

2 0 0 1 / 1

Bulletin

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

FROM THE EDITOR

We continue the theme of education into the new year. The first selection, draws from an unpublished notebook on education, and displays the form Krishnamurti first used in *Commentaries On Living* — a conversation about the human condition, set against the backdrop of nature. It is the form that his friend Huxley admired, during the early years of their friendship in America when he advised Krishnamurti to publish the *Commentaires*.

The Himalayan ranges form the background in the first piece. In the summer of 1959, Krishnamurti spent a month in Kashmir, on the outskirts of Srinagar, in a small *serai* or rest house built by the Mogul Empress Nur Jehan. The *serai*, built around an underground spring, and mentioned in the *Akbar Nama* (see Pupul Jayakar's *Krishnamurti: A Biography*, p.213) had since been converted into a tourist spot, with huts for visitors.

Kashmir in 1959 was very different from the strife-torn valley of today. More than forty years earlier, in the poverty of the valley, and in the nascent anger of its people, Krishnamurti discovered the beginnings of a slowly 'congealing' hatred. Krishnamurti contrasts this scene of resentment with the image of card-playing tourists of the *serai*, successful representatives of modern industrialising India and their numbing indifference — not only to the surrounding poverty but to their own children.

Between the fundamentalist rage of Kashmiri peasants and the uncaring attitudes of the Indian upper class is the image of a motherly woman, a servant, massaging a gurgling, happy baby. The image introduces the themes of the conversation that follows between the author and a teacher at a boarding-school — about discipline and the resistance it breeds, as against tenderness and

care, which, he implies, are instinctive endowments of humanity. Tenderness, the conversation suggests, is the key to educating children, not discipline.

The second piece records an actual conversation about education that took place around the time that the Oak Grove School was being founded, in 1975. Here Krishnamurti delves deeply into the theme that he refers to so lyrically in the first selection. He shows how accumulated experience, which he calls thought, divides and annuls innocent sensation that is the power to feel. There is a difference between Krishnamurti's exploration of the paired dualities of innocence and experience and that of the romantic poets' of English literature. For Krishnamurti, both the student's and the teacher's mind are conditioned, but the responsibility of returning the mind to innocence lies with the adult. In the second selection, we see Krishnamurti engaging with adults in the shared work of confronting fundamental human problems in a spirit of open inquiry.

— R.H.

DISCIPLINE AND ORDER

We were very high up in the mountains — nearly seven thousand feet. From the window you could see the snow-capped peaks and one of them, over twenty-five thousand feet, in the early morning was rose-coloured, clear against that extraordinary blue sky of mountains. By mid-morning or even earlier it would disappear; clouds and fog would cover it, but you would still see the lesser and lower mountains and the dark blue valleys in between. No wonder they worship the mountains. They said that the gods lived there — the perfect ones, the great ones — and from there they looked down toward the south, pouring out their blessing....

It would probably begin to rain in a few days — at least the local people said so — for there had been a rather dry spell. They warned one when the rains began not to walk in the fields and over the hills for there would be snakes, and to be careful where one trod. That morning the highest peak was as bright as a new moon, sharply clear and the valley that lay between the house and the mountain was intensely blue, dark and mysterious. People here were very poor, diseased, and as you walked through the village you would see the filth of it. Nobody seemed to mind it and they carried on with their daily lives, adding more filth. Perhaps the rains would wash away all this but then the roads would be muddy and the paths covered over with water coming down from the hills. All this would be welcome. You walked in the woods, meeting many monkeys and an occasional deer, or in the distance you would see a big bear. They kept their distance.

On that road one afternoon there were two boys, probably brothers, one a little taller than the other. They stood with their arms stretched out and their hands open, in torn rags, dirty, unkempt. They were begging, asking for money and, as we had

no coins in our pocket, we asked them to come to the hut where we were living and we fed them. One has rarely seen two children eat so much. Several cups of milk disappeared and quantities of rice and vegetables. You could see their tummies expand and presently they had their fill and went away. Again in a few days there were those two boys on the road with arms outstretched and open hands, and the blue sky was above them. We asked them to come to eat but this time they shook their heads and with their thin fingers said no. Their mother had told them not to eat at the house of a Hindu for they were Muslims. They wanted only money and not the food cooked by another community. One almost had tears. They will remain hungry, and the slow corruption of time and tradition is going to destroy them and others.

