

# **BULLETIN**

**2/89**

**KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION  
INDIA**

## FROM THE EDITOR :

According to geologists, an examination of the fossil record of life on earth reveals about 5 major mass extinctions of species in the past 600 million years. They believe that a sixth major extinction of life is just beginning. Their conservative prediction is that the number of existing plant and animal species will be reduced by half at the end of the next century. The present mass extinction, occurring in less than 2 centuries, will be faster than any previously recorded loss. And unlike past extinctions the present one will be man made.

Our species is a young species -- it has been on earth for less than 100,000 years. In that short period it has become the most dominant species on earth. Human beings have been very successful in manipulating nature to suit their ever-increasing needs. This very success is now jeopardizing the future existence of the earth and the creatures that share the earth with us. The challenge before us is clear -- to be able to use our intelligence to reverse this process.

The dialogue on culture which follows has to be read in this context of a human culture which is destroying earth. The sum of human achievements -- the great religious systems we have established, the cities we have built, the beautiful painting and music we have created, the spectacular achievements in technology -- cannot meet the challenge posed by the present crisis. The crisis demands a reexamination of the very roots of human culture. An examination that will lead to a transformation. For Krishnamurti, the source of the present problems lies very deeply embedded in human culture, a culture which is very old and which is sustained and nourished in human consciousness. For him eastern culture is not essentially different from western culture -- both have to be transformed.

## WHAT IS CULTURE?

*PJ* : Krishnaji, there is a strange phenomenon in the world today, where the east reaches out to the west to find sustenance, and the west reaches out to the east for some 'wisdom' to fill some vacuum . Is there an Indian mind which may contain the same elements of sorrow, greed, anger, but where the ground from which these spring are different?

*K* : Are you asking whether eastern thought, eastern culture, the eastern way of life is different from the west ?

*PJ* : Well, obviously the Indian way of life is different from the the west --

*K* : It is.

*PJ* : because the conditioning of the two are different. But they in a sense complement each other.

*K* : In what way?

*PJ* : In the sense that the east, or India more specifically, lacks perhaps that precision of carrying an abstraction to concrete action.

*K* : Are you saying that they live more in abstraction?

*PJ* : Yes. They are not so concerned about action in the environment, action as such.

*K* : What would you say they are concerned with?

*PJ* : Today, of course, there is a great change taking place. It's very difficult to say what the Indian mind is, because the Indian mind today is looking -- at one level -- for the same material comforts --

*K* : Progress in the technological world, and applying it in daily life and so on.

*PJ* : Yes, progress in the technological world and consumerism, which has percolated very deep into the Indian spirit.

*K* : So, what ultimately is the difference between Indian culture and western culture?

*PJ* : Perhaps still, in spite of this material overtone, there is, in India, a certain edge to the delving process, the delving into the self, the delving into the within, the insights into things. For centuries the Indian mind has been nurtured in a ground of this feeling; whereas from a certain time in the west there was a movement away -- there's always been a movement away, right from the time of the Greeks -- towards the outer, the environment.

*K* : I understand. The other day I heard on the television a very well-known Indian being interviewed . He said that the technological world now in India is humanizing the Indian mind. I wonder what he meant by that. Instead of living in abstractions and theories and the complexity of ideations and so on, the technological world is bringing them to earth.

*PJ* : And perhaps it is necessary to some extent.

*K* : Obviously it's necessary.

*PJ* : So, if these two minds have a different essence --

*K* : I question that very much, that is, whether Indian thought -- I'm sorry, I don't mean that -- whether thought is ever east or west. There is only thought. It's not eastern thought or western thought. The expression of thoughts may be different, but it's still a process of thought.

*PJ* : But is it also not true that what the brain cells contain in the

west, and what the centuries of knowledge and so-called wisdom have given to the brain cells in the east make them perceive differently?

*K* : I would like to question what you are saying, if I may. I find that when I go to India, there is much more materialism now than there used to be. More concern with money, position, power and all that. And of course there is over-population, and all the complexities of modern civilization. Are you saying that the Indian mind has a tendency to an inward search, much more so than the west?

*PJ* : I would say so. I would say that there is the inner environment and the outer environment, and that the outer environment is the concern of the west, and that the inner environment has been the concern of the east.

*K* : Has been the concern, but it has been the concern of a very, very few people.

*PJ* : But it's only the few people who create the culture.

*K* : The western world is much more concerned, as far as I can see -- I may be mistaken -- with worldly affairs.

*PJ* : But what turned it in that direction?

*K* : Climate. It's a much colder climate. And modern technology comes from the northern part of the world, northern people.

*PJ* : No, but if it was only the climate, then --

*K* : It's not only the climate, of course not.

*PJ* : Mexico and Equatorial Africa would have the same mind. But it's not that.

*K* : No, of course it's not only the climate.

*PJ* : So, if that's not the answer --

*K* : It's climate, and the whole so-called religious way of life in the

west which is very, very different from the east.

*PJ* : That's it. That's what I'm saying. That somewhere along the line, people of one racial stock seemingly divided.

*K* : Divided, yes, from Sumeria and so on.

