

1 9 9 6 / 1

Bulletin

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

FROM THE EDITOR

Nationalism has been the dominating ideology of the twentieth century. It draws its force from stories people have always told each other in response to questions such as: who are we, where did our heroic ancestors come from, how are we different from others? These narratives, which underpin our self-identity and group identities, have served to unite people but also to divide them. Krishnamurti saw clearly that a nation—propped up by a partial view of history, in competition with its neighbours, and heavily armed—is no different from an isolated person locked into his own individuality.

Krishnamurti believed that both nationalism and organized religion are basically divisive, because the sense of identity they foster is exclusive. As Hindus, we define ourselves by rejecting others. In thus defining ourselves and rejecting others, we thrust our worst fears on to them. Thus a cycle of hatred and fear takes root which eventually leads to violence. Brotherhood, he asserted in his later writings, is an ideal; the fact is that men and women do not live in amity. Freedom from strife is not gained by reaching towards ideals of brotherhood, but in coming face to face with the psyche in strife.

His critique of idealism and its utopian visions helped underpin Krishnamurti's view, that all group identities are antithetical in spirit, and his conclusion, that the search for self-identity is wrong-headed. Moral insight requires that we neutralize the desire to find security in extended identifications. In place of endorsing the search for group identities and self-identities, he asked a different question and asserted a different fact: 'You are the world, you are not a Russian or an American, you are not Hindu or Muslim. You are apart from these labels, you are the rest of mankind.'

In this issue of the Bulletin we bring you Krishnamurti's critique of nationalism.

RELATIONSHIP, FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

J. KRISHNAMURTI (K): I think that by understanding relationship we shall understand what we mean by independence. Life is a process of constant movement in relationship, and without understanding relationship we shall bring about confusion, struggle and fruitless effort. So, it is important to understand what we mean by relationship, because out of relationship society is built. There is no such thing as living in isolation. That which is isolated soon dies.

So, our problem is not what independence is, but what we mean by relationship. In understanding relationship, which is the conduct between human beings whether intimate or foreign, whether close or far away, we shall begin to understand the whole process of existence and the conflict between bondage and independence. So, we must very carefully examine what we mean by relationship. Is not relationship at present a process of isolation, and therefore a constant conflict? The relationship between you and another—between you and your wife, between you and society—is the product of this isolation. By isolation I mean that we are all the time seeking security, gratification and power.

After all, each one of us in our relationship with another is seeking gratification; and where there is search for comfort, for security, whether it be a nation or an individual, there must be isolation, and that which is in isolation invites conflict. Any thing that resists is bound to produce conflict between itself and that which it is resisting; and since most of our relationship is a form of resistance we create a society which inevitably breeds isolation and hence conflict within and without that isolation. So, we must examine relationship as it actually works in our lives. After all, what I am—my actions, my thoughts, my feelings, my motives, my intentions—brings about that relationship between myself and another which we call society. There is no society without this relationship between two people; and before we can talk

about independence, wave the flag, and all the rest of it, we have to understand relationship, which means we must examine ourselves in our relationship with another.

Now, if we examine our life, our relationship with another, we will see that it is a process of isolation. We are really not concerned with another; though we talk a great deal about it, actually we are not concerned. We are related to someone only as long as that relationship gratifies us, as long as it gives us a refuge, as long as it satisfies us. But the moment there is a disturbance in the relationship which produces discomfort in ourselves, we discard that relationship. In other words, there is relationship only as long as we are gratified. This may sound harsh, but if you really examine your life very closely, you will see that it is a fact; and to avoid a fact is to live in ignorance, which can never produce right relationship.

So, if we look into our lives and observe relationship, we see that it is a process of building resistance against another, a wall over which we look and observe the other, and we always retain the wall and remain behind it, whether it be a psychological wall, a material wall, an economic wall, or a national wall. As long as we live in isolation, behind a wall, there is no relationship with another; and we live enclosed because it is much more gratifying, we think it is much more secure. The world is so disruptive, there is so much sorrow, so much pain, war, destruction, misery, that we want to escape and live within the walls of security of our own psychological being. So, relationship with most of us is actually a process of isolation, and obviously such relationship builds a society which is also isolating. That is exactly what is happening throughout the world: You remain in your isolation and stretch your hand over the wall, calling it nationalism, brotherhood or what you will; but actual, sovereign governments, armies, continue. That is, clinging to your own limitations, you think you can create world unity, world peace, and that is impossible. As long as you have a frontier, whether national, economic, religious, or social, it is an obvious fact that there cannot be peace in the world.

