

BULLETIN

1/89

**KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION
INDIA**

FROM THE EDITOR

The format of the K.F.I. Bulletin will now be expanded to include articles on J. Krishnamurti, interviews, book reviews, and reports on work being done at the various Krishnamurti Centres around the world; Krishnamurti's writings, his recorded talks and discussions will, however, remain the chief focus of the Bulletin.

In this issue the Bulletin addresses the important question of what it means to preserve and spread Krishnamurti's teachings. Krishnamurti expressed himself on the subject at various times in his life. Towards the very end of his life, answering a question about how the teaching could be preserved without corruption, he said: '(it) depends on you, not upon somebody else. If it means nothing except words, then it will go the way of the rest. If it means something very deep to you, to you personally, then it won't be corrupted'. We reproduce his answer to the similar question put to him in 1947.

Krishnamurti did not consider himself to be establishing a new religion; he was sceptical of all institutionlized religions, with their trappings of ritual and dogmas. But he was interested in education which has its basis in the sacred, and he approached the sacred through the method of doubt and enquiry. What does it mean to lead a religious life at a school? The answer unfolds in a discussion held at Ojai in March, 1978 which is included here.

This issue concludes with a review from Yugoslavia of *The Urgency of Change*. The author sees Krishnamurti against the background of the Christian Church dedicated to preserving the faith. The review may be of special interest to those of our readers who are wondering about the impact of Krishnamurti's thought on Eastern Europe.

The Bulletin will continue to appear 3 times a year. The annual subscription is Rs.22, and life subscription Rs.250. Friends of the Foundation receive a complimentary copy of the Bulletin.

REPORT ON THE MADRAS GATHERING 1989

The quiet and beautiful campus of 'Vasanta Vihar', the headquarters of the Krishnamurti Foundation India, was the venue of the Annual Gathering this year from Jan. 21st to Jan. 23rd 1989. About 300 people from all over India and abroad gathered together to enquire into the questions and perceptions generated by Śrī.J. Krishnamurti. Arrangements for accommodation and food were made at the Theosophical Society, Adayar. Each day the participants were transported from the Society to 'Vasanta Vihar' and back by special buses.

Amidst trees on the ground where Krishnamurti held his public talks, the day's programme began with a session of silence. This was followed by a brief introductory talk on a chosen topic. On the first day, Śrī Achyut Patwardhan spoke on 'To be is to be related'. The second day's theme, 'Living sanely in an insane world' was initiated by Smt. Radha Burnier and on the third day, Smt. Pupul Jayakar spoke on 'The Nature of Perception'. After the talks the participants split into ten smaller groups to explore the issue in depth.

The afternoons were devoted to video shows of Krishnamurti's Talks on topics such as Desire, Fear, Conflict, Brain and Intelligence etc.

In the evenings there was time for informal get-togethers and cultural programmes. Dr N. Ramani's melodious flute was greatly appreciated as was the Dance-Drama 'Ritu' enacted by the children of The School. The children had set up a beautiful display of their poems, paintings and craft work. Every morning they also distributed a news-letter based on their interviews with the participants. The exhibition-cum-sale of Krishnamurti's books and cassettes evoked a good response. The participants were presented with a 'Gathering file' containing Krishnamurti's writings especially compiled for the occasion.

In the concluding session on the 23rd, Śrī Rajesh Dalal, Resident Member of K.F.I at 'Vasanta Vihar' spoke to the participants on the concerns and activities of the Study Centre. Śrī R.R. Upansani, the Secretary of K.F.I thanked the participants for their cooperation in making the gathering a serious and meaningful one. He hoped that the participants would keep the enquiry alive till the next gathering at Rajghat, Varanasi in November 1989.

The gathering ended with the benediction of K's talk on 'Religion'.

ON SPREADING THE TEACHING

Krishnamurti was asked this question in Madras, India on December 28th, 1947.

I am very interested in your teachings; I would like to spread them. What is the best way to do it?

Krishnamurti: Many things are involved in this question. Let us look at it. Propaganda is a lie because mere repetition is not truth. What you can repeat is a lie. Truth cannot be repeated for truth can only be experienced directly; mere repetition is a lie because repetition implies imitation. That which you repeat may be truth to someone but when you repeat it, it ceases to be truth. Propaganda is one of the terrible things in which we are caught. You know something or you don't know something. Usually you have read something in some books and you have heard some talk and you want to spread it. Have words any significance besides the verbal meaning? So what you are spreading is really words and do words or terms resolve our problems? Say, for instance, you believe in reincarnation; you don't know why you believe but you want to spread that belief. What are you spreading in fact? Your belief, terms, words, your convictions which are still within the field, within the layer of verbal expression.

We think in words, in terms, we seek explanations which are still only words and we are caught in this monstrous lie, believing that the word is the thing. Surely, the word God is not God, but you believe that the word is God and that therefore you can spread it. Please see this. To you the word has become important, and not reality. So you are caught in the verbal level and what you want to spread is the word. That means you will catch what I am saying in the net of words and so cause a new division between man and man. Then you will create a new system based on Krishnamurti's words which you the propagandist will spread among other propagandists who are also caught in words and thereby what have you done? Whom have you helped? No, sirs, that is not the way. So don't try what is stupid, what is the height of folly—to spread someone else's experience.

If you experience something directly, it would be experience not based on belief; because what you believe you experience and therefore it is not real experience but only conditioned experience. There can be experience, the right kind of experience, only when thinking ceases, but that experience cannot be spread as information to clear the mess. But if you begin to understand simple things like nationalism, surely you can discuss it with others, in order to make it known as a poison which

is destroying man. Sirs, you are not aware of the enormous calamity that lies in wait for you and for the whole world because this poison is spreading. You are nationalists; you are Hindus against Pakistan, against England, against Germany, against Russia, and so on. So, nationalism is a poison, is it not? You can understand that very easily because it divides men. You cannot be a nationalist and talk of brotherhood; these terms are contradictory. That also you can understand, that you can talk about. But you don't want to talk about that because that would mean a change of heart within yourself, which means that you must cease to be a Hindu with your beliefs, ceremonies and all the rubbish that is around you. We don't talk about nationalism because we might be asked if we are free of it ourselves. Not being free, we evade it and try to discuss something else. Surely you can talk about something which you live and which you are doing every day, and that is what I have been talking about—your daily actions, your daily thoughts and feelings. My words you cannot repeat. If you do, they will have no meaning. But you can talk about the way you live, the way you act, the way you think, from which alone there can be understanding — all *that* you can discuss; but there is no use of groups with presidents and secretaries and organizations which are terrible things in which you are often caught. Sirs, though you all smile, yet surely you are all caught in these.