*PJ* : Divided, and the direction which the west turned was their discovery, their dialogue with nature, out of which arose technology and all the great scientific truths. India also had a dialogue with nature and with the self, but the dialogues were in themselves of a different kind.

*K* : So, are you trying to say that the eastern mind, the Indian mind is more concerned with religious matters than the west?

*PJ* : I am, yes.

*K* : Here, in the west, it's all rather superficial -- though they think it's rather deep -- and there, in India, the tradition, literature and everything says, 'The world is not so important as the understanding of the universe, the understanding of the cosmos, the highest principle --brahman'.

*PJ* : Yes. The swiftness with which the mind can start the enquiry is perhaps different to the west, where the enquiring and the great insights have been in a different direction.

*K* : In the west, you see, in religious matters, doubt, skepticism, questioning is absolutely denied. Faith is all important. But in Indian religion, in Buddhism and so on, doubt, questioning, enquiry becomes all important.

*PJ* : Out of this, today somehow, both the cultures are in crisis.

*K* : Yes both, of course, of course. Would you say that not only the cultures but also that the whole of human consciousness is in a crisis?

*PJ* : Yes. Well, would you distinguish human consciousness from culture?

K : No.

PJ : In a sense they are the same.

K : No, basically they are not different.

PJ : So, the crisis, at the very root, has made them search somewhere away from themselves. They feel an inadequacy and so they turn to the other culture. It's happening in both countries.

K : Yes, but you see Pupulji, in their search from their materialistic outlook, if I may use that word, they are being caught by all kinds of superstitious, romantic, occult ideas and by these gurus who come over here, and all the rest of it. But what I want to find out is whether human consciousness -- which is in a crisis -- can not only resolve that crisis without war, without destroying humanity, but also whether human beings can ever go beyond their own limitation. I don't know whether I am making myself clear.

PJ : Sir, the outer and inner are like two mirror images of the directions in which man has moved. The problem really is that if man has to survive, the two have to be --

K : They must live together.

PJ : Not live together, but a human culture, which would contain both --

K : Both, yes.

PJ : must come into being.

K : Yes, that's it. Now, what do you mean by the word 'culture'? What do you mean by culture?

PJ : Isn't culture everything that the brain possesses?

K : That is, would you say that culture is the training of the brain, the refinement of the brain and the expression of that refinement in action, in behaviour, in relationship, and also that it is a process of enquiry that leads to something totally untouched by thought? I

would say that this is culture.

*PJ* : Would you include enquiry in the field of culture?

*K* : Of course.

*PJ* : Isn't culture a closed circuit?

*K* : You can make culture a closed circuit or you can break it and go beyond.

*PJ* : But today culture is a closed circuit. Today culture as it exists

--

*K* : That's why I want to understand what you mean by the word 'culture'.

*PJ* : Culture, as we understand it today Krishnaji, is our perceptions, the way we look at things, our thoughts, our feelings, our attitudes, the operation of our senses.

*K* : Go on.

*PJ* : You can keep on adding to this.

*K* : That is, religion, faith, belief, superstition.

*PJ* : All the outer and the inner --

*K* : Yes.

*PJ* : which keep on growing -- but growing within that contour. It remains a contour. And when you talk of a search, which is in no way connected with this, would you include it in the field of culture?

*K* : Of course. Would you say -- I'm just trying to clarify the matter -- would you say that the whole movement of culture is like a tide going out and coming in -- like the sea going out and coming in, and that the human endeavour is this process of going out and coming in, and never enquiring whether that process can ever stop? You understand? What I mean is that we act and react.

*PJ* : Yes.

*K* : That's human nature, like the ebb and flow. I react, and out of the reaction act, and from that action react. It's back and forth.

*PJ* : Yes.

*K* : Now, I'm asking whether this reaction of reward and punishment can stop and take a totally different turn. Our lives, functions, reactions are based on reward and punishment -- both physically and psychologically, in every way. Right?

*PJ* : Yes.

*K* : And that's all we know -- deeply. There is this reaction of reward and the avoidance of punishment and so on --like the tide.

Now, I'm asking whether there is another sense of action which is not based on this action-reaction. You understand what I am talking about?

*PJ* : As this action-reaction is an impulse of the brain cells --

*K* : It's our conditioning.

*PJ* : And it's an impulse of the brain cells.

*K* : Yes, of course, of course.

*PJ* : It's the way the brain cells respond and the way they receive through the senses.

*K* : Our question is really: What is culture?

*PJ* : And we went into it.

*K* : A little bit.

*PJ* : A little bit. It can be expanded much further, but still it remains within the same --

*K* : In the same field.

*PJ* : Would you say then that culture is that which is contained in the brain cells?

*K* : Of course:

*PJ* : Anything else?

*K* : All our past memories.

*PJ* : Yes, so, if you take all that, is there anything else?

*K* : I understand now. This is a different question, because -- we must be careful, very careful -- if there is something else -- *if* -- then that something else can operate on the brain cells which are conditioned. Right? *If* there is something in the brain, the activity of that something else can bring about a freedom from this narrow, limited culture. But is there something else within the brain?