Now, the process of isolation is a process of the search for power; and whether one is seeking power individually or for a racial or national group, there must be isolation, because the very desire for power, for position, is separatism. After all, that is what each one wants, is it not? He wants a powerful position in which he can dominate, whether at home, in the office, or in a bureaucratic regime. Each one is seeking power, and in seeking power he will establish a society which is based on power, military, industrial, economic, and so on—which again is obvious. Is not the desire for power in its very nature isolating? I think it is very important to understand this, because the man who wants a peaceful world, a world in which there are no wars, no appalling destruction, no catastrophic misery, on an immeasurable scale, must understand this fundamental question, must he not?

As long as the individual seeks power, however much or however little, whether as a prime minister, as a governor, a lawyer, or merely as a husband or a wife in the home, that is, as long as you desire the sense of domination, the sense of compulsion, the sense of building power, influence, surely you are bound to create a society which is the result of an isolating process; because, power in its very nature is isolating, is separating. A man who is affectionate, who is kindly, has no sense of power, and therefore such a man is not bound to any nationality, to any flag. He has no flag. But the man who is seeking power in any form, whether derived from bureaucracy or from the self-projection which he calls God, is still caught in an isolating process. If you examine it very carefully, you will see that the desire for power in its very nature is a process of enclosure. Each one is seeking his own position, his own security, and as long as that motive exists, society must be built on an isolating process. Where there is the search for power, there is a process of isolation, and that which is isolated is bound to create conflict. That is exactly what is happening throughout the world: each group is seeking power and thereby isolating itself, and this is the process of nationalism, of patriotism, ultimately leading to war and destruction.

Now, without relationship, there is no possibility of existence in life; and as long as relationship is based on power, on domination, there must be the process of isolation, which inevitably invites conflict. There is no such thing as living in isolation—no country, no people, no individual, can live in isolation; yet because you are seeking power in so many different ways, you breed isolation. The nationalist is a curse because through his very nationalistic, patriotic spirit, he is creating a wall of isolation. He is so identified with his country that he builds a wall against another. And what happens, sirs, when you build a wall against something? That something is constantly beating against your wall. When you resist something, the very resistance indicates that you are in conflict with the other. So nationalism, which is a process of isolation, which is the outcome of the search for power, cannot bring about peace in the world. The man who is a nationalist and talks of brotherhood is telling a lie, he is living in a state of contradiction.

Peace in the world is essential, otherwise we will be destroyed; a few may escape, but there will be greater destruction than ever before unless we solve the problem of peace. Peace is not an ideal; an ideal, as we discussed, is fictitious. What is actual must be understood, and that understanding of the actual is prevented by the fiction which we call an ideal. The actual is that each one is seeking power, titles, positions of authority, and so on—all of which is covered up in various forms by well-meaning words. This is a vital problem, it is not a theoretical problem nor one that can be postponed—it demands action now, because the catastrophe is obviously coming. If it does not come tomorrow, it will come next year, or soon after, because the momentum of the isolating process is already here; and he who really thinks about it must tackle the root of the problem, which is the individual's search for power, creating the power-seeking group, race, and nation.

Now, can one live in the world without the desire for power, for position, for authority? Obviously one can. One does it when one does not identify oneself with something greater. This identification with something greater—the party,

the country, the race, religion, God—is the search for power. Because you in yourself are empty, dull, weak, you like to identify yourself with something greater. That desire to identify yourself with something greater is the desire for power. That is why nationalism, or any communal spirit, is such a curse in the world; it is still the desire for power.

So, the important thing in understanding life and, therefore, relationship is to discover the motive that is driving each one of us; because what that motive is, the environment is. That motive brings either peace or destruction in the world. And so it is very important for each one of us to be aware that the world is in a state of misery and destruction, and to realize that if we are seeking power, consciously or unconsciously, we are contributing to that destruction, and therefore our relationship with society will be a constant process of conflict. There are multiple forms of power, it is not merely the acquisition of position and wealth. The very desire to be something is a form of power, which brings isolation and therefore conflict; and unless each one understands the motive, the intention of his actions, mere government legislation is of very little importance, because the inner is always overcoming the outer. You may outwardly build a peaceful structure but the men who run it will alter it according to their intention. That is why it is very important, for those who wish to create a new culture, a new society, a new state, first to understand themselves.