I don't think you know how catastrophic the whole situation is in the world now. I don't have to frighten you. You have merely to pick up a newspaper and read about it. You are on the edge of a precipice and you still perform ceremonies, carry on in your stupid ways, blind to what is happening. You can only alter by transformation of yourself and not by the introduction of a new system whether of the left or of the right. In the transformation of yourself is the only hope but you cannot transform yourself, radically, profoundly, if you are above all a Hindu, if you perform ceremonies, if you are caught in the net of organizations.

As it has always been in the past, so also at the present time the salvation of man is in his being creative. You are caught inwardly in belief, in fear and in those hindrances that prevent the coming together of man and man. That is, if I don't know how to love you, how to love my neighbor, my wife, how can there be communion between us. We need communion, not communion between systems but communion between you and me without systems, without organizations and that means we must really know how to love one another, our hearts must be opened to one another, but your hearts cannot be open if you belong to an organization, if you are bound by beliefs, if you are nationalistic, if you are a *brāhman* or a *śūdra*.

So, you can spread even a tiny part of what I have been talking about only as you live it. It is by your life that you communicate profoundly, not through words. Words, sirs, to a serious, thoughtful man have very little meaning. Terms are of very little significance when you are really seeking truth, truth in relationship and not an abstract truth of valuations, of things, or of ideas. If you want to find the truth of those things verbally, it is of little importance; but words become very important when you are not seeking truth; then the word is the thing and then the thing catches you. So, if you want to spread these teachings, live them, and by your life you will be spreading them. You will be communicating them, which is much more true and significant than verbal repetition, for repetition is imitation and imitation is not creativeness and you as an individual must awake to your own conditioning and thereby free yourself and hence give love to another.

**DISCUSSION BETWEEN J. KRISHNAMURTI,
OAK GROVE SCHOOL STAFF AND DR DAVID BOHM**

Pine Cottage, Ojai. March 25th, 1978.

Opening statement by Principal:

We would like to discuss this question of what it means to lead a religious life at the school and in the community.

KRISHNAMURTI: That's a complex question. I wonder, what do you mean by a religious life? What do we understand by the word religion? Would you call all that goes on in the name of religion real?

QUESTIONER: It seems to be the outward form of religions, not the substance.

K: But would you call those religions?

Q: No.

K: Then what do you mean by religion? We may all not agree. If you have one direction and I have another, as teachers we will be contradicting each other and creating confusion in the students. So we must all be clear about what we mean by that word "religion".

Q: Krishnaji, I wonder if there is any point in simply looking at the dictionary meaning of the word. I looked it up and they gave two different meanings: one was "to gather together" and the other was "to bind".

K: "To bind" and "to gather together", even that is gone, denied; they have gone much further.

Q: Also we have to pay attention...

K: To pay attention, to be diligent and not negligent; that is one of the factors. To be diligent in the service of God; not to neglect it, but that again is further expansion. I would like to know what you all think, what you all want and mean by the word "religion".

Q: Without giving any sort of definition in saying what it means to me, it has to do with respect for facts.

K: Respect for facts? Is that what religion means to you?

Q: I think to me it means to lead a whole life.

K: Would you all agree with that? What does it mean, "a whole life"? Don't let us be theoretical or hypothetical or say religion should be that. Then we are getting lost in words and abstractions. In actual fact what do we mean by a religious life? Fact, the actual mind that sees, that is aware, is that living a religious life?

Q: I think I would concur with what was said. May be one of the main facets for me of a religious life is to have that sense of totality, of wholeness.

K: Do you have that feeling? Does this reality, this state of wholeness of life exist in you who say, "I am leading a religious life" — not in theory, not supposition, not to concur, agree or disagree, but actually? Would you say a religious life is one in which there is no contradiction? Is that part of it? I am just beginning to explore it so please don't agree or disagree. Has it to do with no conflict whatsoever in all our actions, in all our responses? Would you say one of the factors of a religious life is a life in which contradiction ceases? Would you also say it is a life in which there is no effort? You see, this becomes very difficult. I think the Catholics, when they say "Give over your life to God, let His will be done", imply in that the idea that you are his instrument: whatever He directs you do, so that you have no will of your own; you have no effort or contradictions because you are carrying out His will. This is what the Catholics and those people who are deeply "religious", in quotes, in India and the Asiatic world have said. Would that be a fact to you?

Q: You mean with that attitude of surrender...

K: Not attitude.

Q: With the surrendering of one's will...

K: One's self. Don't even use "will". I use Catholic terminology for the moment, or Christian terminology, but it is giving oneself over to an outside agency called God, Krishna, Buddha, whatever it is.

Q: I think the danger would be...

K: No, not danger. Don't discuss; apply, find out if you think that way, if you live that way. You understand what I mean?

Q: Yes.

K: With no effort, no conflict, no contradiction in oneself, actually know, be aware if you are living a non-contradictory life. And also, would you say that a religious life is a life in which there is total order, not only in your room or in something, but total order inwardly? And would you agree that a religious life is also concerned to bring about true relationship with each other; would you consider in a religious life a mind that is in a state of meditation?

Q: Is there an essential quality or factor in all these different aspects of the religious life?

K: Oh, yes. But a total abnegation of the self means nothing at all; the self is conflict. The self is divisive; the self is concerned with its own achievement, and all the rest of it. So don't come to that immediately, if you don't mind. I am asking, if one is living a religious life, is one diligent in freeing the mind from all kinds of conflict? Will you do this; will we all do this? If you say that is right, if you see that way of living frees the mind to observe without the observer, would you also find out what meditation is? You see, sir, you've all become silent. Where is the dialogue?

Q: Would you say that conflict of mind is still rooted in the complexity of the mind? Would you say that conflict of the mind prevents that meditative state?

K: Have you done any meditation, any of you? A true, acute silence. What does it mean? Do you know anything about it? How then can you ask what is a religious life? Have you done it? You know, that word has become common language in America, terrible. Transcendental Meditation; the meditation according to some guru. There is Zen meditation, Buddhist meditation, Tibetan meditation and the inventions of various gurus. So there is this vast field in which they are all asserting, "This is meditation". So what is it that you are doing, or are you not interested in it?