*PJ* : But even physiologically they are saying, Krishnaji, that the operation of the brain cells today is a very, very minute portion of its capacity.

*K* : I know that. Why?

*PJ* : Because conditioning limits it, and it has never been free of those processes which --

*K* : Limit it. Which means, thought is limited.

*PJ* : Yes, it's put all its eggs in one basket.

*K* : One basket. That's how I want to put it. Thought is limited, and we are all functioning within that limitation. Right? Experience, knowledge, memory and thought are limited forever.

*PJ* : What place have the senses and the perceptive processes in this?

*K* : That brings another question, which is: Can the senses operate without the interference of thought? You understand my question?

*PJ* : As they operate today, Krishnaji, they seem to have one root :

The movement of the senses, as they operate, is the movement of thought.

*K* : That's all. Therefore it's limited. I'm enquiring, with a lot of hesitation and a certain amount of skepticism, whether the brain which has evolved through thousands of years, experienced untold sorrow, loneliness, despair, and tried to escape from its own fears through every form of 'religious' endeavour, and all rest of it, whether those brain cells in themselves can ever change, bring about a mutation in themselves.

*PJ* : But if they don't bring about a mutation in themselves --

*K* : What would?

*PJ* : and there is nothing else? --

*K* : Yes, I understand your question.

*PJ* : You see, this is the paradox. Really, it is a paradox.

*K* : This is also the everlasting question; the Hindus raised it long ago -- many, many centuries ago.

*PJ* : Yes, yes.

*K* : They raised this question: Is there an outside agency -- God, the highest principle, and so on, and so on --

*PJ* : The higher self.

*K* : 'The higher self' -- That's a wrong way of... [Smiles]. We'll use it for the moment -- that can operate on the conditioned brain?

*PJ* : Or is it, sir: Can it awaken within the brain? There are two things. One, an outside --

*K* : Agency operating.

*PJ* : agency or energy operating, or two, from within the brain cells -- the untapped portion of the brain cells -- an awakening --

*K* : I understand your question.

*PJ* : which transforms.

*K* : Yes, I understand this question. Let's enquire into it, let's discuss it. Is there an outside agency -- outside energy, let's call it for the moment -- that will bring about a mutation in the brain cells which are conditioned? Right?

*PJ* : May I say something?

*K* : Yes of course, please.

*PJ* : The problem is that energy really never touches the brain cells. There are so many obstacles that one has built, that the flow of energy never seems to touch, engender, create --

*K* : What are we discussing?

*PJ* : We are discussing the possibility of a human culture.

*K* : A culture which is not --

*PJ* : Either of India or of the west.

*K* : Yes.

*PJ* : A culture which contains all mankind, if I may say so --

*K* : Yes, all humanity.

*PJ* : and in which the division between the outer and inner end. And where insight is insight; not insight into the outer or insight into the inner.

*K* : That I understand. So what's the question?

*PJ* : So, for that the instrument is the brain cell.

*K* : Yes.

*PJ* : The tool which operates is the brain cell.

*K* : Is the brain.

*PJ* : Is the brain. Now, something has to happen in the brain.

**K :** Yes, I say it can happen -- without the idea that there is an outside agency that will somehow cleanse the brain that has been conditioned, or by inventing an outside agency, as most religions have done. Right? Or, can the conditioned brain awaken to its own conditioning and so perceive its own limitation, and stay there for a moment? I don't know if I'm making my point clear.

You see, we are all the time, are we not, trying to do something. Which is, the doer is different from that which is being done. Right? For example, suppose I realize that my brain is conditioned, and so all my activities, feelings and relationship with others are limited. I realize that. And then I say, 'That limitation must be broken down'. I'm operating on the limitation. But the I is also limited. The I is not separate from the other. So, can we bridge that? The I is not separate from the limitation which it is trying to break down. Both -- the limitation of the self, and the limitation of the conditioning -- are similar; they are not separate. The I is not separate from its own qualities.

**PJ :** And from what it observes. When you say that we are all the time trying to do something --

**K :** Operate on the other. Our whole life is that, apart from the technological world. 'I am this and I must change that', and the brain is now conditioned in this division: The actor is different from the action.

**PJ :** That of course, yes.

**K :** And so that condition goes on. But when one realizes that the actor *is* the action, then the whole outlook changes all together. Now, let's come back for the moment. We are asking, Pupilji, are we not, what brings about a change in the human brain?

**PJ :** That's really the crucial --

**K :** Point, yes.

**PJ :** What is it that makes it end?

**K :** Yes. Let's go into it a little bit more. Man has lived on this earth for a million years, more or less, and we are, psychologically,;

primitive as we were before. And we have not basically changed very much. We are killing each other, seeking power, position. We are corrupt in everything that we do in the world today -- psychologically. And, what will make human beings -- humanity -- change all that?

*PJ* : A great insight.

*K* : Insight. Now, is so-called culture preventing all this? You understand my question? Take Indian culture. A few people, like the great thinkers in India, have gone into this question. And the majority of the people just repeat, repeat, repeat, repeat. It's just tradition -- a dead thing. And they live with a dead thing. Right? Now, here too tradition is a tremendous power.