In becoming aware of oneself, of the various inward movements and fluctuations, one will understand the motives, the intentions, the perils that are hidden; and only in that awareness is there transformation. Regeneration can come about only when there is cessation of this search for power; and then only can we create a new culture, a society which will not be based on conflict, but on understanding. Relationship is a process of self-revelation, and without knowing oneself, the ways of one's own mind and heart, merely to establish an outward order, a system, a cunning formula, has very little meaning. So what is important is to understand oneself in relationship with another. Then relationship becomes not a process of isolation, but a movement in which you discover

your own motives, your own thoughts, your own pursuits; and that very discovery is the beginning of liberation, the beginning of transformation. It is only this immediate transformation that can bring about the fundamental, radical revolution in the world which is so essential. Revolution within the walls of isolation is not a revolution. Revolution comes only when the walls of isolation are destroyed, and that can take place only when you are no longer seeking power.

I have several questions, and I will try to answer as many of them as possible.

QUESTION: *Can I remain a government official if I want to follow your teachings? The same question would arise with regard to so many professions. What is the right solution to the problem of livelihood?*

K: Sirs, what do we mean by livelihood? It is the earning of one's needs, food, clothing and shelter, is it not? The difficulty of livelihood arises only when we use the essentials of life—food, clothing and shelter—as a means of psychological aggression. That is, when the needs, the necessities, as a means of self-aggrandizement, then the problem of livelihood arises and our society is essentially based, not on supplying the essentials, but on psychological aggrandizement, using the essentials as a psychological expansion of oneself. Sirs, you have to think it out a little bit. Obviously, food, clothing and shelter could be produced abundantly; there is enough scientific knowledge to supply the demand, but the demand for war is greater, not merely by the warmongers, but by each one of us, because each one of us is violent. There is sufficient scientific knowledge to give man all the necessities; it has been worked out, and they could be produced so that no man would be in need. Why does it not happen? Because no one is satisfied with food, clothing and shelter, each one wants something more; and, put in different words, the 'more' is power. But it would be brutish merely to be satisfied with needs. We will be satisfied with needs in the true sense, which is freedom from the desire for power, only when we have found the inner treasure which is imperishable—which

you call God, truth, or what you will. If you can find those imperishable riches within yourself, then you will be satisfied with few things which can be supplied.

But, unfortunately, we are carried away by sensate values. The values of the senses have become more important than the values of the real. After all, our whole social structure, our present civilization, is essentially based on sensate values. Sensate values are not merely the values of the senses, but the values of thought, because thought is also the result of the senses; and when the mechanism of thought, which is the intellect, is cultivated, then there is in us a predominance of thought, which is also a sensory value. So, as long as we are seeking sensate values, whether of touch, of taste, of smell, of perception, or of thought, the outer becomes far more significant than the inner; and the mere denial of the outer is not the way to the inner. You may deny the outer and withdraw from the world into a jungle or a cave and there think of God, but that very denial of the outer, that thinking of God, is still sensate, because thought is sensate; and any value based on the sensate is bound to create confusion—which is what is happening in the world at the present time. The sensate is dominant, and as long as the social structure is built on that, the means of livelihood becomes extraordinarily difficult.

So, what is the right means of livelihood? This question can be answered only when there is a complete revolution in the present social structure, not according to the formula of the right or of the left, but a complete revolution in values which are not based on the sensate. Now, those who have leisure, like the older people who are drawing their pensions, who have spent their earlier years seeking God or else various forms of destruction, if they really gave their time, their energy, to finding out the right solution, then they would act as a medium, as an instrument for bringing about revolution in the world. But they are not interested. They want security. They have worked so many years for their pensions, and they would like to live comfortably for the rest of their lives. They have time, but they are indifferent; they are only concerned with some abstraction which they call God, and which has no reference to the actual; but their abstraction is not God, it is a

form of escape. And those who fill their lives with ceaseless activity are caught in the middle, they have not the time to find the answers to the various problems of life. So, those who are concerned with these things, with bringing about a radical transformation in the world through the understanding of themselves, in them alone is there hope.

Sirs, surely we can see what is a wrong profession. To be a soldier, a policeman, a lawyer, is obviously a wrong profession, because they thrive on conflict, on dissension; and the big business man, the capitalist, thrives on exploitation. The big business man may be an individual, or it may be the State; if the State takes over big business it does not cease to exploit you and me. And as society is based on the army, the police, the law, the big business man, that is, on the principle of dissension, exploitation and violence, how can you and I, who want a decent, right profession, survive? There is increasing unemployment, greater armies, larger police forces with their secret service, and big business is becoming bigger and bigger, forming vast corporations which are eventually taken over by the State; for the State has become a great corporation in certain countries. Given this situation of exploitation, of a society built on dissension, how are you going to find a right livelihood? It is almost impossible, is it not? Either you will have to go away and form with a few people a community, a self-supporting, co-operative community or merely succumb to the vast machine. But you see, most of us are not interested in really finding the right livelihood. Most of us are concerned with getting a job and sticking to it in the hope of advancement with more and more pay. Because each one of us wants safety, security, a permanent position, there is no radical revolution. It is not those who are self-satisfied, contented, but only the adventurous, those who want to experiment with their lives, with their existence, who discover the real things, a new way of living.

