

2 0 0 0 / 2

# Bulletin

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

The second issue of this year's Bulletin, like the first, contains samples of dialogues that J. Krishnamurti had with students of Rishi Valley. While the first issue contained dialogues from the 1960s and '70s, this issue restricts itself to some of those that took place in 1954. The questions that the students posed seem of a very specific nature, namely, boarding-school life: quietness at mealtimes, punctuality, tidiness, the wearing of uniforms, right occupation, and so on. Krishnamurti takes those seemingly 'restricted' questions and makes them applicable to life as a whole.

Of interest is Krishnamurti's usage of the terms 'discipline' ('... a disciplined mind can never really have the freedom of creativity' — *November 4, 1954*) and 'thinking' ('You think now that it is wrong to kill, but when you see a snake all that you are thinking now will be gone, and your instinct will be either to kill or to run away. So, the more you think about all this, the more whole your reactions will be ... Therefore ... think ... now.' — *November 4, 1954*).

This issue also contains the telephone numbers, the fax numbers, and the e.mail addresses of the various Krishnamurti Foundations and Centres.

## KRISHNAMURTI IN DIALOGUE WITH STUDENTS AT RISHI VALLEY

### TO BE AWARE OF THOUGHT AND YET BE FREE OF IT IS MEDITATION

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** Probably what we are going to discuss this morning is a little too serious. So, if you get bored, tired, fidgety and want to go away, please go; walk away quietly and have a good time outside.

I do not know if you have ever thought about how a 'disciplined' mind can never really have the freedom of creativity. Do you know what it is to have initiative? — To begin a thing, to do a thing, not because you are compelled, forced, or asked to do it, but out of your own love of the thing? Most of us — grown-ups as well as young people — have lost this initiative. You see the herd of cows here. Just look at the way they go on year after year: same cows. Our minds also always function in a groove because that is the safest way; in that there is no fear. So we remain in a groove. Here in this country especially, where there are so many people, we are afraid to get out of the rut, out of a 'safe' job because there are thousands waiting to get that job. So we remain disciplined, fearful, anxious, without initiative, and we never find out what real life is. Life is not a series of conformities. Imitating people, following an authority, or listening to your *guru* — that does not bring freedom. And it is only a mind that is capable of thinking that can create a new world where there is no misery, no sorrow.

You see, as long as you are doing what your father, what your family, what tradition says, you are not free; you do not have the initiative to do things. I think it is very important to find out what

you want to do in life, however outrageous, risky and adventurous it may seem to the older people. To find out what you want to do in life, and to do it, means a great deal of courage, understanding. To merely comply, to imitate, is the easiest thing, and our minds always want to find the easiest way: to fit into things and not to create.

Do you know what the mind is? You say, 'I think'. You say, 'I must do what my father says'. When you make statements of that kind, have you found out from where those statements come? You say, 'I must do what my parents want me to do'. Now, from where do these words, these feelings, come? Think it out. Where do you think the words — the English words which you have learnt — and the feeling behind these words come?

**STUDENT (S):** From imagining.

**K:** You say 'imagining'. How do you imagine? What is the source of your imagination? Go on, old boy, pursue it. You will find out. You imagine something, or you have a feeling and you want to tell me, you want to communicate to me or another your feeling. And you use words to communicate, to express it. You use words in English or Tamil to tell me. But from where does all that come? The word, the feeling, the imagination, the phrases, the symbols — is not all that the mind? If there was no imagination, no words, no desire to communicate, would you have a mind? Would you?

**S:** No.

**K:** All that is the mind. Is it not? Let us say that somebody pricks a pin into me. The nerves and the brain react; then I say, 'You have put a pin into me'. The feeling — either annoyance or pleasure — is expressed in words. So the mind is a series of memories. For instance, 'Narayan's mind' — what does it mean? It means that he remembers his name, where he comes from,

who his family is, what he would like to be. What he thinks: how to be successful, how he is jealous — all that is his mind. And that is a series of memories, is it not? You learn right from when you are young. As a small boy you learn alphabets, and as you grow older you begin to read, to study Ruskin or someone else. Your memory is being trained, is it not? And that memory is Narayan or Yeshwant.

Do you know what a state of amnesia means? Take, for instance, soldiers who have come back from war. Because war is such a terrible thing, a fearful thing — shells, death, injuries — it is a tremendous shock to the soldiers' minds. Coming back suddenly, the soldier forgets everything: he does not know his name, where he comes from, where he lives, he cannot read, he cannot recognize anything. The shock of the terrible things that he has seen completely drives all his memory away. He is just a living thing without a memory. He has brains, but he cannot recollect where he lives, his family, or anything. So, if you remove memory, if you free the mind from memory, there is no you. Is there? To sing, to learn geography, history, to paint, to hit back when you are hit, to respect people, to love, to have ambitions, longings, fears, what you believe or do not believe — all that is you. That is your mind. That mind is the centre of what you want to be. Do you follow? That mind says, 'I must be better than that fellow; I must have more pleasure than so and so; I must have a bigger car than so and so'. That mind exists in comparison, in competition, in wanting something and rejecting something. That mind is you, is it not?

You say, 'I want to be a great man; I must follow what my father says; I must follow my tradition, otherwise I will be afraid'. That 'I' which thinks, which names — 'This is Yeshwant' — is always working for itself. Though it says, 'I must *be*', it is always working for itself, thinking of itself. The problem is: Can such a mind —

remembering everything — be free of the thought of itself? You see, that is meditation. To know what your traditions are, to know, to be aware of your ambitions, your passions, your anger, your revenge, your fears — to know all that, to be aware of all that and to be free of it is meditation.

**S:** Sir, how can one be free of all that, when one is thinking of all that?

**K:** You will know. Be aware that you think, and see whether the mind can be free from that. You believe that you are a brahmin or a non-brahmin. That belief has been instilled into you. People have told you and, so, you say, 'This is what I believe', and you keep on believing it for the rest of your life. Can you take up that belief and look at it, understand it: how it has come into being, how you have been impressed by it, how you have been forced into that belief? Then, can you not be free of it? If you understand something, are you not free of it?

You see, education is something vastly different from merely learning or acquiring some information. *Education is this extraordinary process of understanding oneself and the relationship of oneself with another.* You are not educated in that, and that is far more important than all the education you get. After all, if you know how to read and write, you can pick up any book and acquire information. But to find out what is thinking, what is God, what is death, what is truth, what is love, that requires extraordinary investigation, a capacity to think out.

You see, you come to a time, a period, by thinking, by watching, when there is no thinking at all. Your mind is extraordinarily active, but it is very quiet, and all thinking as we know it stops. It is in that state of quiet that you can find out. It is in that state that any real discovery can take place; you can find out what God, Truth,

and death are. But thinking merely continues what has been, modified.

— November 4, 1954

### UNDERSTAND EVIL

**STUDENT (S):** Sir, why is there evil in life, and how is one to get rid of it?

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** You are so anxious to get rid of evil. See this — wanting to get rid of evil — as one of the fallacies of your mind. What is important is to understand evil and not to put it away or throw it away. So, do not think about getting rid of evil but find out what evil is, for if you understand the process of evil, the way it works, then you do not have to get rid of it. When you see a cobra you do not think that you must get rid of it; you just run away from it.

What is evil? What do you — the boy who put that question — think is evil? Do you think it is evil not to obey your father? Do you think it is evil to hurt somebody? Do you think it is evil to have a filthy, bad-smelling village, with people who are starving in it? Just what do you think is evil?— When you pull somebody's hair or when you are jealous of somebody, when you compare yourself with somebody?

