

1 9 9 8 / 1

Bulletin

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

FROM THE EDITOR

Krishnamurti was a stern critic of institutions, both religious and secular. He was also a creator of institutions of several kinds. Over a forty year period he set up schools and foundations across three continents and set down a vision for 'Study Centres' which have subsequently become active across the world. How can we reconcile Krishnamurti's deeply ingrained skepticism of institutions with his abiding commitment to these many schools and organizations?

This question engages a complex set of issues, and Krishnamurti's answer to it may come as a surprise to those who believe that he was opposed to all institutions other than the postal service and so on. The texts contained in this Bulletin reveal how, from the beginning, Krishnamurti held open the possibility of redeeming both secular and spiritual institutions. Even as he was disbanding the Order of the Star in 1929, he held out a now little remembered promise:

If there are three who have become a flame of Truth, who are a danger to everything around them that is unessential, those three and I will create a new understanding, a new delight, a new world.

— *'Now', Ommen Radio Broadcast August 1929*

Thirty years later he developed this promise with unmistakable clarity when he said:

There can be a true working together in every department of life — political, social, economic, religious, educational — when we free our minds

— *Banaras, January 26th 1960*

To guard against authoritarianism within his own organizations he sometimes described the Krishnamurti Foundations as functional entities concerned mainly with publications and schools. But that was not the whole story. On many other occasions in the last decade of his life, he gathered his associates together from all over the world to explore means for sustaining his Teaching 'as a living thing' in the future. On one of these occasions he told them, 'The function of the Foundations is to hold this vessel and keep the waters in it pure, clear, not adulterated' and on another occasion he said, 'The central issue is that a new kind of religious mind should come out of it'. In his public talks Krishnamurti often stressed the need for people to work together to change the world, once they had changed themselves. When Study Centres were in the planning stage, several times he expressed the wish that they would help to convey the perfume of his Teaching to 'the man from Seattle' who might visit those Centres. About his schools, he repeatedly set down the challenge of producing a new generation of human beings so as to bring about a new society. He was keenly interested in the process of building institutions that were neither Utopian nor ideological:

You know what all this requires. It requires not only an intelligent student, a student who is alive, but also an educator, the right kind of educator. There are not the right kind of educators and the right kind of students; they are not born, we must struggle, discuss, push till the thing comes about. You know, to grow a beautiful rose, you require a great deal of care, don't you? To write a poem, you must have the feeling, you must have the words to put it in. All that requires care, considerable watching.

So, is it not very important that this place should be such a place? If it is not such a place, it is nobody's fault but yours and the teachers'. Nobody else is going to create it. Others are not going to create it; you and I and the teachers are going to create it, and that is real revolution. Real revolution is to have the feeling that it is 'our' school — a school which you and I and the teachers and all of us are building together. So, do not say, 'The teachers do not do this. It is the teachers' fault if they do not create this place'. So, it is very important, is it not?, not to have ideals of education, but to understand what we mean by education — there are no such ideals; they are all nonsense. We must begin as we are, understand things as we are and, out of that, build. You do not have an ideal garden or school. You take the soil as it is; you manure it, water it and then create something out of nothing. As there is nothing, you will have to create, to build together.

— *Rajghat, January 4th 1954*

Krishnamurti rejected religious institutions based on hierarchical structures and those that derive authority from scripture, doctrine, ritual or tradition; such institutions, he asserted, are concerned with power and therefore, in the strict sense, are political, not religious. In such cases both leaders and followers become locked in a pattern of mutual exploitation. Over and over, he asserted that Truth cannot be organized.

Even while asserting that Truth cannot be organized, Krishnamurti held out the possibility of people being a light unto themselves, joining hands to create a different society. It is not Truth that is to be organized, but collective efforts of human beings working together to change

the world.

Ultimately the distinction between spiritual and secular organizations dissolve, as human beings in search of freedom also seek to renew the world. Flexibility, insight and honesty are among the gifts that free individuals may bring to such institutions:

If you want to change the physical environment there must be a group of people who are efficient to carry out that system; they must be impersonal, not egotistic, not lining their own pockets, you know, metaphorically and physically. And therefore human beings matter more than the systems. You see the importance of this?

— *Madras, January 13th 1971*

This issues of the Bulletin explores Krishnamurti's reasons for rejecting organizations, and also highlights his understanding of the role of organizations of 'the right kind' in the process of creating a better world.

—*R.H.*

The Search For Truth Lies In Your Own Hands

Q: *In the modern institution of society, it is impossible to live without organization. To shun all organizations as you seem to do is merely escapism. Do you call the postal system a nucleus of power? What should be the basis of organization in the new society?*

Krishnamurti: Again, sir, it is a complex question. Surely, all organizations exist for efficiency. The post office is an organization for the efficiency of communication; but when the postmaster becomes a quasi tyrant over his clerks, the post office becomes a means of power, does it not? The postmaster general is interested in the efficiency of communication, or he should be; his position is obviously not intended to be a means of power, authority, self-aggrandizement — which in fact it is. So, every institution or organization is used by human beings, not simply for efficiency of communication, distribution, and so on, but as a means of power — and that is what I am objecting to. Surely, the post office, the tramway, and various other public services, are a necessity in modern society, and they must be organized. The power house which creates electricity needs careful organization; but when that organization is used for political purposes as a means of self-aggrandizement, as a means of exploitation, obviously the organization becomes the tool of extraordinary brutality.

Now the religious organizations as Hinduism, as Catholicism, as Buddhism and so on are not for efficiency and are wholly unnecessary. They become pernicious; the priest, the bishop, the church, the temple, are an extraordinary means of exploiting men. They exploit you through fear, through tradition, through ceremony. Religion is obviously and truly the search for reality, and such organizations are

unnecessary because the search for reality is not carried on through an organized group of people. On the contrary, an organized group of people becomes a hindrance to reality; therefore, Hinduism, Christianity, or any other organized belief, is a hindrance to truth. Why do we need such organizations? They are not efficient, because the search for truth lies in your own hands; it cannot be realized through an organization, not through a guru or his disciples when they are organized for power. We obviously need technical organizations, such as the post office, the tramway, and so on; but surely, when man is intelligent, every other organization is unnecessary. Because we ourselves are not intelligent, we turn over to those people who call themselves intelligent the power to rule us. An intelligent man does not want to be ruled; he does not want any organization other than that which is necessary for the efficiency of existence.