Q: I think most of the people at this school are here because of this, to find out.

K: Because of meditation?

Q: To find out what this means.

K: So can we go into it, step by step, and will you at the end of it say, "Yes, sir, I understand it and it will be done", not just practise and talk about it next year or a fortnight later? Because it becomes rather tiresome, rather boring.

Should we begin with, “A religious life is a life of absolute order”? When I use the word “absolute” I mean what it says, not something relative but complete, total, absolute order. Will you begin with that? Shall we talk about it? That’s part of it because if you have order, there is no conflict. Now what do you mean by “order” — not what you think is order, not what I think, not opinions, judgements, conclusions, but — what is order? Go into it. A monk would say it is order to give up your family, join a monastery; or in India become a *Sannyāsī* who wanders all over, begging, being fed, clothed, and preaching. But I am asking you what you consider order.

Q: Doesn’t it have something to do with seeing, seeing “what is” for what it is, and out of that seeing where things belong or what is their right place?

K: Are you in order? In yourself? I am sorry to bring it down to persons but otherwise you can’t discuss these things. Do you teachers, educators have inner order? You have said, “What do you mean by that word order?” Do go slowly. I would like to find out what is order. You are already defining it, therefore you are not moving, exploring. What is order in your life, actually; not theoretically, not invented order, but what is order? What do you mean by the word? You want children in the classroom to be orderly, right?

Q: It means things to be in right relationship with one another.

K: What do you mean by it, sir? You ask children to be orderly, to be punctual; I want to begin at the lowest level. You define it and in that definition we are including things. I want to explore without defining, without including, just to see. If I am an educator, in my dealings with the students, what do I mean by “order” there in the classroom, at that level?

Q: There are simple, outward things of being on time, doing things in an orderly way.

K: Do you demand it of the students or are you yourself orderly? You can demand me to be orderly and be yourself disorderly.

Q: Doesn’t it take a certain order in a person to be able to see the need?

K: So I want to find out what you mean by order. A routine, a mechanical repetition?

Q: Well, being on time isn’t repetition. It’s something you establish for minimum efficiency.

K: Would it be mechanical? Should it be mechanical?

Q: It becomes that.

K: It does, generally. So how will you prevent it? I am asking all of you.

Q: Obviously the mechanical routine is a factor of disorder.

K: Yes, but how do you bring about order without being mechanical? Routine? Habit—it's one o'clock and I rush—and yet one has to be there at one o'clock, or whatever it is. How do you bring that about? I want to find out what it means to be orderly, because it is very important in a school, right? Will you have order there and what do you mean by order? The computer is in excellent order, always turning out the right response. That is purely mechanical, right? And is that what you want to cultivate in a student, or yourself? If you don't want that, then how will you bring a mechanistic order into non-mechanical order? Please, sirs, come on.

Q: Sir, I think it's brought about by observing the past, the disorder and its implications.

K: Observing disorder, right?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Now what do you mean by that word?

Q: Disorder?

K: Disorder.

Q: A school which is mainly an arena for activities generally is...

K: Chaotic?

Q: Chaotic, yes.

K: Therefore, out of this chaos, how do you bring about cosmos, which is order? Non-mechanistic, non-routine, non-repetitive—all those imply mechanistic. Do you see disorder in yourself and in the school, in the students?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes. What do you mean by that word? I am not splitting hairs. I just want to know what you all think, what you all feel about certain things. You don't articulate. What do you mean by order, what do you mean by disorder, what do you mean by observing disorder; how do you observe disorder?

Q: Chaos is a state where many separate pieces are all running into each other.

K: Yes, so how will you prevent each teacher, each one, running into each other? Haven't you thought out these things, worked it out?

Q: We face it every day.

K: So I am asking, what do you do?

Q: Maybe the trouble with me now is that I feel when I have answered these questions, you haven't taken the answer, haven't listened to me...

K: I won't, because you start with a definition. I am asking, I am trying—look, sir, I am trying for the moment to find out what you mean by disorder. Be simple about it, not intellectual. I want to know what is disorder in my life. In my life I want to find out what is order and to understand order, and, as you said, I must understand disorder. Now what is disorder?

Q: Disorder is a mess of papers on my table; it is...

K: Which you have to deal with.

Q: Yes.

K: Now, you may not have the time, you may not have the opportunity, etc. Therefore that is not disorder; it is there. You can put it together, paper upon paper, in neat order, but it is still there. So I want to come back, what do we all mean by disorder?

Q: Not a factual example...

K: I said, when you spread lots of papers on the table, that is some kind of disorder but if you have time and the occasion you can put them together and say you will see to it later. That is not disorder. So what do you mean by disorder?

Q: Maybe it means...

K: Not maybe. What does it mean to you? What does that word convey to you, disorder?

Q: To me it means that each separate piece or fragment is calmmouring for my attention and there is no thought that is able to determine which bit should come first, which bit has importance.

K: So, knowing that, observing it, out of that state you say, "I'll bring about order".

Q: No, I don't say that.

K: Just remain like that?

Q: I don't. As I am now, with thought, there is no way I can bring about order.

K: So, by understanding disorder, order will establish itself naturally?

Q: Well, if I am saying the same thing, by eliminating disorder, order establishes itself naturally.

K: Who will eliminate it? The creator of disorder?

Q: No. I see that is impossible.

K: So who will eliminate disorder?

Q: I don't know.

K: Right. I live in disorder; I observe that disorder and disorder smells bad, is ugly. So what am I to do? I don't want it, I don't like it. It is messy. What shall I do?

Q: Well it seems, Krishnaji, that first you begin to eliminate the most obvious factors.

K: Will you?

Q: Well, I can't, obviously...

K: Wait a minute. After eliminating the most obvious, then we can go further.

Q: Well, I can't do it. I don't see how, as thought, I can do it.

K: Is that—please listen—is that your own observation or are you quoting?

Q: That is my own observation.

K: So, if it is your own observation that you cannot do anything about disorder, you being thought etc., then thought has created that disorder, so thought cannot solve it, right?

Q: Yes, it continues.

K: That's it, keep it there. Then what will solve it? What will bring order out of disorder?