The rains had come and gone and the road through the village was muddy. These two boys and a little girl were standing in the same place as before and, as one passed by, they looked the other way. They didn't want even money, let alone food. You stopped and talked to them but they wouldn't reply. There was no smile on their faces; they were hard, almost strangely angry. Their parents were doing a thorough job and, slowly, the seed of hatred was being sown in them: from then on they would ever be separate, congealed in their own antagonisms, bitterness and anger.

A new family came and were there in the next hut — a whole group of them with little children. The next morning in the bright clear sunlight a servant had the baby out, resting it on her bare outstretched legs. The baby was faced down and, talking to it, the servant had taken a little oil and was rubbing its back, bottom, legs and head. She must have been doing it for at least ten minutes. Then she turned the baby over, and gently, smoothly rubbed its arms and chest and tummy. Every part of it was oiled and rubbed

and cared for. Presently somebody brought buckets of hot and cold water. She washed it and used some sort of powder that washed away the oil and the baby never once cried. The baby was so small, probably about six months, and presently it was wrapped in a clean white cloth: the baby looked so happy, pleased, and it was carried inside. Every morning in the sunlight it was bathed in oil, talked to, cared for and every morning there was no crying. There was only that gurgling noise that babies make when they are happy. They were there for several weeks. The mother and the father would be playing cards with others, endlessly talking. You would see the baby in the mother's lap being petted, hugged and kissed, but the servant looked on and took it away when the parents had enough of it....

The pines were now washed clean, fresh and the grass was bright blue-green....

One of the teachers said, 'I would like, this morning, really to go into this problem of discipline. We need it in schools, we need it in the classrooms, in the dormitory. On the playing-fields discipline is observed for they enjoy playing. There you don't have to tell them what to do except how to hold the cricket bat, the tennis racket or the hockey stick; they take to it so easily. But in the classroom it is all a matter of threat, punishment, reward and encouragement. How can we, not only as teachers but as human beings, bring about a natural order in ourselves?'

(K:) Have you noticed, sirs, that when children are very carefully looked after by their mothers — really cared for and loved — there is a relationship between them, a subtle wordless communication in which the child is completely happy? He knows that he is secure, knows that he is really cared for and loved. This care and love does not bring about in the child any form of the resistance from which arise all these violent expressions when

they grow up. When there is over-population, when both parents have to earn a livelihood, when the children are neglected or cared for by the community, a nurse or someone else, you can already see a different expression on the children. They are already being disciplined in the orthodox sense of that word. They are already conforming and the discipline that is a slow death has already begun. That inexpressible relationship between the mother and the child, the warmth, the subtle contact through words, through caress, through tenderness can never exist in a communal crèche or kindergarten. It is this quality of tenderness between the mother and the child that creates the climate in which the child grows and learns, because it trusts, because it has no fear. This learning is the essence of order. Discipline in the sense of control, suppression, imitation, conformity with its reward and punishment, makes for violence. The word 'discipline' itself means to learn and not the enforcement it has come to mean. And now as civilization is becoming more and more industrialized, more expensive, both parents have to go out and earn and the child is neglected. If you are rich you hand it over to a nurse or send it off to public school to get rid of it as quickly as possible. And the boy or girl finds himself in an impersonal world with little relationship, with others like himself, bullied by the older ones; and because they need security they instinctively form groups, imitate the older children. They do not want to be different and the slow death of conformity takes place. This is known by all dictators and by the other governments. Discipline in the sense of enforcement then is necessary and the culture in which they have been brought up naturally encourages them to be violent. Violence is the expression of insecurity. It is the only language of the insecure. It is only the insecure that revolt, that create havoc in the world; only those who are insecure bring war. For you see, the brain can only function harmoniously, easily, happily in security. When there is insecurity the mind is distorted and thought, which is seeking security, tries to find it in division, in separation

— as in nationality, in belief, in dogma and in formulas. This very division is the denial of security. So thought, seeking security, breeds insecurity. From this flows all corruption, violence, ambitions, competition. If we could, as teachers and human beings, understand this: that infinite care and tenderness of not only the parents is necessary for the child, but also between the teacher and student, then there is order which is an expression of intelligence. Intelligence is this sensitivity, this infinite care of the parent which cannot be given by the state, or the government, or by a trained bureaucrat.