The necessities of life cannot be truly organized when they are in the hands of a few, of a class or a group; and when the few act as representing the many, surely there is the same problem of power. Exploitation arises when organizations are used as a means of power, whether by the individual, by the group, by the party or the State. It is this self-expansion through organization that is pernicious, such as a State identifying itself as a sovereign government, with which goes nationalism, and in which the individual is also involved. It is this expansive, aggressive, self-defending power that is objectionable. Surely, in order for me to come here, there must be an organization: I must write a letter, and that letter can reach you only if there is a properly organized system of postal distribution. All this is right organization. But when organizations are used by the clever, by the cunning, as a means of exploiting men, such organizations must be eradicated; and they can be eradicated only

when you yourself, in your little circle, are not seeking power, dominance. As long as the search for power exists, there must be a hierarchical process from the government's minister to the clerk, from the bishop to the priest, from the general to the common soldier.

Surely, we can have a decent society only when individuals, you and I, are not seeking power in any direction, whether through wealth, through relationship, or through an idea. It is the search for power that is the cause of this disaster, this disintegration of society. Our existence at present is all power politics, dominance in the family by the man or by the woman, dominance through an idea. Action based on an idea is always separative, it can never be inclusive; and the search for power, whether by the individual or by the State, indicates the expansion, the cultivation of the intellect in which there is no love. When you love someone, you are very careful, you organize spontaneously, don't you? You are watchful, you are efficient in helping that one or this one. It is when there is no love that organization as a means of power comes into being. When you love others, when you are full of affection and generosity, then organizations have a different meaning; they are kept on their own level. But when the individual's position becomes all-important, when there is craving for power, then organizations are used as the means to that power — and power and love cannot exist together. Love is its own power, its own beauty, and it is because our hearts are empty that we fill them with the things of the mind; and the things of the mind are not things of the heart. Because our hearts are filled with the things of the mind, we look to organizations as a means of bringing order, of bringing peace to the world. It is not organizations, but only love that can bring order and peace to the world;

it is not blueprints of any Utopia, but only good will that can achieve conciliation between people. Because we have no warmth of love, we depend upon organizations; and the moment we have organizations without love, the clever and the cunning come to the top and use them. We start an organization for the welfare of man, and before we know where we are, somebody is using it for his own ends. We create revolutions, bloody, disastrous revolutions to bring about world order, and before we know it, the power is in the hands of a few maniacs after power, and they become a powerful new class, a new dominating group of commissars with their secret police, and love is driven out.

Sirs, how can man live without love? We can only exist; and existence without love is control, confusion, and pain — and that is what most of us are creating. We organize for existence and we accept conflict as inevitable because our existence is a ceaseless demand for power. Surely, when we love, organization has its own place, its right place; but without love, organization becomes a nightmare, merely mechanical and efficient, like the army. When there is love, there will be no army; but as modern society is based on mere efficiency, we have to have armies — and the purpose of an army is to create war. Even in so-called peace, the more intellectually efficient we are, the more ruthless, the more brutal, the more callous we become. That is why there is confusion in the world, why bureaucracy is more and more powerful, why more and more governments are becoming totalitarian. We submit to all this as being inevitable because we live in our brains and not in our hearts, and therefore love does not exist. Love is the most dangerous and uncertain element in life; and because we do not want to be uncertain, because we do not want to be in danger, we live in the mind. A man who loves is dangerous, and we do not want to live dangerously; we want to

live efficiently, we want to live merely in the framework of organization, because we think organizations are going to bring order and peace in the world. Organizations have never brought order and peace. Only love, only good will, only mercy can bring order and peace, ultimately and therefore now.

— Poona, 19 September 1948

You Cannot Organize Truth

Q: *What have you to say regarding religion and philosophy as educative factors in the life of an individual? How far, according to you, is religion of any value to the understanding of truth? Is religious leadership compatible with true spirituality? What is your conception of God?*

Krishnamurti: To me, religion or philosophy is a system to mold the mind. I say that truth cannot be found through a system, through a guide. Religion cannot show the path to truth, because truth or God or life, whatever name you give that reality, can be realized only through individual awareness. Religion and philosophy but superimpose the ideas of others on your mind and thereby dull and cripple your thought. They set up ideals and standards to which you try to conform. Because your thought is limited by tradition, by imitation, by fear, your action also must be limited, and therefore out of that action there springs sorrow. It is only through the intense awareness of mind and heart, through the clear perception of thought, that you can come to the freedom from sorrow and to the realization of that which is eternal.

As I have said, *truth cannot be realized through any organized form of thought*. You have perhaps heard the story of how the devil and a friend were walking one day, and they

saw a man pick up something, look at it intently, and put it in his pocket. The friend asked the devil, 'What was it that he picked up?' The devil replied, 'Oh, he picked up a bit of truth'. The friend said, 'That is bad business for you, is it not?' The devil replied, 'Not at all, I shall help him organize it'. You cannot organize truth, because realization is purely an individual matter. Where mind and heart are pursuing a system and are not relying entirely on their own strength, on their own integrity, there is ever confusion.

So an organized system of thought, a spiritual authority, is to me the utter denial of truth, because truth, the Godhead of understanding, cannot be realized through a system or through another. No one can save man except himself; and this is his greatness, *viz.*, that in himself, in his own fullness of action, lies the realization of truth.

If you were to ask a Hindu, a Christian, a Buddhist, a Muhammadan or a Hebrew to describe God, each of them would try to give expression to his particular conception. That is, each one would contrive to give shape to God in accordance with his particular fancy, his particular predilection or prejudice.

Now God or life or truth cannot be conceived of or described. If you had never beheld the sea and someone were to come and describe it to you, you could but imagine it, and your idea would not convey to you the reality.

— *Star Bulletin, March-April 1933*

You Must Have An Organization

Q: You say that you are affiliated with no organization, yet obviously you are trying to make people think along certain lines. Can the world thought be changed without an organization whose purpose it is to bring your ideas constantly before the public?