**S:** At the moment when we do those things we do not think that it is evil; later on we do.

**K:** Of course; later on you think it is evil. So, what do you consider evil?

**S:** Something that is not to our liking.

**K:** But anything you like is good, is it? Please, think it out; do not make definite statements. Let us say, for instance, that you like a certain kind of food and you keep on eating it. You might like to eat a lot of rice and it might be bad for you, but as you like it, you say that it is good. You might like to have a comfortable, rich life; you like that and, so, you call it a 'good' life. But if there is exploitation in the way you get money, is not that evil? You see, *how* you earn money matters very much. So you will have to find out what you mean by evil, and who has created this thing called evil.

**S:** So long as I behave properly it is all right.

**K:** What do you mean by 'properly'? — Do you mean being 'good', without being evil? Or is 'evil' just a word? Would you call it evil if I hurt you? If I am angry, would you call that evil? When I am angry and kill a man, would you call that evil? If I put a net and catch a bird and destroy it, is it evil? Would you call killing animals and eating them evil?

**S:** No.

**K:** Why?

**S:** Because it is useful to us.

**K:** You say, 'Because it is useful to me, because I can eat it, it is not evil'. Right? So you divide animals into those that are useful to you — those that give you meat, eggs, etc. — and those that are not useful to you. Killing those animals on which you feed, you do not call evil.

You people have already made up your minds as to what is evil, what is useful, and so on, and that is not thinking. Let us go

slowly. Would you call killing evil? Killing a man in anger, killing for a country in war, would you call that evil? Killing a man at any time — is that not evil? You see, it is not that killing a man in wartime is right and killing a man when you are angry is wrong.

**S:** Sir, I do not think that it is wrong to kill a man who has done something very bad to you.

**K:** You see, your country says that you are at war with Germany, and that you must kill the German. Is that right? The man in Germany: he has done nothing to you; you do not even know him.

**S:** But you are forced to kill him; your country compels you to do so.

**K:** You say that your country forces you to go and kill. But, if you think it is wrong, why should you do it?

**S:** If we do not, we will be put in jail.

**K:** Then go to jail. Most people do not think that killing is wrong, and they kill other human beings because there is war — priests bless canons during a war. You do not think — really, deeply — that killing at any time is evil. You do not say, 'I think it is evil, it is wrong, to kill: whether an animal or a man in anger or in a war'.

**S:** What if a man has murdered someone else?

**K:** The law will look after him, but that is a different problem. When we talk about evil, about something being evil, it means that it is wrong right to the very end and not that it is sometimes good, and sometimes evil. So, what do we mean by evil? Is killing evil?

**S:** I do not think that all killing is evil. I think that if you see a poisonous snake going by and you kill it, it does not matter because it will bite some other person.

**K:** Are you killing it because of another man or are you threatened and, so, want to kill it? When you are threatened, your instinctive response is to defend yourself. When you are walking on the road and a snake comes by, to protect yourself you kill it; when a man hits you, you hit back. That is your attitude. This is so with races, with classes, too. Instinctively we organize and fight. You think now that it is wrong to kill, but when you see a snake all that you are thinking now will be gone, and your instinct will be either to kill or to run away. The more you think about all this, the more whole your reactions will be when you meet a snake.

**S:** But we cannot think when we meet a snake.

**K:** Therefore, should you not think about it now? We have all met several snakes at different times — do we always defend ourselves? I am interested, very interested, in watching a snake. Of course, I watch from a distance, and I do not want to kill it.

So, let us begin again. Killing — is it evil? Killing in self-protection, killing to protect others, killing in war, killing out of anger, killing animals to feed yourself and others — is the whole of that evil or do you think that in certain cases killing is not evil?

**S:** Well, in certain cases killing is not evil. Take, for instance, the mosquito; it is harmful to humanity.

**K:** You have begun to differentiate; you have begun to say where killing is evil and where it is not. Please, follow this: If you no longer say that killing a mosquito may be right and eating a vegetable may be right, it means that you are going to find out whether it is right to kill: be it the least advanced creature or that

which is most harmful to humanity. If you no longer say that killing a mosquito is right and that killing something else is wrong, you will begin to see the difference involved; you will begin to think about it. My point is that we do not think about not merely what is evil and what is not evil — that is not the way to think — but about evil itself. Probably this is the first time you have tried to think about it; so, you have to discuss it.

**S:** Sir, suppose somebody says that I have to kill another. Should I kill him or not?

**K:** Should you do that? Do you want to kill another because you are asked to? Is killing during wartime all right because all your politicians say so? Why should you accept what somebody else says?

**S:** Why should you not kill a person who has leprosy? Anyway he is going to die.

**K:** He may recover. You have no right to kill him.

**S:** He will have more pain.

**K:** Let the doctors decide.

**S:** What if he is poor?

**K:** You are supposing; but even he may have a relative. Should not the doctor, a lawyer, the family — all of them — be consulted to find out what to do? There are people who have gone into this question of dangerous incurable diseases; they have discussed this problem.

Let us come back: Do you think it is perfectly right to kill in a war?

**S:** What if the other party attacks you? You have to defend yourself, sir.

**K:** Now why do they attack you?

**S:** Because they want to take our country away.

**K:** You see, Vikram, people consider that killing is justified in war, killing is justified in the case of fatal diseases. People consider killing justified when they kill an animal for food, when they kill a mosquito, dangerous animals. But where do *you* stand in all this? Do you understand?

**S:** It is really not justified; but you protect yourself.

**K:** Which means justification. Do you think about all these things? What will you do when somebody asks you to join the army? What if the government asks you to join the army — will you?

**S:** Boys know that they will get more money, more pay, in the army.

**K:** Sir, the army exists to kill. If you do join the army, do you understand the implications of it? Find out.

**S:** When you join the army and are asked to kill, you have got to obey.

**K:** Of course you have to obey when you join but, before you join, must you not find out why you want to join? Why do you join the army? — Do you join for money, knowing all the implications of the existence of an army?

**S:** The army is interested in killing. So, joining the army ...

**K:** ... Means killing. That is, I am interested in raising cobras and letting them loose. What does it mean? You do not think about all these things.

**S:** But, sir, somebody may join the Air Force because he likes to fly. Is it wrong?

**K:** But he is also asked to drop bombs.

— November 4, 1954

**REAL QUIETNESS IS NOT FORCED, COMPELLED  
IT IS ONLY A FREE MIND THAT CAN BE QUIET**

**STUDENT (S):** Sir, in our dining-hall we have a lot of noise at mealtimes. How do we help the small children to keep quiet?

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** You are asking: How do we get the children to be quiet? But, do you not think that it is quite natural for children to be noisy? They are like a lot of monkeys, are they not?

You have told them several times but, still, they are not quiet. Right? So, how do you set about it? How do you help them to be quiet without beating them up? Do you think that *doing* something at mealtimes will help? Say, for instance, reading a story at mealtimes — will that help? During mealtimes, in the monasteries in Europe, one of the monks reads a chapter of a book — a book of serious nature — while the others eat, so that while they are eating they not only assimilate food but also assimilate other things for the mind. So, I ask, would it not help if you read something to the children? Would it not help to read stories — stories that are not too serious — to keep them quiet? Would that help?

**S:** For a few days they will be quiet, then they will get tired of that.

**K:** So, how will you set about it? — Drug them?

**S:** No.

**K:** You see, it is interesting: Some grown-up people are so restless; they can never sit quietly. Perhaps, if there is an atmosphere of quietness in the dining-hall — if the grown-ups are quiet — the children may be quiet too. Have you grown-ups ever tried being quiet? Sitaram, have you ever tried being quiet? You are never quiet — quiet in the dining-hall — are you? So, how do you expect the little children to be quiet?