Q: Perhaps not wanting disorder.

K: Yes. The other day we talked about having an insight into disorder, right? That is, you have observed the nature of disorder, what disorder does in life, and that very observation is intelligence.

Q: That is also quite pragmatic.

K: It is pragmatic. Keep it as pragmatic for the time being. So where are we? You are all so silent.

Q: Well, we said this, of course, but any attempt that a person makes is ridiculous, it only makes things worse. So the logical answer seems to be not to make any...

K: Insight has nothing whatsoever to do with memory. So, having an insight into disorder, watch, observe the world first. Politically there is tremendous disorder. Nationally there is disorder. Disorder in families, in our relationship with each other, man, woman, and all the rest of it; economically, socially, morally, there seems to be an extraordinary disorder. In one of the magazines, a man writes about moving away from permissiveness because they have seen what it has done. The intellectuals first said, "Let them do all they want". Now they are saying it is all wrong. The intellectuals said, "Marvellous thing, Communism". Then as it is operated in Russia they said it is all wrong and withdrew. But their intellectual capacity has convinced millions who have joined, and they themselves withdrew, disillusioned, while those poor fellows are stuck in there. So, if it is very clear that disorder created by thought cannot be resolved by thought under any circumstances, and you see that, not as an idea, not as a conclusion, but you have seen it, then that very perception is insight. That insight will say, "It is all right, clear". Can you say that? So, what will help you to have that insight which is the highest form of intelligence; help you say, "This is disorder, finish it"? Have we the intelligence—which is part of insight, and we won't deal with that—have we the intelligence to see that thought cannot solve the problem of disorder because thought has created this disorder?

Q: Apparently.

K: Not apparently. Is that a fact?

Q: No.

K: Ah?

Q: No, sir.

K: All right, then, let's begin all over again. What, who has created disorder?

Q: I think the difficulty is that we can see that thought has created all the disorder, but in trying to deal with it we still use thought.

K: He says no.

Q: Well, I think he really wants to say that he doesn't really see that thought has created disorder because the implications of seeing it would be that there is no more disorder.

K: So what is he saying?

Q: That he doesn't really, actually see as a fact that thought has created all this disorder.

K: I see. All right. Stop. Don't you see the disorder of nationalities?

Q: Yes.

K: Nationalities are created by thought.

Q: Sir, one can see that. One can see by inference what thought is.

K: No, actually. You see the separate: the Arab and the Jew.

Q: Sir, what one sees in that case are instances of thought creating disorder, but one does not see that there is something intrinsic to thought that necessarily makes disorder.

K: What is this?

Q: I think he says that you don't see the root—where actually the root, the thought, is disorder. We see the manifestation.

Q: That's part of it.

K: Wait a minute. Let's settle it. Thought, itself, is disorder. You don't see that?

Q: No.

K: Let's begin again. What do you mean by thought?

Q: Please forgive me, but again I can only answer that I cannot answer that out of direct perception of thought—the meaning of the actual fact of thought—until thought is past.

K: Thought is the response of memory—memory being experience, knowledge, for a million years. Right? And that is stored in the brain. So, has not thought created all this confusion?

Q: One can see the role of thought in various instances.

K: Various aspects of it.

Q: Right. But one doesn't see something intrinsic to thought which means it must inevitably create disorder. That's not seen.

K: That means you have not seen, or one has not seen, the very nature of thought.

Q: Right. One has heard about it.

K: Why haven't you seen it? You have heard about it, you have read about it; why haven't you seen it? All the facts are in front of you: nationality, economic division, religious division, the whole gamut of disorder, which thought has obviously created, but you say one doesn't see the intrinsic nature of thought.

Q: Right.

K: What do you mean by that word "intrinsic"? I am not quibbling.

Q: Essential property.

K: Property. What is the essential property of thought?

Q: Sir, one is reluctant to answer; I am tempted to answer from logic. I can give you a logical...

K: Give it to me logically or illogically. I want to know what you mean by the intrinsic value of something. Wait a minute. What is the intrinsic value of love? Be careful, sir. When you use the word "intrinsic value" be careful. That is why I am questioning.

Q: I didn't say "value".

K: Intrinsic nature, all right. What do you mean by "intrinsic"? I understand when you use the word "nature" in the sense of structure, all the rest of it.

Q: Contains within.

K: What is contained in thought?

Q: No, no. It's intrinsic; I think it means essential.

K: All right, the same thing, sir. What is the essential nature of thought? Is that what you are asking?

Q: Yes.

K: Memory. If there is no memory, there is no thought.

Q: All right. Two things arise from that. One is that in daily life, even if one hears this and understands it, in daily life one does not clearly distinguish between the action of memory and what is.

K: All right, keep to that. In daily life you say one is not aware of the mechanistic nature of memory.

Q: That's part of it. Or sometimes one is simply not aware of the presence of memory.

K: Oh, I see.

Q: Yes, one may not be aware that thought is memory.

K: One is not aware, or one has not seen, one has not observed that thought essentially, in its intrinsic nature, is memory.

Q: Right.

K: So you don't recognize at the moment that memory is acting.

Q: Or that something which is basically rooted in memory acts.

K: What? Be careful, again, don't go off. Memory, being knowledge, experience. Sir, I don't understand when we both have said...you seem not to have seen the fact that thought intrinsically is the operation of memory. Intrinsically.

Q: No.

K: You said yes a few minutes ago.

Q: Yes, but there's little bit more to it than that.

K: Of course there's more to it. There is *lots* more to it but that is the essence of thought.

Q: Can I give you an example of one complication?

K: Before you go to examples I want to be quite sure that we both see clearly, intellectually or verbally, or intelligently understand that thought is essentially memory.

Q: Yes.

K: You see it. Not agree with me; not agree with an idea. That's where your difficulty is.

Q: That's what I'm saying.

K: Therefore you are making an abstraction of what is said, it has become an idea, but you don't actually see the nature of thought.

Q: That's what...

K: I am stopping you—that's all I am saying. So what is happening? Somebody says to me, "Look at the flower". What happens? I immediately say, "It is a rose"—which is an abstraction of the flower. I don't actually see the flower, but identify it through memory, etc., etc. That is a rose. Therefore it is an abstraction away from that. Just be simple, very simple. So are you making an abstraction away from the fact: the seeing, the observing, the actuality that thought in its intrinsic, essential nature is memory?