Krishnamurti: I wonder if I am making you think along a certain definite line. I hope not. I am trying to show that thinking is necessary, being in love is necessary; and to think deeply and to be greatly in love, you cannot have a storehouse of self-defensive reactions or memories. Surely when you are in love, you are vulnerable. If I am only making you think along certain lines, then please beware of me, because then I will force you and thus exploit you, and you will exploit me for your own various ends.

What I am saying is that to live greatly, to think creatively, one must be completely open to life, without any self-protective reaction, as you are when you are in love. So you must be in love with life. This requires great intelligence, not information or knowledge, but that great intelligence which is awakened when you meet life openly, completely, when the mind and heart are utterly vulnerable to life.

You ask, 'Can the world thought be changed without an organization whose purpose it is to bring your ideas constantly before the public?' Naturally not, you must have an organization; that is obvious. So we need not discuss it. But when you talk about organization, I think you mean quite a different thing. To convert people to certain beliefs, to force them, to urge them through opinion, through pressure, to adopt a certain method, certain ideas — for that purpose most organizations are formed, not merely for printing books and distributing them. That is how all

religions are formed. That is how the followers destroy the teachers, by making their teachings into absolute dogmas which become the authority for exploitation. For that purpose, organization of the wrong kind is necessary. Whereas, if you are interested in these ideas which I am explaining, you will naturally help to print and to distribute books, but without the desire to convert, to exploit.

— *New York City, 15th March, 1935*

There Can Be A True Working Together In Every Department Of Life — Political, Social, Economic, Religious, Educational — Only When We Free Our Minds

Perhaps this morning, after I have talked a little, it might be worth while to discuss what I have talked about. By discussion I mean that you and I should think the problem out together, that we should inquire, not only verbally, but see how far our minds can penetrate into the problem. To discuss in that way might be more worth while than merely to listen — though listening is an extraordinary thing in itself. But very few of us listen. We are surrounded by our own words, by our own explanations, by our own experiences, and we scarcely, if ever, listen to another to find out what he really thinks. After I have talked a little, perhaps we could go into this question more intimately and deeply through exchanging thoughts and verbally clearing the field, as it were.

What I want to talk about this morning is a problem which I think confronts not only those of us who are here, but also the rest of the world. We are all concerned with the problem of working together, co-operation, getting things done together. This problem of working together has been approached in various ways, has it not? — coercively, compulsively and persuasively. Working together has become

important not only in society, in commercial production, but also ideologically — which I am not sure is working together at all. The whole question of working together has many implications, and everyone who is concerned with a radical change in society, is also concerned, surely, with this question. We generally work together through fear of punishment, or through hope of reward, or through the desire to gain position, prestige, power, do we not?

Please, may I suggest that we do not merely listen to the words, but actually apply to ourselves what is being said.

We sometimes work together because we are influenced intellectually, emotionally, by a cunning person, or by one who has assumed spiritual authority as a saint, as a guru, and so on. That is one way of bringing about our so-called working together. Another is the political way. A certain piece of work has to be done, a party is formed opposing another party with a different plan, and there is a campaign for the getting of votes. In that is implied a great deal of cunning, scheming, chicanery, an enormous amount of propaganda and persuasion.

We are considering the problem, so please follow this a little bit closely.

Then there is the working together for an idea, for a belief, which may be social or so-called spiritual. An idea is put forward by someone, and we co-operate with that person because we think the idea is excellent, worth while, or significant. That is also called working together. So we work together for an idea, through persuasion, through compulsion, through fear of punishment or hope of reward, and that is all we know. That is how we come together to do something. You may say that our working together is not

so brutal and superficial, that we work together for love of the country, love of an idea, love of the poor. Surely, when there is love, there is no sense of compulsion or persuasion, is there? There is no vote-getting, no forming of parties, no sense of the mine and the yours.

To work together for something which is not a self-projected idea, which is not profitable for oneself, for one's family or relations, and so on — such working together has quite a different significance. But before we can find out what it is to work together in that way, surely we must eliminate in ourselves the various forms of compulsion.

Am I capable of working with others in an endeavour which is not based on authority, either mine, or yours, or his, and in which there is no personal profit, however subtle? A true working together comes about, surely, only when you and I both understand the problem, really understand it, for it is this very understanding that creates the necessity of working together. Our co-operation is then not self-imposed, it is not the outcome of so-called tolerance, or of any form of persuasion. The moment you and I both see that a certain form of education must be brought about, there is no 'you' and no 'I' — what is important is the new education. When you and I both see that starvation must be rooted out, when we see the absolute necessity of it, not merely intellectually, but when we feel it deeply, totally, with a great deal of affection, sympathy, love, then in that state of understanding, surely, you and I work together to eliminate starvation. But if you have a pet system by which to wipe out starvation, and I have another, then the system becomes all-important; so you gather votes, and I gather votes, and we fight each other, dissipating our creative thought and energy in an endless struggle to bring about a system that will solve the problem.

Do please examine this. Though it is not possible to go into many details, one can see that working together implies a great deal. There can be a true working together in every department of life — political, social, economic, religious, educational — only when we free our minds from every form of fear, from every form of influence and reward; and for most of us this is a very difficult thing to do, because we want something at the end of it. We want a position, a certain prestige, or we think, 'This is the right thing to do', and we work, sweat for it, gathering votes and pushing others aside; so there is contention, conflict. And to me, every form of conflict, at whatever level of our existence, is a most destructive, deteriorating factor in life.

So, it seems to me that the solution to this problem of working together lies in bringing about a radical change in ourselves — a change which is not the result of any form of influence. Sirs, we do change through persuasion, do we not? It may be the Communist form of persuasion, or the Socialist form of persuasion, or the Democratic form of persuasion, or the persuasion of the mother saying, 'Do this for me'; whichever it is, we do change a little. I wonder if you have ever looked at your own lives to see whether you have changed at all? If you have changed, how has this change in your life been brought about? Has it been through persuasion, through compulsion, through a motive in some form? Or has the change come about without any motive? Surely a change brought about through a motive, is really no change at all, is it?