So, before there can be a right livelihood, the obviously false means of earning a livelihood must first be seen; the army, the law, the police, the big business corporations that are sucking people in and exploiting them, whether in the name of the State, of capital, or of religion. When you see the

false and eradicate the false, there is transformation, there is revolution; and it is that revolution alone that can create a new society. To seek, as an individual, a right livelihood, is good, is excellent, but that does not solve the vast problem. The vast problem is solved only when you and I are not seeking security. There is no such thing as security. When you seek security, what happens? What is happening in the world at the present time? All Europe wants security, is crying for it, and what is happening? They want security through their nationalism. After all, you are a nationalist because you want security, and you think that through nationalism you are going to have security. It has been proved over and over again that you cannot have security through nationalism, because nationalism is a process of isolation, inviting wars, misery and destruction.

So, right livelihood on a vast scale must begin with those who understand what is false. When you are battling against the false then you are creating the right means of livelihood. When you are battling against the whole structure of dissension, of exploitation whether by the left or by the right, or the authority of religion and the priests, that is the right profession at the present time; because, that will create a new society, a new culture. But to battle, you must see very clearly and very definitely that which is false, so that the false drops away. To discover what is false, you must be aware of it, you must observe everything that you are doing, thinking and feeling; and out of that you will not only discover what is false, but out of that there will come a new vitality, a new energy, and that energy will dictate what kind of work to do or not to do.

QUESTION: Can you state briefly the basic principles on which a new society should be built?

K: I can state the principles; that is very simple, but it would be of no value. What has value is that you and I should discover together the basic principles on which a new society can be built; because, the moment we discover together what the basic principles are, there is a new basis of relationship between us. Do you understand? Then I am no longer the

teacher and you the pupil, or you the audience and I the lecturer—we start on a different footing altogether. That means no authority, does it not? We are partners in discovering, and therefore we are in co-operation; therefore, you do not dominate or influence me, nor I you. We are both discovering; and when there is the intention on your part as well as on mine to discover what the basic principles of a new culture are, obviously there cannot be an authoritative spirit, can there? Therefore, we have established a new principle already, have we not? As long as there is authority in relationship, there is compulsion; and nothing can be created through compulsion. A government that compels, a teacher that compels, an environment that compels, does not bring about relationship, but merely a state of slavery.

So, we have discovered one thing together, for we know that we both want to create a new society in which there can be no authority; and that has an enormous significance, because the structure of our present social order is based on authority. The specialist in education, the specialist in medicine, the military specialist, the specialist in law, the bureaucrat—they all dominate us. The sastras say so, therefore it must be true; my guru says so, therefore it must be right and I am going to follow it. In other words, in a society where there is the search for the real, the search for understanding, the search for the establishment of right relationship between two human beings, there can be no authority. The moment you discard authority, you are in partnership; therefore there is co-operation, there is affection—which is contrary to the present social structure.

At present, you leave your children to the educator, while the educator himself needs educating. Religiously, you are merely imitative, copying machines. In every direction you are dominated, influenced, compelled, forced; and how can there be a relationship between the exploiter and the exploited, between those who are in power and those who are subject to power—unless you yourself want the same kind of power? If you do, then you are in relationship with that power. But if you see that any desire for power is in itself destructive, then there is no relationship with those who seek

power. So, we begin to discover the basic principles upon which a new society can be built. Obviously, relationship based on domination is no longer a relationship. When there is no domination, no authority, no compulsion, what does it mean? Obviously, there is affection, there is tenderness, there is love, there is understanding. For that to take place, domination must disappear. We can discuss this presently, if you will listen to me. You seem irritated—perhaps I am upsetting your apple cart a little bit; but you will go out and do exactly the same thing that you did before, because you are not really concerned with the finding of a new basic order. You want to be secure, you want your positions, or such positions as you have, and you want to use them for your own purpose, which you call noble; but it is still a form of self-expansion, exploitation.