So, looking at all this, what could make human beings radically bring about a mutation in themselves? Culture has tried to bring about certain changes in human behaviour. Right?

*PJ* : Yes, of course.

*K* : And religions have said, 'Behave this way', 'Don't do this', 'Don't kill'. But we go on killing. 'Be brotherly', and we are not brotherly. 'Love one another', and we don't. You follow? There are the edicts, the sanctions, and we are doing everything quite the opposite. Right?

*PJ* : But culture has collapsed, really.

*K* : That's what I want to find out. Has it collapsed and has no value at all anymore, and so now man is at a loss? If you go to America, for example, they have no tradition. Right? Each one is doing what he likes. He is doing 'his thing'. And they are doing the same thing here -- in a different way. So, what will bring about a mutation in the brain cells which then... [Gestures expansively].

*PJ* : So, what you're saying really is that it doesn't matter whether the Indian matrix is different or the western matrix is different --

*K* : Or not different.

*PJ* : the problem is identical; that is, the mutation in the human

brain.

*K* : Yes, that's it, let's stick to that. I mean, after all Indians -- even the poorest -- suffer as they suffer here. Loneliness, despair, misery; all that is just the same as here. So, let's forget the east and west and see what prevents this mutation from taking place.

*PJ* : Sir, is there any other way but perceiving the actual?

*K* : The actual. That's what we've maintained for 60 years. That the what-is, the actual is more important than the idea of the actual. The ideal, the various concepts and conclusions have no value at all because one is away from the facts, from what is going on, and, because we are caught up with ideas, apparently to see it is tremendously difficult.

*PJ* : But in perceiving the actual there is no movement of the brain.

*K* : That's all I'm saying. Facts, if one observes very carefully, in themselves bring about a change. I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

*PJ* : Yes.

*K* : It's human sorrow. It's not western sorrow or eastern sorrow. Sorrow is not yours or mine. And we are always trying to move away from sorrow. Now, could we understand the depth and the meaning of sorrow, not understand intellectually, but actually delve into the nature of sorrow? What is impeding or blocking the human brain from enquiring deeply within itself?

*PJ* : Sir, I want to ask one thing. You use the words 'delving', and 'enquiring' into oneself. Both are words connected with movement.

*K* : Movement, yes.

*PJ* : Yet you say 'the ending of movement'.

*K* : Yes, of course, of course. Movement is time, movement is thought. The ending of movement: Can that really end or do we think it can end? You understand my question?

PJ : Yes, sir.

K : After all, the people who have somewhat gone into this kind of thing, both in the past and in the present, have always divided: the entity that enquires and that which is to be enquired into. That's my objection. I think that is the major block.

PJ : So, when you use the word 'enquiring', you use it as perception.

K : Perception, observing, watching. Now, we'll go into that, in a minute, if we have time. But I want to come back to this, if I may. What will make human beings alter the way they behave? This appalling brutality. What will change all this? Who will change it? -- Not the politicians, not the priests, not the people who are talking about the environment, the ecologists and so on. They've not changed the human being. If man himself will not change, who will? The Church has tried to change man. Right? And it hasn't succeeded. Religions have tried throughout the world to humanize, to make man more intelligent, more considerate and affectionate. So far they have not succeeded. Culture has not succeeded.

PJ : You say all this Krishnaji, but that in itself does not bring man to that perception of fact.

K : So what will make him? Say, for instance, you and another have this perception. I may not have it. So what effect has your perception on me? Again, if you have perception and power, position, I worship you or kill you. Right? So I'm asking a much deeper question. I want to really find out why human beings, after so many millions of years, are like this. One group against another, one tribe against another, one nation against another. The horror that's going on. A new culture: Will that bring about a change? Does man *want* to change? Or he says, 'Things are all right, let's go on. We'll evolve to a certain stage eventually'.

PJ : Most people feel that.

K : Yes, that's what's so appalling about it. *Eventually*. 'Give another thousand years and we'll all be marvellous human beings'; which is so absurd. In the meantime we are destroying each other.

PJ : Sir, may I ask you something ? What is the actual moment of facing the fact? What is the actuality of it?

*K* : What is a fact, Pupul? We were discussing the other day, with a group of people here, that a fact is that which has been done, remembered, and that which is being done now, and that which has happened yesterday and remembered.

*PJ* : Or even a rising of a wave of fear, horror, anything.

*K* : Yes, yes.

*PJ* : Now, how does one actually --

*K* : Wait a minute, let us be clear when we say what is the fact. The fact of last week's incident is gone, but I remember it. Right? There is the remembrance of something pleasant or unpleasant as it happened -- which was a fact -- and which is stored in the brain, and what is being done now -- also a fact -- coloured by the past, controlled by the past, shaped by the past. So, can I see this whole movement as a fact?

*K* : The whole movement -- the future, the present and the past.

*PJ* : The seeing-it-as-a-fact is seeing it without a cliché.

*K* : Without a cliché, without any prejudice, bias.

*PJ* : Without anything surrounding it.

*K* : That's right. Which means what?

*PJ* : Negating, first of all, all the responses which arise surrounding the remembrances.