Look, sirs, revolution is obviously necessary: revolution in the school, in society, in religion. Things must be broken up, however uncomfortable it may be; they cannot go on as they are. Where a few privileged people rule; where

tradition, dogmatism and stupidity reign; where the few have educational and other advantages which the many have not; where there is immense poverty, starvation, degradation, and at the same time extraordinary prosperity — things cannot remain as they are. Something must break, and it is breaking, however much you may like your present mode of existence and want it to continue. So, revolution — economic, social, religious — there must be. But unfortunately, most people resist it. The bank clerk, the family man who has a house, a little property, the man in a position of power — everybody resists change, in little things and in big things. Have you not noticed this in your own lives? When you have to eat a different kind of food, something which is not the highly-spiced food you are used to, your body rebels. That also is a form of the desire not to change. Please search your own minds, not my speech. Don't merely listen to a talk. It is a clear morning; there is the lovely river, the beautiful sky. It is much better to look at all those things than be crowded in this room with people who have no intention of examining themselves. It is much better to enjoy life, to feel the richness of the earth, to be aware of poverty, to see the river flowing by, than to sit here and speculate. Speculation is the most stupid form of intellectual amusement.

As I was saying, we always resist change; but change is going to take place, whether we like it or not. Those who rule and resist will be broken the moment the thing they have built up begins to crack; whereas the wise man knows that change is inevitable, and yields in himself when revolution is shattering the things he has been building. But such people are few.

So the problem is how to bring about a radical change in

ourselves — which is so obviously necessary — without persuasion. If you are persuaded to change, you are merely reacting to a certain form of compulsion, whether it is the Indian form, or the Communist form or the Western form; and to change through any form of compulsion is no change at all. If you change because you are offered a reward, or because you are threatened, no real change has taken place. You have merely conformed to another pattern. Revolution which is a reaction to what has been is not a revolution, because it merely establishes a new pattern, which is a modified form of the old; that is all. Am I talking too fast?

One sees that, if there is to be a real change in the world, there must first be a radical transformation in the quality of the mind itself, because people change very easily from the totalitarian to the democratic state, or from democracy to totalitarianism, whether it be the Nazi kind or the Communist kind. Give them more food, offer them better opportunities for earning a livelihood, excite them in the stupidities of nationalism, and they will all 'change', one way or the other. But one sees that any such change is only a reaction, and a mind that merely reacts can again be influenced to change in another direction — today I am a Communist, and if that does not pay, I become a Socialist, or a Capitalist, and so on. Seeing this process going on throughout the world, one asks oneself what it all means. Where is the change to take place? Is change merely a matter of dropping one pattern and conforming to another? Do you see the problem, sirs?

What is implied in the word 'change'? Being greedy, I want to change the moment greed is painful, but I don't want to change as long as I find a great deal of pleasure in greed. So when I try to get rid of greed, I am changing with a mo-

tive; my desire to change is a reaction, and that reaction can again be modified. I do not know if you are following all this.

Can there be a change, a total revolution — not an economic revolution, or a social revolution, or a religious revolution, which are all superficial, but an inward revolution which is total, in which my whole consciousness, my whole being is shattered, and a new thing comes up? You see, sirs, change for most of us is a modified continuity of the past, and that is no change at all. Seeing this difficulty, and realizing how complex is this whole process of revolution, change, one inevitably asks: Is it possible to change at all within the field of consciousness?

Is this all too difficult, sirs?

Q: May I speak?

K: Just a moment. I have not yet finished what I want to say. First see the problem, sir. If one really goes into it, one sees it to be a problem of thought versus being. For most of us, thought is a means to change. Through thought we hope to change, through ideas we hope to transform ourselves. I persuade you, through ideas, to drop your nationalism, to take up a particular form of religious practice, or what you will. I manage to persuade you because I am very clever; I show you the absurdity of this or that, and you are persuaded by my intensity, by my words, and you change — or at least you think you have changed.

Now, what has actually taken place in that process? You have changed your ideas, you have changed your thought, but thought is always conditioned. Whether it is the thought of Jesus, Buddha, X, Y, or Z, it is still thought,

and therefore one thought can be in opposition to another thought; and when there is opposition, a conflict between two thoughts, the result is a modified continuity of thought. In other words, the change is still within the field of thought; and change within the field of thought is no change at all. One idea or set of ideas has merely been substituted for another.

Seeing this whole process, is it possible to leave thought and bring about a change outside the field of thought? All consciousness, surely, whether it is of the past, the present, or the future, is within the field of thought; and any change within that field, which sets the boundaries of the mind, is no real change. A radical change can take place only outside the field of thought, not within it, and the mind can leave the field only when it sees the confines, the boundaries of the field, and realizes that any change within the field is no change at all. This is real meditation. To go into it requires a great deal of work, thought, energy — the energy which we now dissipate on practices of various kinds, which are all so childish. Really to investigate the field of thought, and to see the limitations of consciousness, is of the utmost importance. After all, these limitations are the result of effort, of contradictions, of conflicts and the desire to change. It is seeing this limited field totally, understanding it completely, that the radical change of which I am talking comes about — not through any form of persuasion, compulsion, or authoritative influence; and I think this is the only way to function, to live and work together. Yes, sir?

Q: I feel that the changes you are talking about — social, economic and political — are all the expressions of one unifying principle.

K: That is a theory.

Q: I feel there is a unifying principle working in the world, in the whole of creation.

K: It may be. I don't know.

Q: Changes will come, and nobody can resist them.

K: Are we not resisting changes, each one of us? To see that is what matters. If we were not resisting change, we would not talk about a unifying principle. Then life would be a constant revolution.

Q: The unifying principle rests on the revolution.

K: Why bring the term 'unifying principle' into this problem at all?

Q: If changes are inevitable, what makes us resist them?

K: That is very simple to answer. The man who has a good position — politically, economically, in the school, or anywhere else — resists changes. He says, 'For God's sake, keep things as they are'. The people in authority resist any change, because they do not want to be disturbed. Right through life it is the same, from the prime minister to the small-town politician. The man who is discontented with things as they are — it is he who wants to find out about change. Being disturbed, dissatisfied in himself, he accepts a particular form of change which satisfies him, and once established in that habit, he also does not want to be disturbed.