So, our difficulty in these discussions and talks is that we are not very serious about all this. We would like things to be altered, but slowly, gradually, and at our convenience. We don't want to be disturbed too much, so we are not really basically concerned with a new culture. The man who is concerned sees as false the obviously pernicious things such as authority, belief, nationalism, the whole hierarchical spirit. When all that is put aside, what happens? You are merely a citizen, a human being without authority; and when you have no authority, then perhaps you will have love, and therefore, you will have understanding. That is what is required: a group of people who understand, who have affection, whose hearts are not filled with empty words and empty phrases, the things of the mind. It is they who will create a new culture, not the spinner of words. Therefore, it is very important for each one of us to see himself in the mirror of relationship, for out of that alone can there be a new culture.

QUESTION: What must we do to have really good government, and not merely self-government?

K: Sirs, to have a good government, you must first understand what you mean by government. Don't let us use words without a referent, words without meaning, without something behind them. The word 'watch' has a referent, but

'good government' has no referent, To find the referent, we will have to discuss what we mean by 'government' and what we mean by 'good', but merely to say what is good government has no meaning.

So, first, let us find out what we mean by 'good'. I am not splitting hairs, I am not being school-boyish discussing at a union; because, it is very important to find out what we are talking about, and not merely use words that have little meaning. I know we are fed on words; it creates an impression for us to talk of having self-government and wave the flag—you know the whole business of being enchanted with words when our hearts and minds are empty. So, let us find out what we mean by 'good government'.

What do we mean by 'good'? 'Good' obviously has a referent based on pleasure and pain. 'Good' is that which gives you pleasure, 'bad' that which gives you pain, whether outwardly or inwardly, whether inside or outside the skin. That is a fact, is it not? We are discussing the fact, not what you would like it to be. The fact is, as long as you seek pleasure in various forms—as security, as comfort, as power, as money—that pleasure is what you call 'good', and anything that disturbs the state of pleasure, you call 'not good'. I am not discussing philosophically, but actually. Pleasure is what you want, so obviously you call 'good' that which gives you security, comfort, position, power, safety. Do you follow? That is, 'good' government is that body which can supply what you want; and if the government does not give you what you want, you say, 'Throw it out'—unless it is a totalitarian government. Even totalitarian governments can be destroyed if the people say, 'We don't want this'. But nowadays it is almost impossible to bring about physical revolution, because the aeroplanes and other war machines without which there cannot be modern revolution are in the hands of the government. So, the 'good' is what you want, is it not? Sirs, don't let us fool ourselves and spin a lot of words about abstract 'good' and abstract 'evil'. Actually, in your daily life, the fact is that those who give you what you want, you call 'good', 'noble', 'efficient', and so on, using various terms. What you want is gratification in different forms, and that which can give it to you, you call beneficent.

So, the government is the body which you create out of your want, is it not? That is, the government is you. What you are, the government is, which is an obvious fact in the world. You hate a particular country, and elect those people who will support your hate. You are communalistically inclined and you create a government that has your communalistic outlook—which is again an obvious fact, we need not elaborate it. Since what you are, your government is, how can you have 'good' government? You can have good government only when you have transformed yourselves. Otherwise, the government is merely a bureau, a group of people whom you have elected to supply you with what you want. You say you don't want war, but you encourage all the causes that breed war, like nationalism, communalism, and so on. That being your condition, you create a government, as you create a society, after your own likeness; and having created that government, the government in turn exploits you. So, it is a vicious circle. There can be good—I won't call it 'good'—there can be sane government only when you yourself are sane. Sirs, don't smile. It is a fact; we are insane, we are not rational, clean human beings. We are unbalanced, therefore our governments are unbalanced. Do you mean to say, sirs, that, seeing the whole world caught up in the appalling catastrophe of war and the production of war machines, a sane human being does not want to break it up? Therefore, he will find out what the causes of war are, and not say, 'Well, it is my country, I must protect it'—which is too immature and silly.

Now, one of the causes of war is greed—greed to be something greater—which causes you to identify yourself with the country. You say, 'I am a Hindu', 'I am a Buddhist', 'I am a Christian', 'I am a Russian', or what you will. That is one of the causes of war. And a man who is sane says, 'I am going to get rid of that insane imitation which ultimately produces destruction'. Therefore, we must first create sanity, not a plan for a new government, or a so-called 'good' government; and in order to be sane, you must know what you are, you must be aware of yourself. But again, you see, you are not interested. You are interested in waving flags, you are interested in listening to speeches which have no meaning, you are

interested in stimulation. All these are indications of insanity. And how can you expect a sane government when the citizens are not fully awake, when they are half-alert and unbalanced?