Q: This is my...

K: Of course, sir. All the so-called intellectuals—you people who have used brains have gone off into abstractions. Sorry. You don't see what is actually there. If you had really seen, obviously, that thought is in its essence memory, or the past, then it is over; that is finished.

Q: Sir, excuse me. When you say that if one had really seen that thought is memory, or the past, that it is over, finished, do you mean that one will never again see thought in any other...

K: No. Please, sir, we are stating something very simple, which is, do you see that thought, in its nature, is memory?

Q: I have seen it.

K: No, no. Not have seen—will see.

Q: Yes, yes.

K: Do you actually see it now? Not occasionally, sporadically, when it is convenient, but it is like seeing something dangerous and therefore it is dangerous right through life.

Q: Are you saying that you have to have an insight into the fact that thought is memory?

K: It's so obvious. I don't have an insight—it is so.

Q: It's obvious. You don't need insight.

K: I don't want to use a good word like insight for something so obvious, a fact.

Q: Maybe this is a wrong question, but does that insight enable one to distinguish in daily life the action of memory from non-memory?

K: No, no. Then you are inquiring into whether it is possible—please listen—whether it is possible to act without the past, which is memory. Not when it is the operation of memory and when it is not; whether it is possible to function without accumulated knowledge operating. When you say is it possible to be aware that memory is now operating, or is not operating, is that your question?

Q: Right.

K: Where will that lead you?

Q: That will enable the memory to maintain its right place.

K: Will it? You have made a statement. Find out the answer.

Q: It won't be taken for false value; it won't be taken for what it is not.

K: If you have memory confused with something else, then you're not clear.

Q: Yes, I know, I know. But we said, "End the confusion".

K: I haven't come to that yet, sir. We began by asking what is disorder. We said is there a possibility by observing disorder, to have order grow naturally? Which means, who and what has created disorder?

Q: Right.

K: We said, thought.

Q: Yes.

K: Then you were not quite sure and we said, "What do you mean by thought?" We went into that and you said, "What is the intrinsic nature?" and we said "memory" to which you hesitated.

Q: Yes.

K: And we went into it some more. Ultimately, finally you all said, "Yes, I see it. Thought in its very essential nature is memory". Now you say, "Can we be aware when memory operates and does not operate?" That's your question.

Q: Yes. End the confusion.

K: Wait, wait. There is awful confusion—when is memory operating and when is memory not operating—that is terrible confusion.

Q: Yes.

K: So there may be a different question altogether. What is the place of memory? If that is clear, then there is no confusion. Must memory operate all day, all night, all the rest of my life, you follow? That's what you're asking basically—or when? Thought has its right place: to speak a language, ride a bicycle, drive a car, all the rest of it, knowledge. Has thought any other place? Answer carefully. Thought, we said, is memory and that memory must operate, which is language, drive, business, technology and so on. So has thought any other place? Has thought any place in relationship? Be careful. Has thought any place in relationship between man and woman? Is relationship based on memory?

Q: Memory can only distort the observation.

K: Therefore you are saying in relationship remembrance has no place. But it has.

Q: It takes place.

K: In your relationship with your husband or wife it is definite; memory has a place, which is to recognize her and remember what she has said, done to you, or what you have done to her. So memory, which is thought, has its place in relationship. I know it exists and that it may be one of the causes of disorder. If there is to be order between man and woman, one asks has thought any place in relationship?

Q: Has it no place in the observation of something that is living?

K: I don't know if it is living. Is your relationship with your wife—not yours, sir—not living?

Q: My wife is living.

K: Yes, but you have a memory of her, images.

Q: Are you saying that has no place?

K: Actually, or has it again gone off into theory, idea?

Q: Sir, one can see that the image has no place, but that doesn't seem to prevent the image from operating.

K: There is a very simple explanation; you don't see the image. You think you see it.

Q: I don't think I see the image.

K: Therefore you don't see it.

Q: I see. I see that. One can see that the past illuminates, changes the present.

K: Do you see the danger of a cobra?

Q: Yes.

K: And for the rest of your life you never mistake a cobra for a rope.

Q: No.

K: Quite right. So do you see the danger of remembrance in the relationship with your wife? Danger, not the supposition of danger or the idea of danger. With the cobra the idea of danger doesn't exist, you act. So, in the same way do you see the danger of thought in relationship, apart from recognition and all the rest of it?

Q: When you say do you see it in the same way, are you asking, do you see it as the present?

K: No. Do you see danger? A rock is falling, you see the danger and you move away.

Q: Sir, it is not an individual rock; it is an avalanche; it is a conditioned reflex.

K: Sir, sir. Don't take an avalanche.

Q: Sir, but thought is like that; it is time, it is a conditioned reflex which always moves instantaneously.

K: Sir, we said thought is memory; the essential nature of thought is memory and has memory any place in relationship?

Q: It is acting in relationship. It does not have a place ideally, but it is...

K: Has it any place? You say it has. So what does that memory do in relationship?

Q: It seems to carry itself too far. It makes one step and then continues on to identify, to recognize.

K: I recognize my wife and I recognize the pleasure, sexually or otherwise, that I have derived from her. I recognize the insults, the bullying, the companionship, the comfort she has given me or I have given her. So my relationship is based on memory. That is all we are saying. Now, do you recognize that thought has created—wait, carefully go into it—that thought has created this and therefore it is memory? And memory as thought creates disorder in relationship.

Q: Yes.

Q: The central difficulty I am pointing to is in distinguishing between direct seeing and thought.

K: There is no discernment. I don't discern what is essential and what is not essential. Please, this is very important. We are brought up to discern, all our life, what is essential and non-essential. That is an abomination to me because we already are separated and then choosing.

Q: You are asking if one sees the danger of an image in relationship?

K: Yes.

Q: All right. I am saying, bearing in mind that the basic difficulty is trouble in distinguishing between...

K: Ah, I have gone through that.

Q: Well, I don't understand it.

K: Therefore, let's repeat it. I said when you look at this question, remembering sometimes and not remembering other times, I am caught between the two. That has been your observation, right?

Q: And then I get mixed up.

K: Why have you divided this? Memory operating, not operating; who has divided this? What has brought about this division? Division, we say sometimes, is brought about by memory. Come on, sir. Remembrance. You remember that sometimes this has happened and sometimes that has happened. So remembrance is memory; memory is thought; thought has divided the two. Sir forgive me for pointing it out, your difficulty is that you don't see the essential nature of thought, which is memory, and therefore a thing broken up. You can't have memory of the universe.