Q: Dissatisfied people can very easily be caught in any kind

of change which is made to appear the opposite of what they dislike.

K: Yes, sir, that is what we were saying.

Q: You say that real change must be outside the field of thought. But must we not first know all the possible facts that can be collected by the mind about something, and then let that information influence us until our feelings tell us that it is right?

K: I don't quite see how it can work that way. You are saying that through analysis and deduction one must collect information, see the importance of this collected information, transform it into feeling, and then act from that feeling. That is what most of us do, consciously or unconsciously. I say that a certain political or religious way of living is right. How do I know? Because I have read about it, people and my own experience have persuaded me, and I feel it is worth while, that it will improve the lot of man, so I commit myself to the party, and I am against other parties. That is what most of us do all the time. Now, in engendering that feeling, surely what is implied is a sense of judgment based on experience, is it not? And experience is obviously conditioned. My experience as a Communist, as a Democrat, or what you will, is the outcome of various influences, persuasions, compulsions, fears, rewards. From that conditioning there is feeling, and I act.

Q: I think feeling is more or less unconscious. We should use our conscious thoughts to influence our unconscious feeling, which is the unconscious mind.

K: Is there a real division between the conscious and the unconscious, or is it an unnatural division created by our

social, environmental influences? The conscious mind is the mind that has learnt, that has acquired knowledge; it is a superficial collector of information. It goes to the office every day, does certain routine things, and so on. Then there is the unconscious, and can the conscious mind influence the unconscious? If you really examine it, you will see that it is the unconscious that is influencing the conscious mind fortunately or unfortunately; there is an interplay between the two all the time. But to discuss this question of the conscious and the unconscious requires a great deal of penetration and time. We would have to start right at the beginning, not at the end of the hour. Perhaps we can do it another time.

Q: How is one to bring about a change outside the field of consciousness?

Q: That is possible only when we can forget the division between you and me.

K: I do not think you have listened at all. A gentleman asks how to change outside the field of consciousness. He wants to know what the method is, how to do it. You know, it is one of the odd things about us that we are so slavish to methods — as though any method is going to solve our human problems. Sir, there is a method for putting something together. If I want to be a mechanic, I learn how to deal with mechanical things. That is very simple. I go to school and they teach me the method. But we are not talking of mechanical things, and therefore there is no method. You have to think it out. Sir, do look at it this way, if I may suggest: Is there a method by which to love people?

Q: No.

K: Why do you say no to that question, and yet ask for a method to change?

Q: Isn't it true that we think of change as something tangible, something that can be felt, experienced?

K: Think it out, sir, don't ask me. The problem is so vast. You cannot say, 'Tell me what is the method to change'; it has no meaning. If you are concerned about change, not just theoretically so that you go back home and continue in the old way, but if you see the necessity of it and realize that you have got to change, then this problem arises: the problem of persuasion, influence, punishment, reward, and your own reactions of which you are not aware; so it is meaningless to get up and say, 'Please tell me in a few minutes all about change outside the field of consciousness'.

What is a man to do who is really interested in this question? — and human beings must be vitally interested in it, because it is the problem throughout the world. It is the problem not just of this school, or of the man round the corner, but of humanity itself. Can a change be brought about in the quality of the mind, which is now becoming so mechanical, slavish? If this is a vital problem to you and me, we won't casually ask for a method; we will discuss factually, not theoretically. I feel all theoretical discussion is valueless, hot air, a waste of time. We will discuss factually if we really see the necessity of a fundamental change. I see that I am greedy, and I want to know if it is possible to be free of greed; I see that I am envious, and I want to find out if I can break that envy. I am not looking for a method, but I say, 'Let me examine the problem of envy'. If a man who is in a position of power says, 'Look, I am a great man; I like being in this position, and don't disturb

me', then for him there is no problem. I go away from such a man; I don't play up to him, because I want nothing from him. But as ordinary human beings, you and I are concerned with this problem. It is not my problem, which I am thrusting on you; it is your problem. If you sit there and say, 'Tell me all about it', then you and I have no relationship. But if a few of us can think it over together, then that is a totally different thing.

Q: There is a staircase, and we reach the roof by its means. We do not know what type of roof it is until we get there. Can we say that the roof is something external to the staircase? Will there be a roof if there is no staircase?

K: Sir, the house is the floor, the walls, the windows, the roof and the staircase. You cannot separate the staircase or the roof from the house. There is no such thing as a roof hanging without the walls. The house is a total thing. Now, any change within the house — going from one room to another, decorating each room in a different way, and so on — is a limited change; it is, conditioned, narrow. It is obviously not freedom. So, can there be a total change, a change which is not within the house? Do you say that such a change is impossible, that any change is always within the house? Do you say it is nonsense to talk about a change outside the house? What is it that you think? Is all change within the house, or is it possible to bring about a change outside — or rather, not a change, but a way of action? After all, change means action — a way of action which is not confined to the house.

Look, sir, let us say I am a Hindu, and I see how stupid, squalid, ugly it all is, so I join Catholicism. That is an action, is it not? And I think I have changed. But my 'change' is still within the house, within the cage, it is still within

the field of human misery. I have only exchanged one state of slavery for another. Seeing this fact, I say, 'Is it possible to act without this limitation, without this house, without Hinduism, Catholicism, or any other system?' Vast numbers of people, including the Catholics and the Communists, say it is not possible. That may be so; but then you have to admit that the mind is everlastingly a slave.

Q: You say the change from Hinduism to Catholicism is no change. But when we climb the staircase, we are at a different level.

K: In other words, you are saying that through the gradual process of going step by step up the staircase, you reach the roof, where you have a different outlook on life. In saying this, you are inviting time, are you not? When you go step by step up the ladder till you reach the roof, that process, from the first step to the last, implies gradualness; the distance from one point to another must be traversed, which means time, does it not? All this is still within the field of thought, within the field of the mind.

Q: A man going up the stairs has not seen the roof; he does not know what the roof is like until the last step, and then it is a spontaneous thing.