Sirs, when you yourselves are in confusion, you create the leader who is confused, and you will hear the voice of him who is confused. If you are not confused, if you are clear, tranquil, you will have no leader; if you are clear, you will not wait for the government to tell you what to do. Why does a man want a government? Sirs, some of you smile, and you will push it out. Because you don't know how to love rationally, humanly, you want somebody to tell you what to do; therefore there is the multiplication of laws, laws, and more laws, what you must and must not do. So, it is your fault, sirs. You are responsible for the government that you have, or are going to have; because unless you radically transform yourselves, what you are your government is. If you are communalistically-minded, you will create a government that is like you. And what does it mean? More disturbance, more destruction.

So, there can be a sane society, a sane world, only when you, as part of that society, that world, are breaking away, that is, becoming sane; and there can be sanity only when you spurn authority, when you are not caught in the nationalistic, patriotic spirit, when you treat human beings as human beings, not as brahmins, or as of any other caste or country. And it is impossible to treat human beings as human beings if you label them, if you term them, if you give them a name as Hindus, Russians, or what you will. It is so much easier to label people, for then you can pass by and kick them, drop a bomb on India or Japan. But if you have no labels, but merely meet people as human beings, then what happens? You have to be very alert, you have to be very wise in your relationship with another. But as you don't want to do that, you create a government befitting yourself.

—Bangalore
August 15, 1948

NATIONALISM AND ORGANISED RELIGION DIVIDE MAN FROM MAN

QUESTION: *Gandhiji says in a recent article that religion and nationalism are both equally dear to man and one cannot be bartered away in favour of the other. What do you say?*

J. KRISHNAMURTI: I wonder what you will say. I wonder what your response to this is. Will you question your so-called leaders? Must you not criticize, question, inquire to find out the truth and not merely accept? Will you dare to criticize? Because if you dared you would lose your job, would you not? In this question is implied the acceptance of authority; some one tells and you accept. In acceptance there is blindness and total lack of thought. It does not matter who it is that speaks. If you have lost the critical ability to inquire, to find out, you will never discover what truth is. And that is the tragedy of leaders, political or religious, because you create them, and thus there is mutual exploitation. And in India, as elsewhere, it is extraordinary to watch the growth of leaders, of tyrants, in the name of religion or in the name of politics; and the more power they have the more evil they become.

One of the points we have to bear in mind is not to accept but to inquire, to find out what truth is; and to find out what truth is you must have an open heart and open mind and not be guided by any teacher or any politician. But you see, that means you have to think for yourself. You have to venture out into the open, uncharted seas; but we would rather be told what to think.

I am not criticizing any individual, I am not talking about any specific leader, but about the whole idea of authority. Surely, sirs, you cannot create in the bonds of authority. Where there is authority, creation ceases. You may invent mechanical things but creation as reality ceases, and I think that is one of the curses of this country and other countries. When you have given yourself to somebody, whether it is your priest or a political leader or the man who says he is the Messiah or a

messenger of God, you cease to feel, to think and as human beings you are non-existent. Surely that is no solution to our problems, to our catastrophes, to our miseries.

Now, it is said that religion and nationalism are both dear to man and we cannot barter away one in favour of the other. Now, let us find out the truth of this, not by opposing or defending, but really find out the truth of this matter because it is truth that is going to liberate us, give us happiness, not the assertion of any one.

What do you mean by religion? Surely, it is not going to church or going to the temple and worshipping images, reading the sacred books, or belonging to any religious sect or body. Surely that is not religion. Is it? And religion is not belief. Religion implies, does it not, the search for God, for Truth, or whatever name you give it. Therefore if that is so, then organized religions are an impediment because they constrict thought and feeling by their beliefs, by their images made either by the hand or the mind, by their ruthless ceremonies and all the rest of it. So, religion is the search after Reality and not the performance of ceremonies, the reading of sacred books and so on. So, that means that religion as an organized form of belief, ceases to be religion. In the inquiry after Truth, the approach must be negative and not positive because positive action always leads to a positive end which can only be that which you know. And Reality is the unknowable and you cannot imagine it or put it into words. It is the unknown. Therefore any positive approach to the unknown will make the unknown knowable and therefore that is not the Truth. Truth is when the known ceases to be. The Eternal is approached not through time. The Eternal is when time ceases, that is when thought which is the result of time comes to an end. So, religion is not the positive; it is not dogmatic, assertive or convertive; it is not the worship of images.