*K* : Negating the remembrances. Just keep to that for the moment.

*PJ* : The remembrances which arise --

*K* : Out of the fact of last week's pleasure or pain, reward or punishment. Now, is that possible?

*PJ* : Yes, that is possible.

*K* : That's possible. Why?

*PJ* : Because, the very attention itself --

*K* : Dissipates memory, remembrance. Now, an incident happened last week. Can the brain be so attentive that it does not carry on remembering? My son is dead, and I've suffered. But the memory of that son has such strength in my brain, that I constantly remember it. It rises and disappears; but it's there. So, can the brain say, 'Yes, my son is dead; that's the end of it'?

*PJ* : Does one say that or when there is a rising --

*K* : And then ending ? Which means an endless arising and ending.

*PJ* : No, but there is an arising --

*K* : Which is a remembrance. Let's keep to the word.

*PJ* : which is a remembrance. Out of that, there is the movement of pain. The negation of that pain ends not only the pain but also the arising.

*K* : Which means what? Go into it a little bit more. What does that mean? My son is dead. I remember all the things that he did, etc., etc. There is the photograph of him on the piano or on the mantelpiece, and there is this constant remembrance -- flowing in and flowing out. That's a fact.

*PJ* : But the negating of that pain and the dissolving of this -- doesn't it have a direct action on the brain?

*K* : That's what I'm coming to. Which means what? My son is dead; that's a fact. I can't change a fact. He's gone. Sounds cruel to say it -- but he's gone. But I'm carrying him all the time. The brain is carrying him as memory, and the reminder is always there. I never say, 'He's gone. *That's a fact*'. But I live on memories -- which is a dead thing. Memories are not actual. Now, the ending of the fact -- 'My son is gone' -- doesn't mean that I have lost love or anything. My son is gone; that's a fact.

*PJ* : But what remains when a fact is perceived?

*K* : May I say something without being shocking? -- Nothing. My

son is gone or my brother, my wife, whatever it is -- gone. This is not an assertion of cruelty or a denial of my affection, my love. Not the love of *my* son, but the *identification* of love with my son. I don't know if I'm --

*PJ* : You're drawing a distinction between love of my son...

*K* : And love.

*PJ* : and love.

*K* : Then, if I love my son in the deeper sense of the word, I love man; humanity. It's not only, 'I love my son' but I love the whole human world -- the earth, the trees, the stars, the whole universe. But that's a different matter. We were asking a really good question, which is: What takes place when there is the perception, pure perception, of fact -- without any bias, without any kind of escape and so on? And, to see the fact completely -- is that possible? When I'm in sorrow of my son's death, I'm lost. And at that moment you can't say anything to me. As I come out of this confusion and loneliness and despair and sorrow, then perhaps I'll be sensitive enough to perceive this fact.

*PJ* : You can't tell a person who has just lost a --

*K* : No. No, that will be cruel. But a man who says, 'My son is dead; what is it all about? Death is common to all humanity. Why do we exist?' is sensitive, asking, enquiring. He's awake. He wants to find an answer to all this.

*PJ* : Sir, at one level it seems so simple --

*K* : I know, and I think we must keep it simple and not bring about a lot of intellectual theories and ideas into it.

*PJ* : Is the mind afraid of the simple?

*K* : I think we are so highly intellectual. It's been a part of our education, part of our culture. Ideas are tremendously important; concepts are essential.

*PJ* : Sir, in the whole field of Indian culture, the highest is the dissolution of the self. And you talk of the dissolution

of the fact -- which is essentially the dissolution of the self.

**K** : Yes, but the dissolution of the self has become a concept, and we are worshipping a concept -- as they are all doing all over the world. Concepts are invented by thought, through analysis and so on. You come to a concept, and hold that concept as the most extraordinarily important thing. So, come back to the point: What will make human beings throughout the world behave? -- Not behave my way or your way, but *behave*. Don't kill. Don't be afraid. Love. Have great affection and so on. What would bring it about? Nothing has succeeded. You understand? Knowledge hasn't helped.

**PJ** : Isn't it because fear is his shadow?

**K** : Fear, and also we want to know what the future is.

**PJ** : Which is part of fear.

**K** : We want to know, because we have -- this is simple enough -- sought security in so many things, and they have all failed. And now we say, 'There must be security somewhere'. And I question whether there is any security somewhere at all -- even in God. That's a projection of one's own fears.

**PJ** : What's the action of this dissolution on the brain cell, on the brain itself?

**K** : I would use the word 'insight'. Insight is not a matter of memory, not a matter of knowledge and time -- which are all thought. I would say that insight is the absence -- total absence -- of the whole movement of thought as time and remembrance; so there is direct perception. It's like: I've been going north for the last ten thousand years; my brain is accustomed to going north, and somebody comes along and says, 'That leads you nowhere. Go east'. When I turn around and go east, the brain cells change. I'll put it differently. The whole movement of thought is limited, and is acting throughout the world now as the most important action. We are driven by thought. Thought will not solve any of our problems -- except technological problems. If I see that, I've stopped going north. And I think that at the ending of a certain direction -- the

ending of a movement that has been going on for thousands of years -- at that moment there is an insight which brings about a change, a mutation in the brain cells.