**S:** ‘Quiet’ means not just *not* making a noise, talking; it means also not throwing things — orange peels, and so on — at each other.

**K:** They should sit separately then. What would solve the problem?

These little fellows in the front are very bored and, yet, they stay. They do not understand what we are talking about. They do not know English well enough to understand what we are saying, but they are quiet. Why?

**S:** They are being considerate.

**K:** So, why are they not also considerate when they eat? Suppose you talked about it everyday — not as a serious ‘set’ thing, but just talked about being polite, being considerate, about sitting quietly, would not that penetrate the mind? It is no good *telling* them again and again to be polite, to be considerate, to be quiet, and so on, but if you talked about it often, would not that penetrate

the mind? During classes, and just before mealtimes this reminder: There must be regard, there must be consideration, for others. This reminder is not to compel or force them to be quiet, but for them to understand for themselves that there must be regard for others, that there must be consideration for others. Could not this be done? Why do you not try it? You cannot do this — talk about this — *at* mealtimes; it would be like suppressing a lot of monkeys.

**S:** Sir, I feel that we have to have coercion.

**K:** With regard to whom? Do you need to be coerced to do something? If you were not coerced, would you not do something? Do you need to be threatened, punished?

**S:** I would not like it, of course, but if someone had used coercion on me right in the beginning of a task, I would have done better.

**K:** Would you? If someone had forced you to read history — would you have *learnt* history? You may know all the facts — when Asoka reigned, and so on — but do you think that you would have *understood* history? History is the process of culture, of civilization; it is not merely dates. Would you have learnt Arithmetic if you had been forced to learn it?

**S:** In the beginning if I had no interest, and I was forced to study Arithmetic, I would, perhaps, find interest later on while working on Arithmetic. But it would be due to that act of being forced.

**K:** So you think that in the beginning you ought to be compelled, you ought to be beaten up and that later on you will be all right. Do you know what beating — violence — does? Do you know what the instillation of fear does? *Fear that is instilled in the beginning always remains.* My lord, you boys think that you should be coerced and beaten up!

**S:** No, no coercion with the elder ones.

**K:** Only the younger ones, right? You want the younger ones to do what you want them to do. Right? You really do not think out the problem; you just make remarks.

Have you tried keeping quiet for two minutes? Do you understand what I mean by keeping quiet? Have you ever tried to keep not just your body but your mind quiet, without a movement? Just try it, and see what happens. In order to be quiet, in order to make your mind quiet, you must sit in a position which you can maintain for sometime. Then, observe your mind. Observe how it wanders. Observe how it moves — all the time — back and forth. It is difficult to keep the mind quiet. You see, real quietness is not only of the body but also of the mind. Real quietness is not forced; it is not compelled; it is not brought about by ‘discipline’. *It is only a mind that is free, and not a mind that is ‘disciplined’ that can really be quiet.*

**S:** Sir, our minds wander.

**K:** Let it wander, but be conscious that it is wandering. You see, our minds wander unconsciously, but the moment we become conscious that it is wandering, we will see that it stops wandering. Look at your watch. While you are looking at your watch you are not quiet, are you? Your mind is fixed on the second-hand, and you are watching the second-hand move around. You might be sitting still, but that is not being quiet. Quietness implies — does it not? — not only your body being still but also your mind not being fixed on anything: on the watch, on something that is outside the window, on somebody’s back, and so on. See if your mind can be really quiet — without any movement, without it being fixed on, ‘observing’, something. Try; you will find how extraordinarily difficult it is.

Do you know what meditation is? Have you seen people 'meditate': sitting very quietly in a room before a picture, or under a tree, with their eyes closed? You have seen them, have you not? They think that they are meditating. But, are they really meditating, or are they just repeating certain words and, so, quieting their minds? Are they meditating, or just fixing their minds on a picture, on an image, on a symbol, and their minds are absorbed in that, concentrated? Now: Is a mind quiet when it is absorbed, when it is concentrated? It is only when the mind is really free that it is quiet. When the mind is concentrated, it is fixed; it is not made to move — is it not? A concentrated mind is not a free mind, but a free mind can be concentrated. Do you see the difference? The same thing applies when the mind is absorbed in something. It is lost in that something and, therefore, it is not free. So, find out if your mind can be free, can be quiet without being absorbed or concentrated on something. You see, *unless you know the whole process of your own mind, you know very little about life*. There are very clever people in the world — they run schools; they do things; they make explanations — but unless they know this, they are of very little value to the world or to another.

**S:** It is clear that a concentrated mind is not a free mind. But what do you mean when you say that a free mind can be concentrated?

**K:** A concentrated mind, a disciplined mind, is not a free mind. Sir, are you just repeating this, or is this a fact, a truth? It may be clear verbally, but is that actually so? *A concentrated mind is not a free mind* — is that the truth? Do you understand? A donkey that is tethered to a post cannot move. That is a fact, and we see that. Now, do you see as factually that a mind that is disciplined is not a free mind? Or do you merely verbally accept it?

What is a free mind? A mind is free when it does not compare itself with another mind. A mind is free when it is no longer pursuing a reward, an end, a goal. A mind is free when it is no longer burdened by knowledge — knowledge being the past. Such a mind can give attention to things and not be entangled in the process. Therefore what is important is *not* a free mind that can concentrate, but a free mind. Do you follow? What is important is to find out whether it is possible for a mind to be free from all comparisons: my 'becoming' something, my accomplishments, my ideals, my thoughts. Can the mind be free from all that? Can the mind be free from time? — Time being the process of knowledge. If one can really go into that and find out the truth of that matter, then concentration becomes a very minor affair.

— *November 13, 1954*

**EDUCATION SHOULD BE CONCERNED WITH  
A VOCATION, FOR A VOCATION IS  
THE COMPREHENSION OF LIFE**

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** Have you ever thought of becoming a teacher? You would be rather horrified — would you not? — if you thought that you had to become a teacher instead of becoming a lawyer, an engineer, or a scientist with a lot of money and cars and a big position.

**STUDENT (S):** I do not want to be a teacher, because I want to be, to do, something else.

**K:** Is it because you want to do something else, or is it because you think that the teaching profession is very low?

**S:** I do not think it is very low.

**K:** All right . . . .

You know, there is such a thing as a 'vocation' and an 'occupation'. Most of us want to be occupied. An occupation is very important to us because, if we were not occupied with our hands and our minds, what would we do? Most of us seek jobs not just to earn money, but to be occupied. Most people, if they were not occupied with some thing, would be unhappy, would not know what to do.

You know, there are new kinds of machines — machines which are going to do man's thinking and take over many of man's occupations. Instead of three thousand people running a factory, just a dozen people would do. What is going to happen to the rest of those people? — They have to be occupied. Most human beings demand an occupation, for if they were not occupied, they would be unhappy. Think of a man who is used to going to the office from morning till evening. (You will all probably end up doing that: becoming mere glorified clerks.) Think of such a man — a man who has been going to an office all his life, working and working, having no time to think, no time to live. Such a man, suddenly deprived of his occupation, will be very unhappy; he will not know what to do.