Q: Are you saying that because there is not a seeing of the essential nature of thought, therefore thought has gone out and divided memory and non-memory...

K: Of course.

Q: And has attempted to grasp a distinction between the two, which is wrong?

K: It has taken half an hour to see that? At first I said, "This is the way you are thinking and this is wrong". Remember? You are thinking; you are looking at it wrongly. If you had understood the very essence of thought, memory, you would have seen the thing immediately.

Q: And the other questions don't even arise?

K: You haven't answered my question, which is, "What part has memory in relationship?" Memory divides, it cannot see the whole. It can imagine, it can speculate, but it is a fragment, a broken piece. So if thought is memory, of course it is broken up: my country, your God, my God.

Q: To me it's an idea.

K: No. Because it is not an idea. You like to think it is an idea. You keep on repeating it. Pain is not an idea: it's an actual fact.

Q: I'm not saying that you are stating an idea.

K: What I am saying is what is taking place.

Q: You are saying something about the fragmentary nature of memory.

K: All right. If you want to go into that, we'll go into it.

Q: I don't want to go into it, but you asked me if I followed and I'm telling you that to me it's an idea. I'm not saying it is an idea, I'm saying...

K: All right, then why is it an idea? Why don't you listen before you form an idea?

Q: The point is we don't see it as an actuality.

K: Why don't you?

Q: Because we are thought and thought cannot see it. So who or what can see it?

K: We went into that. We went logically, pointing out and the logical conclusion was that this is wrong. And you said, "Yes, I understand it", which was that the understanding has come about from examination and through observation. And you say you understand it and the understanding is essentially intelligence, right? That intelligence says this is disorder.

Q: It seems to me that thought is not stopping; you see when you are quiet that thought wants to stop, to see, but that memory is the essence of thought—right? but if we immediately come out with..

K: You see, his difficulty is that he translates. He hears something and it becomes an idea.

Q: That is because thought...

K: No, wait. See the difficulty. He hears something and immediately it's an idea. He doesn't wait. There is no hiatus, no saying, "I am listening, I won't precipitate it into an idea, I will just listen, find out".

Q: Thought is so fast.

K: Don't run. If you are listening to somebody, don't run.

Q: It is because we are trying so hard to...

K: Don't try, just listen.

Q: I hear you and I understand what you say when you say, "Don't run". But there seems to be a phenomenon whereby speech automatically keys the mind to think.

K: That's what he is saying, sir.

Q: No, not quite, sir.

K: He says that when he hears thought is something or other, he formulates an idea of it. And you are saying the same thing.

Q: I am saying the same thing but I take it one step further, which is that I see the idea is old, is of the past, is memory. I see that and I am wondering. I am asking now if in seeing that I am not acting from it, because obviously to act on that is to act out the old, or out of the past? What can I do other than just simply see it?

K: All that the poor chap is saying is, "Listen". That's all. Don't run to a conclusion, just listen. If I love that child, I listen to it. I don't impose my ideas. I love that child, I want to find out what he is saying. So what am I to do? I just listen to somebody to find out. I know my conclusions, my reactions. I know all the circus that is going on inside. But I want to listen to what is being said; I don't say this is right etc. He is telling me a story and I am interested in the story. But you are not interested in the story; you have ideas about the story, how it should be told. So would you listen for two minutes, listen, not hear? Don't hear with the ears of hearing, but listen. Will you? Will you really listen, not project, interfere? If your wife wants to tell you something serious, will you listen? I am saying thought in its very nature is memory. Memory is the accumulation of past events, incidents, and so on, stored in the brain and that brain is very quick in its operation. That brain is always functioning in memory. So can that brain work very slowly, which it is doing now if you are listening. That brain, we have found out, has strange phenomena: when you are actually listening to somebody whom you love, whom you care for, there is listening. There is no idea, there is no conclusion. After listening very carefully, then you can say this is the way I look at it, this is the way I feel, this I don't understand. But you jump into it before. When you listen to a child and you care for that child, love that child, you listen. The next time you may do something else but the first fact is you listen. But apparently you don't seem to listen, any of you. Not that you must listen to me, I'm not saying that, please.

You see, sir, our relationships are very odd. With a child you are holding its hand or it sits in your lap, and you listen to all the complaints, but there is a deep communication of affection. The child knows that you care for him, that there is affection, there is a sense of communion; therefore he is telling you his confidences. He respects you, he feels protection, there is an enormous sense of relationship. And if you don't have it, don't listen but say, "All right, all right, I've heard that before, go to bed", he knows. He knows that you really don't care what he feels.

So please find out if you are listening—not to me—but listening. Don't make an idea of listening. So, sir, if someone tells me and I care for that person, I respect that person, I will say, "Please, tell me about that story, about thought", and he tells me thought in its nature is memory. That's all. I want to grasp the meaning of it, do you follow? He has said something which I have not thought about. He has revealed something to me which may cover the whole universe. It may answer all my questions. It may bring complete order, a sense of great love.

He has said something so I want to ruminate over it. Something has been thrown at me and I have swallowed it, whether I like it or not, and it is gestating. As it is gestating, I say, "By jove, is this so? Is thought only that?" I see it is only that in everything I do; that is—thought is in operation in everything I do. So I ask the question, "Is there an action which is not a part of thought?" That's all. I want to find out. Again, that is an extraordinary question. It is something unusual, unique; it is something born of heaven. That is the question. So I say, "Is that so? Let me find out". And I go into it, you follow?

Are they actually listening now? Actually listening, not the idea, but to the art of it, the beauty of it, the orderliness when you are listening to your daughter, wife, husband, a child. You must be an extraordinarily quiet person. He is pouring his heart out. So, one has seen the art of listening when one has listened to a child. I am not being romantic, sentimental. At that moment nothing exists but the child. That's all.

Have you found the religious life? I have. It is the pure act of listening.

(A review of Krishnamurti's *The Urgency of Change* appeared in the Yugoslavian journal *Kulture Istoka* (The Culture of the East) No.13 in 1987 as *Mozema Li Se Mijenjati*. The following is a translation — ed.)