One sees this very clearly and one asks: What will make others -- make humanity -- change? What will make my son, my daughter, change? They hear all this, they read something about all this from biologists, psychologists and so on, and yet they continue in their own way. Is the past -- tradition -- so strong? I have thought about myself for the last thousand years and I still am thinking about myself: 'I must fulfil myself.' 'I must be great.' 'I must become something.' This is my condition, this is my tradition. And the past is incarnating all the time. Is it part of our culture to continue in our condition?

*PJ* : I would say that it is part of our culture.

*K* : Culture may be part of our hindrance. Religious concepts may be our hindrance. So, what is the brain to do? They are saying that one part of the brain is old, and another part of the brain is something totally new, and that if you can open the door to the new there might be change. For, according to these specialists, we are only using a very, very small part of our brain.

*PJ* : Obviously when there is attention --

*K* : The whole brain --

*PJ* : the fragment has ended.

*K* : That's it. We can talk about that, we can describe what attention is, we can go into it and so on. But at the end of it, a listener says, 'All right, I understand all this but I am what I am'.

*PJ* : No, sir, I understand this intellectually, verbally but --

*K* : It hasn't touched the depth of my being.

*PJ* : But isn't it a question of that first contact with thought, in the mind?

*K* : I haven't quite got it.

*PJ* : I have a feeling, sir, that we talk about observing thought, which is an entirely different thing to the actual state of attention.

*K* : That is, thought being aware of itself. Now, I'm afraid we are going away from this. It's a very central issue. The world is becoming more and more superficial. More and more money-minded. Money, power, position, fulfilment, identification. All this is being encouraged by everything around you. Now, you who have travelled, who have seen all this too, what do you make of all this business? There are these extraordinary, intelligent people -- clever people -- and the most stupid people, the neurotic, the people who have come to a conclusion and never move from that conclusion -- like the communists.

*PJ* : You can only touch the people who are not committed.

*K* : So, are there people who are not committed?

*PJ* : I would say that today that is the one sign of health.

*K* : Are they young people?

*PJ* : That there are today, as never before in the last 20 or 30 years, people who are not committed to anything.

*K* : I question that.

*PJ* : No, really sir, I would say so. On the one hand you see this tremendous deterioration of everything, and on the other, somewhere, this movement away from a commitment. They may not know where to turn. They may not have a direction, but they don't belong to anything.

*K* : There are people like that, I know. They become, you see, rather vague. They become rather confused.

*PJ* : Yes, because they turn these into concepts.

*K* : Yes.

*PJ* : It's so easy to turn what you say into a concept, and to have axioms which contain what you say.

*K* : Of course, of course.

*PJ* : If there is a human culture, which perhaps may be the culture of the mind, in such a stage -- if I may ask -- what happens to all the civilizations which the world has seen and known?

*K* : Gone. Take for instance the Egyptian civilization.

*PJ* : No, they may have gone, but they are still contained in the human race. But when you wipe out --

*K* : Which means Pupilji, actually: What is freedom? Are we aware that we are prisoners of own fantasies, imaginations, conclusions, ideas? Are we aware of all that?

*PJ* : I think we are.

*K* : Pupil, if we are aware, if we are attentive to all that, the thing is burnt out.

*PJ* : But, it doesn't end sir. *This* is of course gone, but at some point where we can't...because you don't admit of an in-between state.

*K* : That's impossible.

*PJ* : See, this is the whole problem.

*K* : 'In-between'-- it's like a man who is violent and trying to be non-violent. In the 'in-between' state he is violent.

*PJ* : Isn't that also a question of this whole movement of time?

*K* : Time and thought and so on. Which is what? Limitation. If we could just acknowledge or see the fact that as thought -- in any direction, in any field: surgery, technology, computers and also enquiring into itself -- is limited, one's enquiry will also be very, very, very limited.

*PJ* : Yes, but the difference is, sir, I might see that, but the attention necessary for it to remain alive in my waking day is not there.

*K* : I know.

*PJ* : It's that the quantum, the capacity, the strength of that attention which --

**K :** How do you have that passion, how do you have that sustained movement of energy that is not dissipated by thought, by any kind of activity? I think that only comes when you understand sorrow and the ending of sorrow. *Then* compassion and love and that intelligence which is the energy which has no depression, and none of the human qualities.

**PJ :** You mean it neither rises nor falls.

**K :** No. To rise and fall, you must be aware that it's rising and falling. And who is it who's aware and so on?

**PJ :** No, but is it possible throughout the day to hold that passion?

**K :** It is there. You don't hold it. It's like a perfume that's there. That's why I think one has to understand the whole conditioning of our consciousness. I think *that's* the real study, real enquiry, real exploration: to go into our consciousness, which is the common ground of all humanity. We never enquire and study it -- not that we should enquire as a professor or psychologist enquires and studies. We never say, 'Look, I am going to study this consciousness which is me. I am going to look into it'.