K: Similes are most misleading, and that is why one hesitates to use them. Let us not get lost in similes and examples. Don't try to find a way out — just see the problem. Though I am putting all this into words, be aware of the problem for yourself, sir. The problem is that we must change. You may say, 'Don't disturb me, let things remain as they are', but things will not remain as they are. Life is going to shatter that which has become crystallized. Whether it is life in the form of a soldier with a gun, or life

as a man like me with the word, something is going to shatter you. And when you are shattered by an outward event, through some form of compulsion or influence, is that a change? Is it a change if there is a motive of any kind? And is it possible to change without a motive? Don't say it is possible, or it is not possible. We are thinking it out. We are not coming to any conclusion. It is a terrible thing to come to a conclusion, because then you have stopped thinking. The problem is enormous, and one has to be very tentative about it; one has to inquire, to find out for oneself through watching, through constant awareness, if there is a change which is not induced, which is not the result of influence.

Sirs, another difficulty is that the mind likes to function in habit. Habit is the desire to be secure. If I am a so-called great man, used to having power, I like to function in that habit. The mind establishes various habits which give it a certain sense of security, and it resists any movement that disturbs those habits. When we do want to break a habit into which the mind has fallen, we say that we must have an ideal, that we must practise, that we must do this or do that; and I say, is that a change? Or is change something entirely different — something which awakens the extraordinary feeling of creation? Surely, that is the only real change. Creation is not the creative faculty of a cunning mind, nor is it the creativity of a mind that has a gift or a talent; it is the sense of complete release from the house of the self, and from acting within that house.

— *Rajghat, 26th January, 1960*

Being A Light To Oneself A Report On The K.F.I. Public Gathering At Rajghat, 1997

A religious life implies being a light to yourself.

— Madras, 1979

In the very process of looking, watching, discussing, doubting, questioning, having no beliefs, no faith, in that process of investigation you are already living the religious life.

— Bombay, 1985

Krishnamurti's annual visits to the schools were occasions for a recharging of their religious spirit. People thronged to hear him and when he spoke it was not 'to' the people but 'with' them. He took his audience with him on an investigative journey into questions that touched their lives very intimately. The Gatherings organized by the KFI function to keep that vitality, that flame of intelligence alive, unflagging. Accepting no authority other than their own insights, people gather together to explore and understand themselves and their lives. A few basic, inescapable questions are raised and probed together.

Last year the Gathering was held at the Rajghat Education Centre in Varanasi from October 16th to 19th, 1997. It was well attended, with nearly three hundred participants, comprising members of the foundation, teachers from the KFI schools and others from all over India and different walks of life, driven from within to partake in serious inquiry.

The environs on the campus of the Rajghat Education Centre with the perennial waters of the Ganga flowing calmly alongside and the exuberance of the Varuna bounding into it, were ideal for philosophic inquiry. Here it was in an-

cient Kasi that the *rishis* of old had meditated over the meaning of life. An age old setting for an age old quest. The abundant greenery imbued a sense of kinship with nature.

All participants were presented a folder containing the entire programme as well as a book *On Religious Life*, especially compiled by Sri Kishore Khairnar for distribution at the gathering.

Over the four days, the participants would go on various walks conducted around the campus and take boat rides on the Ganga, at dawn and dusk. The chanting of Sanskrit *slokas* followed by a period of silence was an integral feature of the mornings. A number of carefully selected video cassettes of Krishnamurti's talks interspersed the afternoons, notably the new videos on 'Freedom and Authority', 'Change', 'Conflict' and 'The Sacred', produced by the Krishnamurti Foundation of America. The film 'The Silent Mind' containing invaluable footage from Krishnamurti's life was screened by a 16 mm projector and made for compelling viewing. A cultural programme was presented by participants, featuring Bharata Natyam, Carnatic and Hindustani classical music and Rabindra Sangeet. The stall selling Krishnamurti's books and audio and video cassettes was highly popular. Mealtimes found the spacious dining-hall at the school abuzz, with people interacting informally.

The chief *raison d'être*, of the Gathering were the group dialogues and panel discussions held for two hours on each of the four days. On the 16th, the Gathering opened with a hymn to the rising sun specially composed by Sri Kanitkar. Smt. Radha Burnier, a senior trustee of the KFI lit a lamp to inaugurate the Gathering. At the outset, the

convenors spoke of the nature and purpose of the Gathering, and some light was also thrown on the nature of a dialogue:

— People have gathered from far off places. Perhaps it is because they have become acutely conscious of disharmonies in the world within and without them. Traditional answers do not satisfy them. They have come to raise and hold questions about these incoherencies, to find out if there are any immediate answers.

— Unlike a discussion, a dialogue does not begin with knowing and having opinions and beliefs and trying to convince others of these. A dialogue is a religious inquiry which begins with not-knowing. The truth is posited as the unknown. The direct perception of truth is what is valuable rather than cultivation of knowledge and memory through words. One has to be a light to oneself. There is no hierarchy in the perception of truth. Staying with questions is more important than arriving at answers. One must withhold the temptation to verbalize or respond quickly. From this holding of questions, a new perception may emerge.

Smt. Radha Burnier initiated the first session of group dialogues. She raised certain fundamental questions around which the dialogue could centre. A brief summary of these questions and observations is given below:

We come together because we share a deep concern about the predicament of the world, with its conflict, confusion and misery. In human society there is a great deal of unhappiness, struggle and inanity.

The affluent are unhappy and take shelter in excitements, entertainments, drugs and alcohol. There is the pain and the pity of broken relationships, relationship not only with human beings but with everything that lives and breathes. The poor know a deeper unhappiness and misery than that of their physical circumstances. There is the unhappiness of conflict, of comparison, of a mind which divides people from people. We can see all this. If we feel concerned with our heart about the predicament of the world, we ask why is all this unhappiness part of human life? Is it because we miss what is vital? We must ask ourselves: Are we seeing rightly? Is there some basic inadequacy or error in our way of looking? Can we become aware of what is wrong? There has to be a change in the quality of our perception. Are we missing something altogether?

Is it that we are driven from inside to snatch at things? Endless desire seems to be a part of our lives. Want is pervasive in the consciousness, always wanting something for ourselves. Is that what drives our consciousness, our relationships, so that we see things in a distorted way, not holistically? People have said that when there is desire there is anger, frustration, disappointment, fear of losing things, competition, comparison. All this makes society unhappy. Is this so, or are these merely words and conclusions?