And what is nationalism?—The feeling, is it not, of belonging to a group of people or to a country? When you call yourself a Hindu, a Mussalman or a Christian, what do you do? Does it not give you a sense of well-being, to feel that you

are united with something you consider greater than yourself. When I say I am an Indian there is a sense of belonging to a whole group of people, to an ancient land with all the vanity implied in it. Is it not so? I belong to my family and it also gives me a sense of continuity; property, ownership gives me a sense of continuity. The idea gives me a sense of continuity. Therefore through nationalism I continue, the 'mine' continues, therefore I identify myself with what is considered the larger, the whole, the country called India. In myself I am empty, shallow, poor, I am nothing; but if I identify myself with something called India, an idea, then I am well placed, I have happiness and through that idea I can be exploited, I can butcher other countries with immunity. That is what has been happening in the world; the Germans fighting the French, Hindus fighting the Muslims and so on, all in the name of nationalism, in the name of country, in the name of God, in the name of peace. Because I like to be identified with something which I call India, which is really myself enlarged, and when you attack that I am ready to kill you because without it I am not. Therefore I invest in nationalism all my feelings, it takes the place of religion, and that is what is happening now; Gods are disappearing and the States are taking their places. Both are ideas and therefore you have nothing to lose; that you barter one for the other is of very little importance, because you are really, fundamentally seeking continuance through a concept, and whether it is India or God or Germany or something else does not matter as long as you, as an entity, can continue in some form.

So, nationalism like organized religion has brought division between man and man. Through nationalism you can never find brotherhood. If you are a nationalist and try to become brotherly you are living in deceit because you cannot be identified with one and deny the rest. The moment you identify yourself either with a belief or with a country you are the creator of wars. You may speak of brotherhood but you live in a state of suppression, therefore you are causing wars. I do not see much difference between nationalism and organized religion. Both have brought misery to man, both have created division, both have spread destruction, conflict; because through beliefs and through patriotism they separate

man from man. Surely, you must go beyond these petty images created by the mind or by the hand, to find Truth, must you not? You must cease to be nationalistic however thrilling it may be, however stimulating and you must cease to belong to any particular religion in order to find Reality, must you not? As both nationalism and organized religion are inventions of the mind, of time, to understand the timeless, you must be free of time. This is extremely difficult in the modern world as the modern world is geared for war, total war, total destruction which nationalism or organized religion render inevitable; therefore a man who desires to find Truth must leave these two behind, for Truth is to be found not in an image made by the hand or by the mind, but when thought ceases; the ending of thought is the ending of time. Truth can only be understood through self-knowledge, and not by following the assertion of any leader.

— *Madras*
December 14, 1947

EDUCATION IN A FREE INDIA

QUESTION: *Since till now a foreign government has prevented the right kind of education among our beloved people, what should be the right kind of education in a free India?*

J. KRISHNAMURTI: What do you mean by a 'free' India? You have succeeded in substituting one government for another, one bureaucracy for another; but are you free? The exploiter exists as before, only now he is brown, and you are exploited by him as you were by the other. The usurer exists as before, the communalism, the class divisions, the quarrels over separate provinces, over which province shall have more or less, over which group in that province shall have the jobs—all these factors still exist. So the same conditions continue as before, only now there is a difference which is psychological. You have got rid of a group of people, and this acts on you psychologically. You can stand up again now; now, at least, you are a man whereas before somebody was treading on your neck. The white man may not be treading on your neck, but a brown man is, who is your own brother and much more ruthless. Don't you know he is much more ruthless, having no morality? What do you mean by a 'free' India? You will probably have your own army and navy—you are following after the rest of the world with their armies, navies, air forces, and regimentation. To see an old people like you playing with things that children should play with is a sad sight, is it not? It is just like an old man flirting with a young girl, it is an ugly thing. That is what you call 'free', and you ask what kind of education you should have in a 'free' India!

First, to have education of the right kind, you must become intelligent. You cannot be intelligent by merely substituting one government for another, one exploiter for another, one class for another. To bring about a new kind of education all these must go, must they not? You must start anew. That means radical revolution—not of the bloody kind, which does not solve a thing, but a radical revolution of thought, of feeling, of values. That radical revolution can be brought about

only by you and me; a revolution that will create a new, integrated individual, must begin with you and me. Since you are not putting a stop to racialism, organized dogmatism in your religion, how can you produce a new culture, a new education? You can speculate about it, you can write volumes about what the new education should be, but that is an infantile process, another escape.