**PJ :** I can't say one doesn't; one says that --

**K :** But doesn't.

**PJ :** One *does* it.

**K :** Partially.

**PJ :** I won't accept that, sir. One does it, one attends, one enquires.

**K :** And then what?

**PJ :** And then suddenly --

**K :** And have you come to the end of it?

**PJ :** No, suddenly one finds that one has been inattentive.

**K :** No, I don't think inattention matters. You may be tired. Your brain has enquired enough and you may say, 'Enough for today'. Well,

there's nothing wrong with that. You see, I object to this question of attention and inattention.

*PJ* : But that is the basic question in most of our minds.

*K* : No, I would not put it that way. I would only say that where there is this ending of something -- totally -- there is a new beginning which has its own momentum. It's nothing to do with one. That means, one must be completely free of the self. And to be free of the self is one of the most difficult things, because it hides under different ... oh ... [Shrugs] different rocks, different trees, different activities.

Brockwood Park, 1983

24th June  
h

## BOOK REVIEW

### J.Krishnamurti as I Knew Him

By S. Weeraperuma: *Chetana, Bombay.*

Why is it that we find the biographies of great men more arresting than their writings? Is it that the stories of men's lives are nearer the bone, closer to origins of greatness, and therefore more revealing of the real man than the writing? Or is it that in biographies we see the life quickened by the thought and the thought made transparent by the life?

Certainly the published biographies and memoirs evoke different facets of Krishnamurti's personality -- the religious philosopher, the poetic friend, the reluctant guru, the religious sceptic, the mysterious stranger. Several of these are written by men and women who were connected with his work and closely associated with the events in his life. Inevitably these memoirs and biographies reflect the personality of the authors, their real and imagined place under the Krishnamurti sun. And inevitably they are partial. For Krishnamurti was not only a great and passionate man, he was also a man who gave of himself completely and with abandon to his audience. So it is with the sense that each new biographical venture adds a facet to our knowledge of Krishnamurti's enigmatic personality that we welcome Dr Susunaga Weeraperuma's latest book.

Dr Weeraperuma is best known as the compiler of the only Krishnamurti bibliography. He first heard Krishnamurti in 1949, while still a student at Sri Lanka's Colombo University. Sri Lanka is a country which had preserved the ancient Pali texts of Buddhism and kept the faith alive long after its disappearance in India. Dr Weeraperuma

was brought up in the Buddhist faith. And it is through an abstract view of the religious phenomenon, heavily influenced by Buddhism, that Dr Weeraperuma sees Krishnamurti. Near the very beginning of the book, Dr Weeraperuma declares: 'No name can adequately describe the man who represented that which is nameless.' -- Name and form (*namarupa*) merely cover over that which is timeless. And if Krishnamurti embodied the timeless, what was he like?

This initial statement and the questions that arise from it, dictate the form of the present memoir, and link it to the traditional lives of saints -- biography mixed with religious teaching, meant essentially to be uplifting.

Dr Weeraperuma affirms Krishnamurti's spiritual personality through anecdotes which underline Krishnamurti's love of nature, his self deprecating humour, his generosity and disregard for people in high places, his intensity. He also defends Krishnamurti's occasional irritation and impatience with his audiences. The tone throughout is deeply affectionate and also serious. For the anecdotes are summed up with a general statement linking the personality with the teaching -- Krishnamurti's or Buddha's.

The title of the book *J. Krishnamurti as I Knew Him* suggests a memoir, but the book is strictly speaking not a memoir. There is no quizzical investigation of the human personality, the changing inchoate being, a bundle of memories -- to use both Buddhist and Krishnamurti's vocabulary -- when it is infused with divinity. What happens to a personality when the observer and the observed merge? What happens to the human being who has lost the basic sense of self protection which gives the ordinary human personality its strength? And the parallel question -- what happens to a writer, also a bundle of memories, when he encounters the 'nameless'? The author does not turn autobiographical and tell the reader how his encounter with Krishnamurti changed the course of his life. Krishnamurti is perfected humanity and the author is a witness of that perfection -- this is the general framework of the book.

Important issues are raised on the few occasions when the author does step outside this framework. One such instance occurred in 1968 when Krishnamurti set up the Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, in England. Dr Weeraperuma wrote a letter to Krishnamurti, which

he quotes in full here, warning him of the dangers inherent in spiritual organizations. Dr Weeraperuma reports that he did not receive any reply from Krishnamurti. But several months later when Krishnamurti met Dr Weeraperuma, he told him that it was 'quite a sensible letter'.

The ambivalence revealed by Krishnamurti here about spiritual organizations was well entrenched. Krishnamurti was the man who dissolved the spiritual organization to which he was heir by virtue of occult predictions and training. And even after he had set up organizations which bore his name, Krishnamurti continued to speak out against spiritual organizations and is supposed to be the author of the following joke, repeated in the book by Dr Weeraperuma. The devil was taking a walk with a man who picks up something. 'What is it?' asks the devil. 'The truth', says the man. 'Let us organize it', says the devil.