Is desire a necessity? Are we in love with desire? What is the within? There is turmoil in the mind — agitation, restlessness; the mind is not ready to be still. Is that restlessness, that crowded state inside caused by our belief that we must have objectives

and try to fulfil them? Just as water which is not tranquil cannot reflect, the mind which is never able to be quiet cannot perceive correctly.

This condition of the mind makes us insensitive to the wonder which is everywhere around us, the wonder of life. Our perception is distorted by constant wanting and we do not feel deeply, sensitively about life around us. The world is being built out of this condition of the mind — a world full of immorality. The seed of immorality is in each one of us. We are all responsible for everything that is happening.

Krishnamurti has said that the religious life is one which begins with deep, total discontent. What is discontent? Does it arise out of a deep concern? Is it something very different from desire? Discontent can also be desire if it is for some outer gain. What is the difference? Is there something that frees the mind because it does not accept the conditions inside or outside without wanting anything?

We come together to share our concern, asking questions to explore, to try to understand. Do these questions arise from within because we give our attention to the world? If that concern makes us investigate, explore what is wrong in the way we function, it may bring about a new quality in our relationships, it may take all humanity somewhere nearer the truth.

After her talk the participants broke up into fifteen small groups to probe into these questions. For the first time, a separate Hindi group was formed for participants who pre-

ferred to communicate in Hindi. This turned out to be a valid requirement with well over fifty people choosing to join it. Prof. Krishnanath was the co-ordinator of the Hindi group. The next day he initiated the group dialogues with the following observations and questions:

Is desire a river with two banks and must we choose to either fulfill or suppress it altogether? Is it an all or nothing situation in terms of desire? Is there a middle ground to move along, a space which is neither tied to this side (tradition) nor the other side of the river (the unknown)? The tradition leans on one side, in modern times are we leaning too much on the other side? What is the right place of desire? It is said that seeing is ending. What does this really mean? If my seeing doesn't end anything, is it that something is missing in the quality of my seeing? Anything physical or psychological has infinite aspects. An ordinary person may not see all the aspects at one time. This is a basic limitation of one's seeing. Is it a continuing process over our life or over many lives?

In this age of hurry, is it that we can't stay with it? Our lives are too scheduled, we don't have the time and inclination to stay with sorrow. Is it that if one stays with that sorrow, grief, love or passion it can be turned into an insight? Despite all the seeing and listening to Krishnamurti, why is it we do not change? Is it because we have become insensitive, we can not open ourselves up? Is it related to the vitality of the people? Do we lack the well-springs of energy, of passion? What causes a lack of seeing or perception or sensitivity?

After this talk the small-group dialogues ensued, each group selecting relevant questions to pursue seriously and go deeper into them.

On the third day Sri Rajesh Dalal convened a dialogue by organizing a panel on 'K's Teachings in Daily Living'. The panelists were Sri Ramachandra Rao, Prof. Krishnanath, Sri Kandaswamy, Sri Sridhar and Prof. Krishna. The session was later thrown open for the audience to join in and express their views. The convenor focussed on the topic, with the following observations:

K's teachings are so vast and deep that one finds oneself before a great ocean, looking at a few pebbles. But this Teaching has touched us, done all kinds of things to us. It has disturbed us, shaken us out of complacency and the habitual ways of functioning of our lives. It has made us look at the world differently and we are facing the tremendous implications of it. We have no choice about the world being what it is. We need to respond to it. We may be partially awakened to certain extraordinary truths and may be we are all vastly asleep too, like all mankind.

Can we go into the depths of these Teachings and can these Teachings bring a new quality to our daily life? The Teachings are not a system to be practised. The beauty and the challenge of this dialogue is that we do not know how to go about such a dialogue. What really matters is the quality of investigation, of affection, the depth of mindfulness we bring to the dialogue. Can we listen to the word and the thought outside and to our reactions to the word? From where does the reaction arise? Is it possible for the mind to be without any reaction whatso-

ever? It is an ongoing, living challenge we must take up now. Different dimensions of the Teachings have been absorbed by each one of us, depending on our temperament and predilections. Perhaps none of us holds within us all the dimensions and depth of the Teachings. May be we don't even know what it means to keep the whole as one. What is the essence of these Teachings? How does it permeate, transform, affect or contact the quality of our daily life? We actually respond to the Teachings from where we are. Krishnamurti appears to be talking of the way of responding to the Teachings but do we not all respond to it in different ways?

The panelists spoke at length on the meaning Krishnamurti's Teachings had for them in their daily living. A gist is given below:

The essence of the Teachings seems to be one. It gets manifested in different forms depending on the context but essentially there is an undercurrent which is the same. The essence has to do with integrity, with being whole. Is it possible to be whole, to live totally in the here and now, and from that meet the world which is broken up, fragmented?

I can only live my life with the understanding that I have, not with borrowed understanding. My understanding of life can grow if I observe, question, enquire and seek the truth for myself instead of just agreeing or disagreeing with what others have said, choosing what suits me, adhering to it and saying this is the Teaching I like. My liking has nothing to do with truth. I must begin with observing for myself whatever I have been told. Accepting something

untrue as true limits my understanding — it is illusion. It is necessary to doubt one's concepts, and stay with the question 'Is it true?'. In doing that one's understanding grows so that one actually perceives in one's everyday life what the truth about something is. That perception of truth brings about a change in my consciousness which then reflects in my everyday life. To me, approaching life in that way, learning, staying with questions, beginning from where one is, is the essence of K's Teachings.

It requires energy to see one's partial reactions arising; some kind of dropping has to take place. Human beings are seeking wholeness through adding more and more to their selves in the quest for security. This is incoherent and confused seeking. Krishnamurti speaks of living with all one's senses alive. What does it really mean? One is not sensitive to the world of light, sound and colour and these are perceived in a muffled kind of way by most of us.