There can be no creation until you throw down the barriers and are free, and then you will be able to build a new culture, a new order, which means you have to revolt against the present conditions, against present values—revolt in the sense of seeing their true significance, understanding them intelligently, and thinking things out anew. It is comparatively easy to dream of a Utopia, a brave, new world; but that is sacrificing the present for the future—and the future is so uncertain. No man can know what the future will be, there are so many elements intervening between now and the future. We hope that by creating a conceptual Utopia, a mental idealization, and working for it, we shall have solved the problem; but we shall certainly not solve the problem that way.

What we can do, if we are intelligent people, is to tackle the problem ourselves in the present. Now is the only eternity, not the future. I must give full attention to the problem now. Merely to discuss what should be the right kind of education for people in a free India is quite obviously stupid. India is not free: there is no free India. You have a flag and a new anthem, but surely that is not freedom. You speak in your mother tongue and think you are awfully patriotic, nationalistic, and that you have solved the problem. Sir, solving this problem requires thinking anew, not looking through the spectacles of the old formula. That is why it is imperative, for those who are serious, to create a revolution by regenerating themselves; and there cannot be regeneration unless you break away from the old values, examining them and seeing their significance and their worth, not blindly accepting any one of them as good. That is why it is important to look into ourselves and to see the manner,

the ways of our own thinking and feeling. It is only then that we are free, only then that we can produce a new culture and a new education.

— *Poona*
September 26, 1948

Published by Dr Radhika Herzberger for Krishnamurti Foundation India, 64 Greenways Road, Madras 600 028 and printed at Sidma Offset Press (P) Ltd., 11 Gulam Abbas Ali Khan First Street, Thousand Lights, Madras - 600 006.
Editor: Dr Radhika Herzberger

KRISHNAMURTI SCHOOLS

- | | |
|---|---|
| THE BHAGIRATHI VALLEY SCHOOL
P.O. Ranari (Via Dunda)
Uttar Kashi - 249 151, Uttar Pradesh
Phone: (01374) 812171, 81206 | Elementary School
for local students |
| RISHI VALLEY SCHOOL (KFI)
Rishi Valley - 517 352
Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh
Phone: (08571) 62037, 68622 Fax: 62818 | Boarding School
Ages 8 to 17 |
| RAJGHAT BESANT SCHOOL (KFI)
Rajghat Fort
Varanasi - 221 001, Uttar Pradesh
Phone: (0542) 331717, 331289 Fax: 330218 | Boarding School
Ages 7 to 19 |
| VASANTA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN
Rajghat Fort
Varanasi - 221 001, Uttar Pradesh
Phone: (0542) 331717, 331289 Fax: 330218 | B.A. and B.Ed.
(Humanities only) |
| THE SCHOOL (KFI)
'Damodar Gardens'
Besant Avenue
Madras - 600 020
Phone: (044) 4915845 | Day School
Ages 3½ to 17 |
| THE VALLEY SCHOOL (KFI)
'Haridvanam'
17th K.M. Kanakapura Road
Thatguni Post, Bangalore - 560 062
Phone: (080) 8435240, 8435241 | Day/Boarding School
Ages 6 to 17 |
| SAHYADRI SCHOOL
Tiwai Hills - 410 513
Rajgurunagar Taluk, Pune District
Phone: (02135) 84269, 84272 | Boarding School
Ages 12 to 15 |
| BAL-ANAND
'Akash Deep'
28, Dongersi Road
Bombay - 400 006
Phone: (022) 3627817 | After-School Centre
for young children |
| BROCKWOOD PARK
Bramdean, Hampshire SO240LQ, UK
Phone: (0044-1962) 771744 Fax: 771875 | Education Centre
and Boarding School
14 years upwards |
| THE OAK GROVE SCHOOL
P.O. Box 1560
Ojai, California 93023, USA
Phone: (001-805) 646-8236 Fax: 646-6509 | Day/Boarding School
Ages 3½ to 17 |

BULLETIN
KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

Please note that editorial matter in this Bulletin does not reflect any official position of Krishnamurti Foundation India. The Editor is responsible for selecting materials to be printed in the Bulletin and for any editorial comments on these selections.

Copyright Notice: Passages from Krishnamurti are protected under International Copyright Laws and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written permission from the copyright holders. For materials prior to 1968: Copyright© Krishnamurti Foundation of America, Box 1560, Ojai, CA 93024, USA. All rights reserved. For materials from 1968 onwards: Copyright© Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd, Brockwood Park, Bramdean, Hampshire SO24 OLQ, UK. All rights reserved.

Krishnamurti Foundation India
64 Greenways Road, Madras 600 028, India