Dr Weeraperuma does not consider Krishnamurti's attitude here as paradoxical. He is convinced that Krishnamurti made a 'colossal mistake' by linking his name to organizations. Towards the end of the book he writes: 'Let us not build an organization or a temple around his name, for over the years one of the things he so vehemently denounced was organized religion, especially organized religion with vested interests.'

Dr Weeraperuma's warning is well taken, for the history of organized religion has been one of followers taking on to themselves the charisma associated with the founder. And yet, Dr Weeraperuma must surely have wondered what would happen to the schools that Krishnamurti had worked so hard and so assiduously to establish, without people to look after them? What would happen to the places that Krishnamurti had so loved without an organization? Would such an extensive body of work survive without an organization devoted to its preservation?

Surely it is premature to suggest that Krishnamurti made a 'colossal mistake' by creating organizations around his teachings. It need not necessarily be so. For Krishnamurti always held out the possibility of people whose faces are turned to the truth working together. And whether this will happen or will not happen depends on whether those in positions of authority in the Krish-

namurti organizations choose to live by Krishnamurti's teaching or do not choose to do so. The history of Buddhism in Sri Lanka surely justifies Krishnamurti's paradoxical attitude to spiritual organizations.

R.H.

From *Krishnamurti as I Knew Him* by S. Weeraperuma

Commentaries on the Teachings

There is a popular misconception that K was opposed to books by authors who discussed his teachings. I decided to obtain K's opinion of this issue by meeting him privately. With characteristic clarity K answered my question:

'Each person who has been touched by the teachings will want to spread them according to his talents. Some will become teachers or preachers. Others may like to express their understanding by writing books about the teachings.'

'My problem', I explained, 'is that I happen to be a conscientious writer. I am particularly careful not to misinterpret your teachings. Still, how can I be sure that I am not inadvertently distorting them?'

K said: 'It is very simple. You must write in the light of your own understanding. Don't read into the teachings what is not intended. This means that you must be so intensely watchful of yourself so that you are no longer influenced by the various ideas, beliefs and experiences that have conditioned your outlook on life. When writing about the teachings, can you not state that you are only investigating them? Both you and your reader are going on a voyage of discovery together. Neither of you is sure what exactly K meant by a certain statement. Therefore you can never say "This is what K meant". All you can say is "Probably this is what K meant". It is good to use words like "perhaps" and "probably" because they introduce an element of doubt in the mind of the reader. Sir, if you do that you will not run the risk of becoming a misinterpreter.'

There will be a public gathering at Rajghat from 22nd November to 25th November 1989. Those wishing to attend the gathering should contact:

Rector,  
Rajghat Education Centre,  
K.F.I.  
Rajghat Fort,  
Varanasi. 221 001

### 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.

Statement about ownership and other particulars of  
Krishnamurti Foundation India Bulletin

**FORM IV**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Place of Publication  | Krishnamurti Foundation India<br>'Vasanta Vihar'<br>64/65, Greenways Road,<br>Madras 600 028 |
| 2. Periodicity of Publication  | Once in 4 months   |
| 3. Printer's Name  | J. Loyola Rodrigo  |
| Whether Citizen of India   | Yes  |
| Address:   | M/S Sidma Offset Press (P) Ltd.,<br>56, Cathedral Rd.,<br>Madras 600 086                     |
| 4. Publisher's Name  | Dr. (Mrs.) Radhika Herzberger  |
| Whether Citizen of India   | Yes  |
| Address:   | Krishnamurti Foundation India<br>'Vasanta Vihar'<br>64/65, Greenways Road,<br>Madras 600 028 |
| 5. Editor's Name   | Dr. (Mrs.) Radhika Herzberger  |
| Address  | Same as above  |
| 6. Name and addresses of individuals who own the Newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one percent of the total capital | Krishnamurti Foundation India<br>Address as above  |

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

Dated 10 th August 1989

Sd/- Radhika Herzberger  
Signature of publisher

**Published by Dr. (Mrs.) Radhika Herzberger for the Krishnamurti Foundation India, 64/65, Greenways Road, Madras 600 028 and printed at M/S Sidma Offset Press (P) Ltd., 56, Cathedral Road, Madras 600 086.**

**Editor: Dr. (Mrs.) Radhika Herzberger**

**KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA**  
**Vasanta Vihar,64/5 Greenways Road, Madras 600 028**

U.K.	Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. Brockwood Park, Bramdean, Hants, U.K., SO24 0LQ
SPANISH AMERICA	Fundacion 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	Krishnamurti Australia, Box 6486, GCMC,Bundall, QLD., 4217.
BELGIUM	Krishnamurti Komitee Belgje (French) Comte et Comtesse Hugues van der Straten Ponthoz, Mr R.Linssen, 20 rue Pere Dedeken, 1040 Bruxells Krishnamurti Komitee Belgje (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 Germlinden Mr Manfred Schneider, Albert-Schweizer-Strasse 1, D-6072 Dreieich-Gotzenhain
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- Mizrah 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 Nederland, 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	Nucleo 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 South Africa, 113 Ninth Avenue, Durban
SPAIN	Krishnamurti Informacion, 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 Wurenlingen Miss Gisele Balleys (for Suisse Romande) rue Encyclopedie 6 bis, CH 1202 Geneva