There is a difference between an occupation and a vocation. A mind that is occupied has not found its true vocation. You see, most of you are concerned with getting an occupation. Your parents are concerned with occupations. They want you to pass examinations in order to get a job — it does not matter what kind of job. Pass the exams and get a job — that is all that they are concerned with. Should not true education be concerned with a vocation and not with an occupation?— because, after all, *a vocation is the comprehension of the whole of life, of living.*

You know, the problem is that we think that if we have a degree

and an occupation we have understood life, understood the process of living. If we make life — living — our vocation, then we can create a different society, a different world. Living implies — does it not? — not just knowing mathematics, history and science, but also to live. Living is — is it not? — to think, to love, to be considerate, to know what it is to meditate, to die, to find out what Truth is, what God is. Living is to enjoy music; it is to be musicians, and to write poems. To suffer and to know what suffering is, to have happiness and the full content of joy — all these things are life.

Life is not merely your 'occupation'. An occupation is exclusive. You go to an office, and there you forget your family, you forget your worries, because you are occupied. And most of us want an occupation because we cannot tolerate the inflow of life. To be concerned with the beauty of sunlight on a leaf, to be concerned with another, and so on, requires a great deal of watchfulness, alertness and sensitivity. So, most of our minds demand occupation. Have you ever thought about it? An occupied mind is a very shallow mind. *A mind that is occupied — whether it is occupied with science, with astronomy, with algebra, with God, Truth or with kitchen affairs — is a very small, petty mind. An occupied mind is not a free mind.*

Perhaps if in this school we are rightly educated, we may learn what true vocation — which is living — is. In a true vocation, an occupation, a job, a livelihood, also has a place. If we are concerned with living, then we will also be concerned with the right occupation. And, I feel, that for human beings teaching — if we know how to approach it — is the right occupation, not law, trade, politics. *Teaching is concerned with the whole problem of living*, and not merely with the imparting of information about history or mathematics or science. *Education is the understanding of the whole process of living*, and not merely the training necessary to get an occupation.

**S:** Can you please, sir, say a bit more about right occupation?

**K:** Do you see the difference between an occupation and a vocation? Let us go slowly. Is joining the army the right occupation? To be a soldier, a policeman, a lawyer, a politician — not an administrator, do you see the difference? — is that the right occupation? We need good, capable, efficient, incorruptible administrators — do we not? We do not need politicians, but we do have politicians. As long as there is a society in which there is constant conflict within and without, as long as there is a society that is based on acquisitiveness, greed, envy, wanting more than somebody else, there must be conflict, there must be a battle, internecine war, between its citizens — between you and me. And as long as the social structure is as it is now — based on acquisitiveness, greed, envy — there must be the soldier, there must be the policeman, there must be the lawyer, and there must be the politician.

**S:** So, in Rishi Valley, as long as we have this outlook on life — comparison, fear — we have to have authority, discipline, and so on.

**K:** As long as society — Rishi Valley, too — is based on acquisitiveness, envy, greed, there must be conflict within society. And to maintain 'order' within a society which is based on acquisitiveness, envy, greed, you need the soldier, you need the policeman, you need the lawyer, you need the politician, and this brings about the destruction of society. So the question is: Is education merely to enable you to get an occupation, or to help you to understand the whole structure of living and, therefore, to find out your true occupation, vocation, without the process of creating conflict in society? Do you understand what I am talking about?

What is society as it is now? There are the big people on top, the

nobility of the land: the politicians, the policemen, the brahmins. Then there are the non-brahmins, the peasants. And each is fighting the other; each is comparing, wanting. Each is aggressive, driving. This is our society, and to maintain order, to bring about control, in this society you need all these people: the soldier, the lawyer, the policeman, and so on.

Now, if there is right education — an education that helps you to understand the whole structure and meaning of life, an education which helps you find out your true occupation, your vocation — there will be no competition between you and me. If there is right education, we may create a new society — a society which is not based on acquisitiveness and where many of our present so-called occupations will be unnecessary. It is the function of these schools — Rishi Valley and Rajghat in the north — to give, to ‘create’ such an education — an education for living, an education which will not make you a part of this corruptible society.

**S:** But, sir, it is only when everyone in society understands and realizes what life is will it be possible to have no policemen.

**K:** You are saying that only if everyone in the social structure understood, would there be no need for policemen — right? And then you will ask: How are you going to make all Indians understand this? This is the usual question that we are asked. We must make everybody understand this, for only then will this happen, and how are we going to explain this to the whole of India?

All right. Think it out. You want to convince the whole of India that this is the ‘right’ way of looking at life. Now, where would you begin?

**S:** With a small village or so.

**K:** Would you not begin by saying, 'That is the way I want to be educated, that is the way I want to live'? You must completely understand this for yourself, must you not? Then you can go to the village. Of course, if you do not want to go to the village, you will become a clever man, a politician, a cunning lawyer who uses the villager to make money. *If you understand, then you will be like a flame that will go around.* If you do not understand, then you will be merely making propaganda. And that has no meaning. If you get it, stick to it and work it out. Do not become a merchant, a lawyer, a politician.

**S:** Why has there been no move made towards this kind of society? Why have we not realized the need for this kind of society — a society in which there is no necessity for policemen and soldiers?

**K:** Is it not because we have no right educators, educators who have realized this for themselves? Do *we* — you and I and Govind — realize this *now*? — It is *not* that 'they have' or that 'they will'. Do *we* see the importance of a society of such a kind?

**S:** Yes, I do realize.

**K:** You say that you realize .... That realization — what does it mean? It really means — does it not? — that it must necessarily begin with me, with M and G. It means that I am not going to be acquisitive. It means that I will not be envious of a single person, because — in myself — I am rich; I know how to live. It is a man who does not know how to live, who is poor inwardly; he is ambitious, competitive, and acquisitive; and he, therefore, creates this rotten society.

Sir, if you really said, 'This is so for me. I have realized', then you will create a new order, a new society. M will, G will. We will all 'create' a new education, a new society.

**S:** What about the forces of evil? How do we combat them? Perhaps we are not sufficient enough to create that society.

**K:** Sir, do you know what happens to you if you say, 'This is true, and I am going to live that Truth'? You then never think that you are not capable, not 'sufficient'. You are that thing, and because you are that thing you have tremendous vitality. *That thing itself has tremendous vitality.* So, if X and I have a misunderstanding, we will clear it up. We will not carry the injury to the next moment. We will wipe it away.

— November 14, 1954

### THOUGHTFULNESS IS IMPORTANT IT WILL BRING ABOUT QUIETNESS

**STUDENT (S):** We are constantly being reminded by our teachers that we should be tidy and that we should not make a noise at certain times and at certain places. I do not think that most of us deliberately disobey our teachers; it is just that we forget. Why do we forget, and what can we do, sir, to help us to remember such things?

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** What do you mean by 'remembrance'? Please, follow this. You say that if you can remember not to be noisy and not to be untidy, then you will not be noisy and not be untidy. But you do forget. So, you have the problem of remembering to be tidy, to be punctual, to have good manners. To you remembrance is important. When you put this question: How can I remember? then 'remembrance' is what you are emphasizing. So the problem arises 'how' to remember? — Tie a string round your finger, or write the thing on a piece of paper and keep it in front of you, and so on. You see, you do not say remembrance is not the important point, but what is important is *why* I am untidy, *why* I make noise, *why* I am unpunctual. Why

are you untidy? You take your clothes off and drop them on the floor, and your mother or *akka* comes along to pick it up. Right?