Two reasons prompted me to buy *The Urgency of Change* when I discovered a copy in the local book shop window. I was acquainted with author, J. Krishnamurti, for a dear and old friend of mine had presented me with a copy of his first book, *At the Feet of the Master*, when I was barely 20 years old. The second reason had to do with the book's title — *The Urgency of Change*; the necessity of doing just what was indicated by the title of Krishnamurti's book had become for me something of a preoccupation. The word 'change' denotes, of course, an inward change. For, in Aldous Huxley's words: "There is only one corner of the universe that you can improve for certain — it is you yourself".

Krishnamurti's book does not leave the serious reader — one who would make demands on himself and on what he is reading — half way. In only about a hundred pages, Krishnamurti illuminates about thirty key problems dealing with those questions that have been asked by men from time immemorial. Although all of these questions are important, I can only dwell on a few here. What does Krishnamurti — this grey haired, venerable old man (born in 1895), this legendary Indian guru of our century who for decades has lived outside his own country, this indispensable 'purgative' (as one of my friends calls him) of all sentimentality and emotionalism and also of dogmatic disciples of Truth the world over, this clear thinking man who has never felt the need to found a school of thought, but one who can enter so easily into another person's thought — what does this man have to say about fear, about the religious life, about the heart and the mind, about observation and discipline, about faith and tradition, about the individual in society.

Let me state at the outset that Krishnamurti represents a type of person, one who combines an altogether original and provocative spirituality; he is a sort of 'religious atheist', of which Cedomil Veljacic in our own country is an example. They are the cleansers of all forms of spiritual corruption, of occultism, of institutionalized religious dogmatism, of our archaic layers of magical thinking.

Let me begin with Krishnamurti's explication of the phenomenon of fear, and explication which is both psychologically accurate as well as cogently reasoned. Man, who is both weak and insecure, needs security and protection. Needing security he comes to depend on things and people for protection — first his parent, then friends, spouse, material comforts and a secure profession. A child's first fears have to do with loss of security associated with his parents.

These fears, which cannot be avoided in the most harmonious of homes, remain with us for the rest of our lives. And, according to Krishnamurti, each form of psychological dependence will unfailingly cause fear. What then does the uncertain and frightened man try to do? Naturally he tries to become independent and self sufficient. But this is a mistake, for the self sufficiency isolates him, makes him construct complicated and seemingly impregnable defenses against the outer world (as in Franz Kafka's story *The Liar*), all of which only serves to strengthen the fear. This loneliness of the frightened man forms an emptiness inside, and springs up when he compares himself with others.

Though a seemingly natural tendency beginning with a little child's comparing himself to his parents, and later with his classmates at school, Krishnamurti asserts that comparison is detrimental to the well being of man. This is because implicit in every act of comparison is the feeling of inferiority, of weakness, of ugliness. Comparison deepens insecurity and expresses itself in aggressiveness. Is there a way out for the unhappy human being?

Love, says Krishnamurti, is the only exit from this blind alley of fear. His answer happens to be the same as the answers given by Christianity as well as by other religions against whom Krishnamurti has so consistently spoken. For Krishnamurti love is, first of all, an absence of fear. John the Apostle in the First Pastoral Letter expressed this: "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear". Secondly, there is no dependence when there is love (for when there is no fear there is no dependence either). Thirdly, love does not mean self sufficiency. How can I be sufficient unto myself when to experience love without fear is to experience a consciousness which is cosmic? This consciousness, which contains in it an empathy with and so responsibility for our fellow man and for all living things, is not the same as the political consciousness with its anonymous sense of responsibility towards the collective.

We have known from time immemorial that one of the most difficult things for human beings to do is to take control of their emotional lives. There are sufficient numbers of human beings who, unsure of how to handle their emotional lives and so suffering continual defeat, have succeeded in so subduing their emotions as to have not a trace of fellow feeling left; our emotional lives are part of the irrational sphere which we have learned to put down with a heavy hand. How can one remain sensitively in touch with our emotions — for without that there can be no love, no harmonious relation with others, no religious life — and yet not be emotional?

Krishnamurti argues vehemently against emotionalism holding it responsible, among other things, for cruelty and for wars. Indeed for him emotionalism is a form of insensitivity having definite links with fanaticism which, in its political and religious forms, has wrought such devastation in the lives of individuals as well as nations. This uncontrolled and unfree emotionalism contrasts sharply with the free sensibility that Krishnamurti has in mind. For him this fine sensibility, which is never sentimental, is realized only when each moment of life is treated as a new challenge. Since there are no moments in life which lack significance, attention must be given to each and every moment of life, for we bear responsibility for each.

An awareness of the wholeness of life, the need for an integrity of thought with feeling, is necessary because the division between thought and feeling, each carrying on as if in separate compartments, is a disease. This division is bridged in the intensity of a vigilant awareness. Krishnamurti here offers a metaphorical image: "The mind must be completely awake, that is all. As a man in a jungle has to be entirely awake in order to survive, so man in the jungle of the world has to be entirely awake in order to live by the whole of life".

The effort required on the part of those who would live the religious life is indeed very great for it has to be sustained over long periods of time. Only then can we understand Eshil when he wrote: "That which is divine is without effort". To a Christian, therefore, the most provocative aspect of Krishnamurti's exposition is contained in an answer to the question which addresses the necessity of faith. Krishnamurti's answer to this question is immediately followed up in the book with a question about Krishnamurti's own responsibility towards the small numbers of his own disciples from around the world. While I find his answer to the first question — to say that god exists or does not exist is equally blasphemous, wise, I find his response to the second both surprising, and unacceptable. He says: "I have no disciples and I have no responsibility to you or to those listening to my discourses. As well, I am not a Hindu or anything else because I do not belong to any group, religion or something similar. Everybody must be a light to himself. Therefore there is no master, there is no disciple".

Only somebody who has completely destroyed his roots, a sage or an illumined man speaking *sub specie aeternitatis* can afford to really say this. In which case, I really do not understand why he talks at all to the people who gather around him, for whom he says he feels no responsibility. I myself have never heard a guru either from the east or from the west speak in this way.