Partial perceptions exist and these bring tremendous vitality, because energy is no longer caught in those false moves and is therefore available for deeper exploration. There are certain pointers, perceptions which open up and have a clarifying effect on the mind. One has seen the validity of some of Krishnamurti's Teachings — how the image distorts in relationship, how one lives in the past and future and misses the living moment, the falseness of comparison — and the mind is lighter, less stressful. The body tends to acquire a certain physical sensitivity, for the right kind of food, for its need to exercise. One becomes watchful and so less prone to fall into

illusions or delusions.

On the last day there was a session on 'Education', convened by Sri G. Gautama. It took the form of a panel discussion with the convenor posing certain questions to the panelists. Afterwards, further questions were invited from the audience. The panelists were Ms Shahida Khanam from Rajghat Besant School, Ms Geetha Iyer from Rishi Valley, Ms Shobha from the Valley School, Sri Rajesh Dalal from Uttar Kasi and Prof. Krishna from Rajghat. The convenor began the discussion with the following observations:

The teachers in our schools represent a group of adults who are seriously going into the questions of right education. Are we very different from the young? Is there a completely new way of engaging the young? Do these questions live in the midst of our schools? Is there exploration into what is the right thing to do by children? In Krishnamurti schools, we discuss such questions. The attempt is to remain with the questions, not to conclusively answer them. Can human beings with varying ways of addressing a question still stay coherent and together?

The trend of the discussion which ensued is outlined below in a question and response format:

— **Question (Q):** Our schools reject punishment and reward as motivating factors. How can one help young people to find a wholesome and effective way of living without looking for approval or feeling rejected and hurt by criticism?

Responses (R): The children learn much more from

what we are than from anything we may say. Teachers must ask: Am I seeking rewards? Do we know anything called no reward, no punishment?

There appears to be no escape from situations which may be interpreted as reward and punishment. Unintended, they arise. Teachers and children are all conditioned by it.

If I use measurement as a tool for rewarding or punishing, out of my conditioning, it leads to fear. Learning and understanding cease. So, is measurement necessary at all?

— Q: The art of attending to the inner and outer without any expectation is central to Krishnamurti's Teaching. Is there a way this can be communicated to children?

R: When I use punishment and threat, I create fear and so achieve outer order at the cost of inner order. When I take responsibility for both inner and outer order I see it is important not to create fear. A larger challenge is to bring about outer order by creating inner order. Can I make the subject so interesting that there is joy in learning it, which creates its own order?

Rightness lies not so much in specific actions as in the quality of mind from which that action arises. One should never take the child for granted. The teacher needs a certain tentativeness in seeing the child. Can we move towards a perceptive quality in education?

— Q: The teaching of skills and subjects is important. How does one attempt to relate this to the whole of life?

R: Krishnamurti had suggested that the teacher could spend the first five or ten minutes talking generally about life and relating the subject to life. For instance, maths can be related with order, science with enquiry and freedom from authority and history with one's own past.

The child must perceive us not as a maths teacher but as a life teacher.

— Q: How can one who has not ended his problems, fears, insecurities, be a teacher to a student? Krishnamurti said that as you teach you learn. Is there an apparent paradox here?

R: Is teaching separate from living?

In academic subjects there is hierarchy. In the psychological field we are not really different from the child. So one is really learning together, for instance understanding anger together.

Do we have the honesty to say we don't have moral certainty?

Are we really learning together as equals? It seems children often have a greater clue how to remain in harmony. Can we learn to follow that clue and see where it leads?

Questions put forth by the audience included:

- Do you include the inner world of the child in your concerns?
- Measurement is a fact in our schools. How does this fit in with Krishnamurti's Teachings?
- How do we educate the educator?
- How do we educate a child who is not interested in academics?

A lot of interest in educational matters was generated and the session proved too short to deal sufficiently with it.

The Gathering closed with a viewing of Krishnamurti's talk on 'What is the Religious Mind?' It showed us just how far away we are from understanding life deeply.

— *Anjali Sareen*

LIST OF BOOKS

	Rs	P
KFI Publications		
Beyond Violence	60	00
Commentaries On Living - I Series	75	00
Commentaries On Living - II Series	80	00
Commentaries On Living - III Series	115	00
Commentaries On Living -(Telugu)	85	00
Education And The Significance Of Life	50	00
Exploration Into Insight	65	00
Freedom From The Known	45	00
Freedom From The Self	16	00
In The Light Of Silence	25	00
Inward Flowering	3	00
Krishnamurti At Rajghat	100	00
Krishnamurti For Beginners	175	00
Krishnamurti For Beginners (Telugu)	45	00
Krishnamurti On Education	80	00
Krishnamurti On Education (Tamil)	50	00
Krishnamurti's Journal	40	00
Krishnamurti To Himself	40	00
Krishnamurti's Note Book	65	00
Letters To The Schools Vol.I	40	00
Letters To The Schools Vol.II	40	00
Life Ahead	85	00
Meditations	45	00
Meeting Life	80	00
Mind Without Measure	65	00
Questions And Answers	55	00
Sri Lanka Talks	20	00
The Book Of Life	3	00
The First And Last Freedom	90	00
The Flame Of Attention	60	00
The Flight Of The Eagle	75	00

The Future Of Humanity	50 00
The Ending Of Time	115 00
The Last Talks	65 00
The Network Of Thought	60 00
The Only Revolution (Tamil)	65 00
The Way of Intelligence	75 00
The Wholeness Of Life	80 00
Tradition And Revolution	95 00
This Matter Of Culture	65 00
Truth And Actuality	55 00
Within The Mind	40 00
You Are The World	75 00

Other Publications

Fire In The Mind	200 00
J. Krishnamurti — Biography	200 00
The Penguin Krishnamurti Reader	365 00
The Second Penguin Krishnamurti Reader	425 00
Beauty Of The Mountain	60 00
Questioning Krishnamurti	300 00
Beginnings Of Learning	365 00
Krishnamurti-100 years	700 00
Kitchen Chronicles	650 00
Krishnamurti On Fear	300 00

BULLETIN
KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

Please note that the 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

Published by Dr Radhika Herzberger for the Krishnamurti Foundation India, 64-65 Greenways Road, Madras 600 028 and printed at M/s Sidma Offset Press (P) Ltd., No. 11, Gulam Abbas Ali Khan First Street, Thousand Lights, Madras — 600 006.

Editor: Dr Radhika Herzberger