If you are thoughtful, you will not be untidy. Is that not so? If you are thoughtful, then you will put your clothes away. So, thoughtfulness is more important than remembrance. Thoughtfulness will help you to be punctual, because you do not want others to keep waiting. Thoughtfulness will bring about a quietness, a silence, at mealtimes. So what is important is *not* how to remember but to be thoughtful. If you are thoughtful all the time then the problem is very simple, is it not? Then you say, 'I must be punctual, because I really do not want people to keep waiting'. This means that you are considerate, and that it is not just a habit. Nobody compels you. You act out of freedom, out of kindness, out of politeness. You are punctual — are you not? — because you are thoughtful. Being thoughtful, being alert, is much more important than cultivating habits of punctuality, because to develop habits is thoughtlessness. *To have habits — whether good or bad — is to be thoughtless.*

**S:** Why am I not thoughtful?

**K:** That is a wrong question. If you ask *why* you are not thoughtful, then the problem arises as to *how* you are to be thoughtful and, then, you are back again in the old groove. Please, this is very important, for if you catch the significance of this just once you will never ask, 'How am I to be thoughtful?'

You ask: How am I to remember to be punctual, to be tidy, to be silent, to be courteous? *Remembrance can create a habit: a habit of punctuality, of tidiness, of being very polite. But a habit is just a mechanical thing.* What is important is to be thoughtful. Where there is thoughtfulness there is tidiness, consideration, and all the rest. *When you are thoughtful there is action, is not there?* Please, just listen. You are not thoughtful — are you? —

because you cannot be thoughtful; you are too young. As you are pressed for time, you want to take off your clothes, and go to the next class or out for games. So, you develop untidy habits. There is the organization of life all round. Right? You have to dress up, you have to go to breakfast, you have to go to classes, you have to play games. This means that you have to be aware the whole day of what you have to do; you have to be thoughtful of all this.

Now, when you ask, 'How am I to be thoughtful?' the *how* creates a pattern of thinking — a habit. *And the moment you have a habit, thought ceases.* If you see the importance, the necessity, of being thoughtful, you are thoughtful. If you do not, then you will ask, 'How am I to be thoughtful?' Do you get the point? Forget your lessons, and bombard your teachers this morning about this — not about *how* to be thoughtful, but about the necessity of being thoughtful. The moment you see that it is important to be thoughtful, you are thoughtful, are you not? The moment you say, 'I must play the game', you run when the time comes — don't you? You don't ask, 'How am I to run, what am I to do?'

You see, the problem is: Why do you not see the importance of being thoughtful? For instance, you do something: smoke or bite your nails. It has become a habit. People generally say that it is terrible to smoke; it is a terrible habit; stop it. But you cannot stop it, because it has become a habit. So, they tell you to cultivate another habit which is the opposite of it. This means that you have become thoughtless. Whereas if you are thoughtful, would you smoke and make it into a habit? Need a thoughtful man have habits? — Habits being thoughtlessness, habits being action without conscious, deliberate awareness.

Have you noticed that the moment you are aware that you are biting your nails, you *almost* stop it? Have you tried it? Being

aware of it, that is, seeing your hand go into your mouth and your teeth biting your nails, at that moment you will stop. Try it. When you are thoughtful, when your mind is not a mind which is living in habit, then you do not have to discipline yourself not to bite your nails.

You see, it is very important for a mind not to be occupied. Occupation becomes habit, and then the mind is sterile, dead.

— November 14, 1954

### **TIMELESS BEHAVIOUR MEANS RIGHTEOUSNESS**

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** I would like to discuss manners, behaviour. Do you know what manners are? What does behaviour mean? What does it mean to behave, to conduct oneself in a certain manner? *Behaviour means righteousness*, does it not? If you are kind, gentle, then your manners, your behaviour will also be gentle. If you are considerate to others, then your manners, your behaviour will also be considerate, unselfish. You will spontaneously think of others....

Should we all have to go through this farce every morning? The children, the little ones, get bored, tired. I wonder whether they should stay even for two minutes. What do you think? We have extraordinary ideas of compulsion. Do you think to behave righteously is a form of compulsion? Please, think it out.

Behaviour: I am not only talking of superficial behaviour, but of instinct. Do you know what instinct is? — That instinct which is the outcome of goodness, of consideration, the outcome of being really kind and which produces a certain behaviour, a certain kindliness of manner? For instance, you get up when the teacher comes into your class — do you not?

**STUDENT (S):** We do not.

**K:** Then, I am sorry. Why do you get up when I come? Are manners dependent on culture? Do, please, listen to this very carefully; you will find out something very good. Are manners and behaviour dependent on culture? In Western culture, that is, in Europe and America, when a lady comes into the room you instinctively stand up. This is based on the idea of chivalry, on tradition. You may not care for the lady. You may not look at her or consider her worthy, but you get up automatically when she comes into the room, and sit down automatically when she sits down. That is considered part of good manners. Also, at table, when you are eating, it is considered good manners not to belch, not to make a noise with your spoon and fork, and so on. But those are superficial effects of culture — are they not? — and not what I would call instinctual consideration of kindness, of affection, of real respect. That is merely the outcome of superficial instructions. Now here, in Oriental culture, you have certain behaviour patterns. You can make a noise when you eat; nobody thinks much of it. You do not get up when a lady comes in, but if a *guru* comes in, you get up whether you understand what he is talking about or not.

Ask yourself whether righteous behaviour is merely the effect of culture or something entirely different. You do not get up when a teacher comes into your class. Why? Is it because you have no respect for him? Or is it because it is a habit? That is, everyday you see him; everyday he comes to your class and he tells you what to do; so you have got used to him, and not got used to me. But if you saw me everyday and heard me tell you to learn, you would soon lose respect for me. Now, the loss of respect through custom, through habit is superficial, is it not? But *if you are inwardly, innately, deeply kind, you will get up in spite of your having seen your teacher a thousand times*. I am not concerned with the teacher, but with my respect of teaching.

**S:** Why should you get up to show your respect?

**K:** I am talking about the *feeling* of respect, not of getting up. You see, you may either get up, or salute, or do something or the other. After all, why do you get up when I come in? Why do you not throw a book at me? Is that a superficial mannerism: politeness? Or is it out of a deep respect for another — it does not matter whom: a villager, just another human being? Is it out of respect for life? Do you follow what I am talking about? Or do you merely learn superficial manners of politeness? You appear kind, appear respectful, but inwardly you do not care.

People judge you by your outward behaviour, manners. When you get up when someone walks in, they say how polite you are. They say that you are polite when you talk a little more quietly, when you are silent, when you let somebody enter a room before you. All that is superficial; but that may also be an indication of an inward respect for people. Have you that inward respect from which righteous behaviour comes, or are you merely learning some superficial manners which can be brushed off when it does not suit you?

What are your manners, and on what are they based? Are they the result of a culture and therefore of a tradition and therefore of habit and therefore superficial? Or are they the effect of your inward state, of your inward understanding, affection, consideration, kindness and, therefore, a natural thing? Do you follow? If you have such inward kindness, inward, spontaneous respect, then there is neither Western culture nor Eastern culture. I do not know if you realize all this.

When you eat and then belch it is not very pleasant for another, is it? Even if everybody does it, is it pleasant to listen to the noise? A thousand people may do it but, please, look at it for yourself; think it out for yourself. Do you think that it is nice? Let

us say, for instance, that you travel in a carriage in Europe. There is a notice put up which asks you not to smoke. But you begin to smoke. Nobody pays attention to the notice except the man who does not smoke. He feels uncomfortable but, as he is in the minority, he keeps quiet. If he is aggressive, he calls the conductor.