Insofar as it places its own demand for perfection on an imperfect humanity by requiring of it impossible tasks, Christianity can be considered a religion of the elite. And yet Christianity puts before its adherents the perfect figure of Christ, a man who was also god, and also the spiritual witnesses of Christianity in the figure of the priests and monks of the Church. And through the holy secrets of the church — the liturgy and the eucharist — the Church takes responsibility for all Christians. Even so the number of sincere Christians in the world is very small. In putting forward the same kind of elitist demands on his followers, Krishnamurti, on the other hand, does not take any responsibility for them, and claims not to be interested either in their understanding him or in their misrepresenting him.

Krishnamurti's questions and answer indeed remind me of the shock therapy practised by Wilhelm Steckel (an interpreter of Freud), of John Rosen and Arthus Gianov. Two answers concerning religious faith which might interest our younger people contain the observation that experience does not verify faith, rather it is faith which conditions our experiences. In other words, the feeling that we touch the truth of religion through experience is an illusion: "If one believes in God one will have the experience of God; one experiences what one believes". I ask myself then, what can faith be apart from the experience of faith? And is not experience, when it is authentic, also universal because the religious archetype within us is universal?

To the above questions, Krishnamurti's not entirely original answer is that faith is connected with fear; not only is faith connected with fear but fear is very destructive. "One must get free of the fear and of the faith."

Why is it necessary to rid ourselves of faith? In order that a human being can come face to face with his own fears, is Krishnamurti's answer. Here again we confront Krishnamurti's elitist demands that can perhaps be placed on a Kierkegaard, a Heidegger or a Suzuki, but can a young person of today with an average intellect sustain his search for truth under such conditions? May not Krishnamurti's question, when addressed to the young, become like the *Riesenspruche* (an expression from German psychoanalytic literature for the impossible demands neurotics put on themselves)?

Referring to the present inclination on the part of young people all over the world including Yugoslavia to do away with the past and with its traditions (of family, nation and religion), Krishnamurti quite rightly points out that it is impossible to get rid of the past by using the past to investigate itself. The only way it can be done, and Krishnamurti is convinced that

each human being can do it by himself, is to observe the past “with eyes that are not made turbid by the past. To view in silence, without the noise of thought”. These are beautiful words indeed, but can it be done?

Based on a reading of *The Urgency of Change*, my conclusion is that Krishnamurti is a truly original representative of the spiritual intellectualism of today, of a superrational new *majeustica*, the Socratic method by which the master leads his disciple through questions put in such a way that the disciple is led to the truth on his own. I see him as a strange religious hybrid, a religious atheist, probably of Buddhist provenance, one who is freed of the “I”, one who travels around the world speaking to various uprooted and homeless people of the world, some of them neurotic, others alienated. He may free some seekers of their illusions, their belief in various occult practices, others he may leave helpless, perhaps embarrassed. There is no need to follow Krishnamurti, nor does he need disciples. On one point we can agree with him with our whole hearts and that is, as the title of the book proclaims — The Urgency of Change.

Dr Vladeta Jerotic

NEW PUBLICATIONS

J. Krishnamurti—The Last Talks

K.F.I. Publications (1989)-Rs.45/=

This volume contains Krishnamurti's talks delivered in India between November 1985 and January 1986. They include discussions with Buddhist scholars at Varanasi, talks with teachers and students of Rishi Valley and the public talks at Varanasi and Madras. They are the last talks Krishnamurti gave before his death in February, 1986 in Ojai, California. An introduction describes Krishnamurti's last journey through India.

KFI BULLETIN IN HINDI

Parisamvad—a bulletin in Hindi—published quarterly by the J. Krishnamurti Prajñā Parisad, Kāśī, contains translations of published/unpublished Talks, Dialogues, Discussions and interviews of Krishnamurti, as well as articles, memoirs, etc., about Krishnamurti. It also contains information regarding the activities of the Prajñā Parisad, Kāśī.

Annual Subscription	: Rs. 20.00
Life Subscription	: Rs. 200.00
Single copy	: Rs. 5.00

To get your copy of Parisamvad, please fill in the form below and mail it to the address given therein.

The Secretary
Rajghat Education Centre
Krishnamurti Foundation India
Rajghat Fort, Varanasi-221 001.

Dear Sir,

Please

- Send me a specimen copy of Parisamvad.
- Enrol me as an Annual Subscriber
- Enrol me as a Life subscriber.

(Please tick your choice)

I enclose herewith a bank draft/M.O. Receipt No..... dated
for Rs. payable to the SECRETARY, RAJGHAT EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE at VARANASI.

Please mail my copy of Parisamvad to the address given below:

Name in Block Letters _____

Signature

**SUBSCRIPTION RENEWAL
KFI BULLETIN**

Dear Subscriber,

This is a reminder that your Annual Subscription to the KFI BULLETIN for the year 1989 is due for renewal. To ensure continuity please fill in the form below and mail it to us along with your payment by Demand Draft, payable to KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA at Madras.

Annual Subscription	Rs. 22.00
Life Subscription	Rs. 250.00

Please ignore this reminder if you have already renewed your subscription.

KFI Bulletin—Subscription Form

The Secretary
Krishnamurti Foundation India
'Vasanta Vihar'
64, Greenways Road,
MADRAS-600 028.

Dear Sir,

Please enrol me as a subscriber/renew my subscription to the 'KFI Bulletin' for the year 1989/Life.

Name _____

Postal Address _____

Payment Enclosed DD No _____ dtd _____
issued by _____ on _____
for Rs. 22.00 Rs. 250.00

Signature

INDIA	RISHI VALLEY SCHOOL (KFI) Rishi Valley 517 352 Chittoor District Andhra Pradesh	Boarding School Ages 8 to 17
	RAJGHAT BESANT SCHOOL (KFI) Rajghat Fort Varanasi-221 001. Uttar Pradesh	Boarding School Ages 7 to 19
	THE SCHOOL (KFI) 'Damodar Gardens' Besant Avenue Madras 600 020.	Day School Ages 3 to 17
	THE VALLEY SCHOOL (KFI) 'Haridvanam' 17th K.M. Kanakapura Road Thatguni Post Bangalore 560 062	Day School Ages 6 to 17
	BAL-ANAND 'Akash Deep' 28, Dongersi Road Bombay 400 006.	An after-school centre for young children
U.K.	BROCKWOOD PARK Bramdean, Hampshire SO 24 0LQ	Education Centre and Boarding School from 14 years
U.S.A.	THE OAK GROVE SCHOOL P.O. Box 1560 Ojai, California 93023	Day and Boarding School Ages 3 1/2 to 17

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