to learn, there must be freedom from violence. There must be great sensitivity to beauty — whether it is the beauty of a man, a woman, a face or the beauty of a lovely tree, and the understanding, the learning with your heart and mind, of the whole structure and nature of pleasure and fear. Therefore there is an understanding, a learning of what order is. It is only such a mind, such a heart, that can come upon this word which is so heavily loaded and spoiled.

You have been given a piece of earth, and what are you going to do with that earth? Put it in your pocket or intellectually discuss it? What are you going to do with it? If you have a piece of earth, you cultivate, you grow things on it. To grow things on it you must have energy, passion, drive, intensity. This you have discovered, you have learnt. And are you going to keep it just at the intellectual level? Or are you going to live it, and therefore let the treasure of it become extraordinarily clear, more vibrant, alive?

So that's the question the speaker would like to ask. What are you going to do? You have lived ten years, thirty years, or eighty

years. What have you done with your life? Don't say I am going to fulfil next life. There is only the present — the beauty of the present, the richness of the present. You have had this life, this extraordinary thing called life in which there is sorrow, pleasure, fear, guilt, and all the tortures and the loneliness and the despair of life, and the beauty of life. You have had it. And what have you done with it? Do consider it, and it is very important to ask and to answer it. When you ask it, don't go to bed with sorrow because you have done nothing. A life was given to you, the most precious thing in the world, and what have you done? You have distorted it, tortured it, torn it to pieces, divided it, brought about violence, destruction, hatred, without love, without compassion, without passion. And if you can answer it, you will find out what love is.

*Bombay, 3rd Public Talk  
14th December 1969*

## THE KRISHNAMURTI ARCHIVES

K.F.I. Headquarters  
Vasanta Vihar  
64-65, Greenways Road  
Madras - 600 028  
Tel.: 416803/417596

The Krishnamurti Archives at Vasanta Vihar, Madras, are being reorganized to incorporate material which are not presently available in our collection. The archives here contain the following Krishnamurti material and would be greatly enhanced by your gift or bequest of any of these:

- All of Krishnamurti's books, both in and out of print.
- Original hand-written manuscripts of several early books.
- Foreign language translations of all Krishnamurti's books.
- Books about Krishnamurti.
- Books that contain quotes from Krishnamurti.
- Newspaper and magazine articles on Krishnamurti.
- Pamphlets and brochures related to Krishnamurti.
- Phonograph records of early talks.
- Master audio and video tapes of talks and discussions.
- Films of Krishnamurti.
- Letters to and from Krishnamurti.

(Confidentiality of the letters will be honoured if the donor so wishes. We will be happy to receive *authentic copies* if originals cannot be spared. We shall be bound by any stipulation regarding material given in sealed covers, to be opened after specified date. Names and intimate references could be blacked out in material donated, if the donor so wishes.)

- Photographs of Krishnamurti, including group photographs.
- Masters and Doctoral theses on Krishnamurti's teachings.
- Old issues of : *Herald of the Star*

*International Bulletin of the Order  
of the Star in the East*

*The Brothers of the Star*

*The Halcyon*

*The Server*

*Shishya*

If you have, or know of others having these or any other archive material connected with Krishnamurti, please contact the K.F.I. Headquarters at the address given above.

Secretary  
KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

## **Books : J. Krishnamurti**

<b>Talks &amp; Dialogues</b>	<b>Rs. P</b>
The Way of Intelligence (Hard cover)	95.00
The way of Intelligence (Paperback)	50.00
Commentaries on Living I Series	22.00
Commentaries on Living II Series	22.00
Commentaries on Living III Series	25.00
The Penguin Krishnamurti Reader	78.00
The Second Penguin Krishnamurti Reader	78.00
The Flight of the Eagle	25.00
You are the World	25.00
The Impossible Question	78.00
Beyond Violence	18.00
Tradition and Revolution	25.00
Krishnamurti's Notebook	25.00
The Network of Thought	50.00
Questions and Answers	25.00
Mind Without Measure	30.00
The Flame of Attention	30.00
Talks by Krishnamurti in India (1967)	10.00
Talks and Dialogues	35.00
Truth and Actuality	75.00
Wholeness of Life	40.00
Talk at Los Alamos	3.00
Exploration into Insight	20.00
<b>On Education</b>	
Beginnings of Learning (Penguin paperback)	86.00
Letters to the Schools — Vol. I	16.00
Letters to the Schools — Vol. II	10.00
<b>On Krishnamurti</b>	
Krishnamurti: The Years of Awakening — a biography by Mary Lutyens (paperback)	55.00
Krishnamurti: The Years of Fulfilment	55.00
One Thousand Moons: A book of Photographs by Asit Chandmal (Hard cover)	195.00
Within the Mind	40.00
The Seer Who Walks Alone	1.00
<b>Pamphlets</b>	
Inward Flowering	3.00
A Dialogue with Oneself	2.00
Core of the Teachings	1.00
Book of Life	2.00

---

Published by Dr. Radhika Herzberger for the Krishnamurti Foundation India,  
64-65, Greenways Road, Madras-600 028 and printed at Sidma Offset Press  
Private Limited, Madras-600 086.

Editor : Dr. Radhika Herzberger

---

### **RAJGHAT GATHERING 1987**

A gathering of persons interested in the teachings of Shri. J. Krishnamurti is being organized at Rajghat, Varanasi from October 26 to 29, 1987. Those interested in participating should write to the Secretary, Rajghat Education Centre, Krishnamurti Foundation India, Rajghat Fort, Varanasi 221001 for details.

---