What do you think? What do you — not out of your superficial culture, your civilization where everybody belches, and so on, but as an individual who is aware of respect, aware of kindness, aware of consideration for another — think? Should you or should you not, out of consideration for another, get up when the teacher comes in? Should you or should you not, out of consideration for another, be punctual for everything? If you say that you will do something, should you or should you not do it? Should you or should you not, out of consideration, be tidy? You see, if you are untidy, somebody else has to do the job. If you throw a piece of paper, somebody else has to pick it up. In Switzerland, it is a punishable offence to spit in the streets. Here you know what it is like. Here it is much more serious, because we all walk barefooted and we might tread on it. You see the patterns of behaviour all over the world; you see the superficial effects of certain civilizations. What do you think of all this? From what point of view would you behave? From what level would your conduct be? Would your conduct, behaviour, manners be on the superficial level of any particular civilization? Or would you say, 'My behaviour will be righteous; it will be dependent on my consideration, on my affection, on my gentleness'? Do you follow? If it is based on the latter, then your manners will be perfect wherever you are. Your manners will be perfect whether you are in America, or in England, or in India, because you are being righteous to something which you think is true.

**S:** If I like the teacher I get up, if I do not, I sit down.

**K:** Which means what? You have respect for those whom you

like or for those of whom you are afraid, and disrespect for those whom you do not like. When a servant comes in, you do not get up. If you had a kindly, real, deep respect for him, your manners would be entirely different. So, should you not now, as part of education, find out on what your manners are based? Find out whether your manners are based on superficial politeness, superficial adjustment to customs, to habit, to patterns of behaviour, or whether your manners are based on your inward understanding of kindness and of consideration.

I have seen people here eating *pan* — betel leaves. They tear the leaves and throw them on the carpet because their servants come and pick them up. And you do it too. Why? If you had to do it yourself, you would not do it. Some elder: your mother or your father or some servant is going to do it and, therefore, you do not throw your leaf away. You see, we have this casual behaviour because of over population, because we have so many people. Somebody, for ten rupees, will work for you. In America, where you have to do everything for yourself — clean, mop, wash, cook, do the laundry — you would be jolly careful.

Here, in India, there is no social conscience. I was walking in a street in Bombay and a basin of rubbish was thrown out of a window; and it just missed me. I looked up at the lady and the lady looked at me and we both smiled; and I went on. She would have smiled even if she had thrown the stuff on me.

Is social conscience merely the effect of environment, of economic necessity, or is it something entirely different? The fact is that there is more social conscience in America than anywhere else; as you come East, it grows less and less. There is more of it in England, France, and Germany; less in Italy, still less in Egypt, and none at all in India. Social conscience is being considerate to others, it is to keep your garden beautiful, not just because it pleases you but because it pleases your neighbour also. In

America, when a man's house is burnt, all his neighbours get together and help him to rebuild it. People are much more considerate than you are in this country.

**S:** You are generalizing.

**K:** It is not a generalization; they are much more considerate. It is a well-known sociological fact that the West is more advanced in this area than the East. I am trying to find out what correct behaviour is — not according to the West or the East, but in itself. What are manners? What is good behaviour? That is all I am concerned with.

**S:** It depends on the circles in which you move.

**K:** No, you are mixing up what I am talking about. There is a general feeling of considerateness whether you are among millionaires or among Polish immigrants. I do not say that it is with every person, but newspapers are publishing it, talking about it. *Reader's Digest*, which has nine-and-a-half million issues in circulation per month, is talking about it. They are impressing on everybody to be socially conscious.

**S:** What about the crime wave there?

**K:** There is a crime wave. There is rape, murder. I am discussing behaviour; you are being irrelevant. Let us forget America; let us forget England. Do not become nationalistic ....

I asked at the beginning: Is your behaviour superficial, is it acquired from certain patterns of civilizations, is it brought about by compulsions of the environment whether of the East or the West? Or, I asked, is your behaviour something that is independent of tradition or custom, and based on your instinctual kindness, etc.? *The last one is true behaviour, and the other is not.*

**S:** Sometime ago, the Governor came here to Rishi Valley. Before he arrived, his visit was hotly discussed. Whether we should do certain things or not do them was debated. Some people felt that since we have seen that politics and governance is all shallow, we should turn up in rags and be insolent. You see, when we behave like that, our behaviour is actually misbehaviour, but we consider it correct; we consider that we are very true to ourselves.

**K:** Really, when we talk like that, it is because we do not know  
....

I am asking: Do you behave according to a certain tradition, or do you behave in a certain way because you say, 'Well, there must be kindness in life, there must be kindness in relationship and I am going to base my manners on that. My manners will spring from it'?

You see, there is another problem. What is the Orient and what is the Occident? What is the Western culture which is being imposed on Eastern culture? Western culture has brought India nationalism, parliamentarianism, and militarism in the organized way. It has brought to this country scientific and industrial thinking. This is a historical fact. Would you deny this? Would you say that I am generalizing? Now, nationalism, militarism, and all the rest of it are being imposed on Indian culture; these layers of the West are being put on the other layers of Indian culture. Now, as you take the other culture only superficially, it poisons the whole thing. You do not become entirely Western, accepting its religion, its militarism — all of its ways; you merely take a few layers of it. And, as you do, it is inevitably going to poison you. So the problem is: How not to be poisoned? Poisoning is inevitable; it is taking place.

Is it not possible to find out whether there is a culture which is neither of the East nor of the West? This is very interesting. You

see, I do not know if, in India, there ever was 'nationalism' — in the way that it was in the West. There has never been industrialization here. There has never been scientific progress. There has never been militarism in the sense of a whole nation taking part. Here, in India, there have been groups taking part in a war; there has not been the organized, complete coercion of the whole nation. That has come from the West. We know how it developed in the West, and that has come here. This country, or Asia, has its own culture: agrarian, village, non-industrial, non-scientific, non-national in the accepted sense of the word. Now the aggressive West, the aggressive movement from the West — I am not condemning, I am merely using the adjective factually — has imposed these layers on India, and what has happened is that these layers are poisoning the culture which is Indian. It is like something heavy being imposed on the top of a structure. Something which is not natural or native to the country is being imposed, and those layers are poisoning the whole structure. Are they not? We are disintegrating. We are scientific on the one hand, and worship Vishnu, and perform *pujas*, etc., on the other. We are nationalistic, but we talk about the unity of life. We say we must be non-violent, but we prepare for war. So, it has brought about a contradiction and, I say, that is a poisoning which is going on. We neither become totally western — it is not possible — nor do we return to our own ancient culture; that we can not do either. So, we are caught. So, we have to develop a culture which is neither of the West nor of the East: a culture which is totally new, something human.

Sir, look at Brahminism; that is disappearing very rapidly except in the poor little village. And it will go there too. It is disintegrating more rapidly because of the contact with the West. Please, take it as a fact. Now, are you not, as a human being — knowing the effects of the West and knowing the disintegration that is taking place here — concerned? We are not creating marvellous original art; we are copying. Knowing the disintegration that is taking

place for various reasons should you not, as a human being, try to find a culture which is neither of the East nor of the West? Should you not go into this whole problem of civilization and culture? Should you not find a human civilization, a human culture, and not revert to the ancient Hindu culture or go forward — or backward — to Western culture?

**S:** Instead of allowing the West to superimpose on us, why can we not take some things from it?

**K:** You have taken science; you have taken militarism ....

You are missing my point. We are inquiring about culture. We want to find out what culture is. Is there a Western culture and an Eastern culture? One is either being destroyed by the other, disintegrating, or merely being modified. We ask: Is there a culture which is something that is not 'theirs' or 'ours', but human? Do you follow?

**S:** Sir, history has shown that when one civilization is superimposed on another, the civilization which is 'under' disintegrates. This is a matter of history.

**K:** Please take Rome, Greece. One of them disintegrated. These are all historical facts.

**S:** Sir, not the conqueror ...

**K:** It is *woe to the conquered as well as the conqueror*. America, England, France — they have all conquered Germany. They are all in misery.

**S:** Sir, our behaviour has to adjust itself to the present.

**K:** I am not concerned whether our behaviour is right according

to the West or according to the East. I am concerned whether our behaviour is something that is right, right through time. Do you follow? I am concerned not with conduct that is right according to this or that, but with timeless behaviour, timeless conduct. That is all that I am concerned with.

— November 11, 1954

### LOVE BRINGS UNITY

**STUDENT (S):** Sir, can you, please, say something about unity?

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** So, you are interested in unity. Does unity depend on a language? It helps, does it not? But is it — language — a binding factor? Will Hindi, when spoken right throughout India, be a unifying factor? You see, this is really one of the great problems. Napoleon, Caesar, Alexander and, even, Hitler tried to unify, tried to make one Europe. Alexander tried to conquer all of Asia — make all the countries one; Hitler tried it for a few days. You see, there is this urge in man to unify, for *where there is separation there is disintegration.*

**S:** Sir, if we had a uniform dress — would it unify? Would a uniform bring about unity?

**K:** Would it? If you all wore the same kind of *kurtas* and *pyjamas*, would that unify? You see, politicians have tried to unify, religions have tried to unify, conquerors have tried to unify, but there is always an element which is breaking society up, which is separating humanity. Unless you tackle that element, mere outward compulsion is not going to unify. Law, language, a uniform, tyranny — none of it is going to unify.

So, the question is: What is the thing that really brings about unity? Today you can fly from the West coast of America

to Moscow in a few hours; you can fly from the West coast of America to India in twenty-four hours. Transportation has become easy. Is that going to bind us? We must find out, spontaneously, without compulsion, the factor that really unifies.

What is that factor? Have you ever thought about it? Have you — as part of your education — thought about it? When you read history, do you not see how empires have come and gone. The Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Roman, the Prussians, and the recent ones — they have all come and gone like waves. They all tried to unify — maybe out of their own interest, but there was the tendency to unify. But they have not done it. No religion has done it. Christianity — more than any other religion — has been responsible for a lot of war.

So, what is the factor that will unify? What unifies you? Between your father and mother — if there is unity — what brings it about? Surely this thing called love, is it not? To love somebody, to have the feeling of love for other people, that is really the binding factor. But we do not know what that means, because our parents do not love us. If they loved, they would see that there was no provincialism. No Telugu, no Tamil — there would not be this breaking up. They would see that there was no war. They would see that there were no poor people and rich people. This means really that they — the parents — and the teachers would see that we have the right kind of education — education where there is real affection; education without fear.

— *November 12, 1954*

### YOU MISS THE BEAUTIFUL THINGS

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** Some of us went out for a walk. We saw the newly planted mango-trees. And as we walked down the road and up the road, it was very cloudy. Especially towards

the east, there were magnificent clouds: great billowing clouds, full of rain. And this morning, when we woke up, all the hills were covered; the clouds low on them with the promise of rain.

You know, if you can walk alone, quietly, it is an extraordinary thing. When you walk by yourself, you notice much more: your heart becomes more quiet; your heart becomes rich, full, and your mind becomes very attentive, alert and watchful. Unfortunately, very few of us are ever alone. Do you go out for a walk?

**STUDENT (S):** Yes.

**K:** When you do go out, there are three or four who go along with you, and you are always talking — are you not? — never feeling the extraordinary depth of the skies and the distant hills. You never feel the beauty of the earth, because your minds are always occupied, chattering. If you are not chattering, you sit down and look at an insect; but then, too, you are occupied: occupied with the insect. You never look at the whole valley with its extraordinary beauty.

You know, to appreciate the beauty and loveliness of things there must be independence. Do you know what independence is? It is the freedom to be what you are. Very few of us are independent. As Mr Pierce was saying, freedom is not to make things ugly. To throw things about for others to pick up, to do what you like, to be late for meals, to be noisy, to be rowdy — that is not freedom. Freedom comes with that strange feeling of inward strength and independence. And that comes when you feel, when you know, what you are. And, unfortunately, most of us do not know what we are ....

These boys are fidgety. We will hold them a little longer. Is making them do what we think they ought to do compulsion? When you

see a little boy go near fire and you draw him away, would you call that compulsion? As you grow older, they say it is harmful for you, and they force you to move away. So you lose the extraordinary spirit of independence, the sense of being free to examine, to observe, to look, to feel. If you watch, during the day, you will see how very little you are free — free, not to throw paper about, not to make a mess of things (that any silly boy can do) but to think independently. Watch how little you are really free, independent. Independence means fearlessness. Independence does not mean doing what you want to do; it means to be free from fear. Freedom from fear gives independence, and that means courage, strength, and an astonishing capacity to find out, to discover, to investigate.

You little ones want to go away?

**S:** Yes.

**K:** First, please, sit still; do not move. Just see how long you can sit like that. See how nice it is when you hear the bumble-bee, those birds chirping, the cock crowing. You hear everything because your mind is quiet. And being quiet, you will see that you are sensitive, and you hear the man beating the rocks. (The famous American humourist, Mark Twain, said that in India he saw men trying to break rocks with a piece of cloth.) But would you hear it if you were talking? Sit quietly; be quiet not merely physically, bodily, but also mentally, inwardly. Sit very straight and be very quiet and listen, and you will hear that crow cawing, then you will see what an astonishing thing life is; you will see how beautiful silence is. You know, in silence everything exists: the birds, the noise, the movement, and so on. *Everything exists in silence*. It is only when we are disturbed, that there is separation, contradiction.

When the mind is really still, when you are sitting quietly, then you will see in the silence that though things exist — the universe, the whole earth, lives in that — you can go beyond it. And the beauty is to go beyond. Not only to perceive the whole existence of things in silence, but also to go beyond — that is really meditation. To really meditate you must sit quietly, sit still. We will do this every morning, just for the fun of it. Just as you play, listen to everything that is happening around you. When you are able to sit quietly, think quietly, and to receive everything, then you have a great sense of freedom, and independence. You are not independent now, because everybody tells you what to do. As you grow older, you are more frightened, you have more responsibilities: parents to look after, children, a boss. So the more you grow, the less independent you are. Therefore, it is very important, while you are young, to have this feeling of independence, and that comes when there is no fear. And independence does not mean to do what you like. On the contrary, independence requires a great deal of thought, inquiry. A man who is independent is, in his conduct, thoughtful. He considers others because this very freedom, this very independence, demands not hurting others.

*(The younger students leave.)* Did you notice how quietly they went out this morning? Why did that happen? — Because they were sitting quietly, it happened naturally. Just see what an extraordinary thing life is....

Do you think there is communication only through words? You think that we can communicate only through words. Right? Please sit still, and see if we can commune with each other without saying a word. Is there not a communion with each other which is not separative? — not by thought nor by word. The communion which is not word or thought has much more significance; in that state we can understand much more.

Do you know what love is? To love something: a tree, a bird, a woman, a man, your father, your mother, your friend — do you know what that means? When you love somebody there is no communion with words and thoughts or with even a gesture — is there? You may sit next to a cat and you may not stroke it but, because you love the cat, there is a feeling which goes out of you and the cat knows it. So there is a communion — is there not? — which is not word, which is not thought, which is not gesture. And the mind which is always thinking, which is always talking, which is always making a gesture can never know that communion of love. Sirs, please do try something sometime: try sitting quietly either under a tree or in your class or in your room and listen to everything that is going on. Then your mind will become very sharp, very sensitive not only to all the sounds but also to the silence between sounds. You will notice that when your mind has absorbed that strange silence you are able to think much better: much more clearly, freely, and independently.

Have you dug holes and planted trees?

**S:** Yes; one. A mango-tree.

**K:** You say that you planted a mango-tree, but if someone else did all the work, that is not planting. Did you, on your own, dig? Did you, on your own, dig, collect, the soft, rich, mellow earth, put the tree in the hole and plant it? Then did you water it and build a hedge around the plant? Have you?

**S:** No.

**K:** Why not?

**S:** Sir, we will be going away.

**K:** That is an excuse. You see, you might be going away, but you can tell someone else to look after the plant. You can arrange for

it. That is part of the whole business of enriching the earth, beautifying the place. You do not miss a meal; you do not miss your games, but you must miss this. That is what I am telling you. You miss the beautiful things and do the everyday silly things. So your mind becomes silly, and the rest — the beauty — goes away, and you, too, go; you go without that. Of course, you have to eat, but you also have to plant. You know, there is something very nice, and that is: there is a time to weep and there is a time to laugh; there is a time to plough and sow and there is a time to reap; there is a time to play and there is a time to be wise. But, you see, you have time for having a good time but no time for serious things. To have a good time is also to have time to plant. You miss all that; you really do.

**S:** Sir, you say dig, and so on, but my fingers get dirty and I do not like it. The soil gets into my nails. What am I to do?

**K:** When you boys play in the mud, you do not think about all this, do you? You want to dig a tunnel, and you love it. Afterwards you wash your hands; you clean your nails. Do you not? Love the whole of life — the good and the ugly things. To get dirty, to cry, to laugh, to play, to be wise — all this is part of existence; all this is life. But, you see, you think that life is having a great amount of happiness and pleasure and nothing else. That is extraordinarily one-sided. You are half human beings; it is like having a strong right arm and a withered left arm. It is like being able to see and never being able to talk; then you will be dumb persons. And, unfortunately, most of us are, because we do not think about the whole of life.

— *November 23, 1954*

## **E-MAIL, FAX AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS**

### **KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION OF AMERICA**

e-mail: [kfa@kfa.org](mailto:kfa@kfa.org)

Fax: (001-805) 646 6674

Telephone: (001-805) 646 2726

### **THE OAK GROVE SCHOOL**

e-mail: [oakgrove@fishnet.net](mailto:oakgrove@fishnet.net)

Fax: (001-805) 646 6509

Telephone: (001-805) 646 8236

### **KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION OF CANADA**

e-mail: [namurti@islandnet.com](mailto:namurti@islandnet.com)

Fax: (001-250) 474 1104

Telephone: (001-250) 474 1488

### **KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION TRUST**

e-mail: [kft@brockwood.org.uk](mailto:kft@brockwood.org.uk)/[info@brockwood.org.uk](mailto:info@brockwood.org.uk)

Fax: (0044-1962) 771 159

Telephone: (0044-1962) 771 525

### **BROCKWOOD PARK SCHOOL**

e-mail: [admin@brockwood1.win-uk.net](mailto:admin@brockwood1.win-uk.net)

Fax: (0044-1962) 771 875

Telephone: (0044-1962) 771 744

### **FUNDACION KRISHNAMURTI LATINOAMERICANA**

e-mail: [anadonfk@ddnet.es](mailto:anadonfk@ddnet.es)

Fax/Telephone: (0034-91) 544 5941/544 7476

### **KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA**

e-mail: [kfihq@md2.vsnl.net.in](mailto:kfihq@md2.vsnl.net.in)

Fax: (044) 499 1360

Telephone: (044) 493 7803/493 7596

**RAJGHAT EDUCATIONAL CENTRE, KFI**

e-mail: [kfivns@satyam.net.in](mailto:kfivns@satyam.net.in)/[kfirvns@nde.net.in](mailto:kfirvns@nde.net.in)/  
[admin@jkrishnamurti.org](mailto:admin@jkrishnamurti.org)

**Fax: (0542) 430 218**

**Telephone: (0542) 430 336/430 717**

**VASANTA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN**

**Telephone: (0542) 430 587**

**THE VALLEY SCHOOL**

e-mail: [kfibr@blr.vsnl.net.in](mailto:kfibr@blr.vsnl.net.in)

**Fax: (080) 843 5242**

**Telephone: (080) 843 5240/843 5241**

**RISHI VALLEY SCHOOL**

**Fax: (08571) 68622**

**Telephone: (08571) 26037/68622/68582**

**SAHYADRI SCHOOL**

**Fax: (02135) 84269**

**Telephone: (02135) 84270**

**THE BHAGIRATHI VALLEY SCHOOL (KFI)**

**Telephone: (013712) 5417/5474**

**THE SCHOOL**

**Telephone: (044) 491 5845**

**BAL-ANAND**

**Telephone: (022) 362 7817**

e-mail: [kfivns@satyam.net.in](mailto:kfivns@satyam.net.in) ◆ ◆ ◆  
[admin@jkrishnamurti.org](mailto:admin@jkrishnamurti.org)

**KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA**  
**GATHERING 2000**

The Krishnamurti Foundation India is happy to announce that its Annual Public Gathering is being organized by the Rajghat Education Centre, Varanasi from the 31st of October to the 3rd of November, 2000.

The purpose of the Gathering is to bring interested people together as fellow human beings and to discuss, share and probe the fundamental issues of life in the light of Krishnamurti's teachings.

The daily programme begins with a chanting and silence session in the morning and includes talks, group discussions, video showings of Krishnamurti's talks, evening walks and cultural programmes.

The themes for the Gathering are: Day 1 Art of Learning  
Day 2 Relationship  
Day 3 The Religious Mind

The last date for receipt of forms for registration is 30th September, 2000. For further details, please contact:

Co-ordinator  
KFI Gathering 2000  
The Krishnamurti Study Centre  
Rajghat Fort  
Varanasi — 221 001  
Uttara Pradesh  
Telephone: (0542) 430717  
Fax: (0542) 430218  
e-mail: [kfirvns@satyam.net.in](mailto:kfirvns@satyam.net.in)/[kfirvns@nde.net.in](mailto:kfirvns@nde.net.in)/  
[admin@jkrishnamurti.org](mailto:admin@jkrishnamurti.org)

**STATEMENT ABOUT OWNERSHIP  
AND OTHER PARTICULARS OF THE  
KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA BULLETIN**

**FORM IV**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Place of Publication   | Krishnamurti Foundation India<br>'Vasanta Vihar'<br>64/65, Greenways Road<br>Chennai 600 028                                   |
| 2. Periodicity of Publication   | Once in 4 months   |
| 3. Printer's Name<br>Whether Citizen of India<br>Address  | J. Loyola Rodrigo<br>Yes<br>M/s Sidma Offset Press (P) Ltd<br>11, G.A.A. Khan 1st Street<br>Thousand Lights<br>Chennai 600 006 |
| 4. Publisher's Name<br>Whether Citizen of India<br>Address  | Dr Radhika Herzberger<br>Yes<br>Krishnamurti Foundation India<br>'Vasanta Vihar'<br>64/65 Greenways Road,<br>Chennai 600 028   |
| 5. Editor's Name<br>Address   | Dr Radhika Herzberger<br>Same as above   |
| 6. Name and address of<br>individuals who own the<br>Newspaper and partners<br>or shareholders holding<br>more than one percent of<br>the total capital | Krishnamurti Foundation India<br>Address as above  |

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

Date: August 21, 2000

Sd/- Radhika Herzberger  
Signature of Publisher



**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  
64-65 Greenways Road, Chennai 600 028, India

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