The teacher was silent for a while and then he said, 'I follow what you are saying; I see the logic of it, but how am I to establish this sensitive relationship with a group of boys? I really don't know them and they don't know me. They come with antagonistic resistance, running from one class to another, dashing off to the playing-field and finally to their homes. The classes are growing larger instead of smaller. Physically I can't talk to every student or care for them. One hasn't in oneself the energy for all this. In a limited time one has to teach so many subjects in each term. They must acquire knowledge in certain subjects by the end of that term. There is constant pressure upon the students, upon the teachers, and this brings about great strain. Now taking all this in, how am I, who want a decent relation with the student, to bring this about? Knowing the difficulty of the student, his possibly broken home, that his parents are occupied with their own pleasures or worries, knowing that there are gangs in the schools, knowing that the boys are reluctant to learn, knowing, too, that most of them are in revolt and that they think they know everything — what is one to do?'

(K:) This is a question that is asked all over the world, and it requires a great deal of intelligence on the part of the teacher, the educator. He has to take into consideration the insecurity at home,

the unconscious desire of the student to find security in a group of his own and to turn his back on society. The teacher knows that the parents rarely have established this sensitive relationship with their child, and he knows, too, that he himself is seeking security in relationship and is confused and in misery. Knowing all this, not only verbally but actually experiencing it without running away from it, aware of the fullness of it, when the students rush into the classroom, have them sit quietly for two or three minutes. Explain the necessity of it — that when the body is quiet there is a self-recollectedness which brings sensitivity. Then both teacher and student can share this quality and discuss its implications before beginning the normal study of that particular class. Discuss and teach through dialogue rather than merely impart knowledge. The most important thing is to bring about this sensitivity in the relationship between the teacher and the student. In this sensitivity the authoritarian spirit disappears and the honesty of understanding, of care, is felt by the student. Therefore he will listen, and this very act of listening brings about its own order. It is this order born of sensitivity and intelligence that frees the mind of all resistance. Order is a movement in freedom and this movement comes when you understand the nature of disorder. Violence is disorder, and you cannot bring about order through violence. So one has to understand very deeply the whole issue of human action and life.

— *September 17th, 1970*
Unpublished Notebook On Education

THE WAY OF EDUCATION

J. KRISHNAMURTI (K): I wonder what you all thought about what we discussed the other day. What was your reaction to it all?

QUESTIONER (Q): I felt that it was excellent in explaining the general idea of a school, especially relating to Brockwood, the school in England.

K: No, sir, I only brought in Brockwood, which is in England, near Southampton, Hampshire, to point out what we have done. Not that we should do the same thing here — that would be terrible!

Q: Well, my point was: Can we, today, get into specifics?

K: Yes, sir, that's what we propose.

First of all, let's be clear whether it is possible to bring about a different quality of mind — not the European mind or the American mind or the Indian mind, but a human mind totally developed: a whole mind, not a partial mind, not a fragmented mind, which is what is happening in the world.

We are cultivating a fragmentary part of the brain, of the mind. And education — at least, we think — should be concerned with the total development of man, that is, physical, psychological, intellectual, emotional and, if I may use that word, spiritual — the totality of the human being — not just one part, which modern education is cultivating, that is, to cultivate the mind, a part of the mind that is absorbing information, then using that information

Reprinted from the *KFA bulletin*, No. 74, 2000.

skillfully and effectively merely to survive, and neglecting the rest of the human being. And we were saying, what is important is to include the totality of the mind; and whether that is possible, in education, with the children, with the students, with the teachers, with the parents, all of us cooperating.

Do we all — not accept — see the necessity of it, the importance of it: that partial education is no education at all? Because wars have not stopped; there is tremendous division between human beings, not only in their private relationship, but generally. There is — I'm not a communist — class division; there is religious division. And each human being is fighting for himself, trying to survive in a world that is overpopulated, and becoming more and more overpopulated, with all its immense problems.

Taking all that into account, can we start a school, not only for students but for grown-ups too, where the human mind can be penetrated and transformed — psychologically, intellectually — in every way? Is this possible — I think it is possible — and, how do we do it; what is the *process* of it?

Q: That's the part that really interests me.

K: I'm coming to that but, first, we must see the necessity of such a thing.

Q: I think we do, sir, or we wouldn't be here.

K: Of course, sir. But I want to be absolutely sure that we are all of the same mind: that we want to bring about a total transformation, a psychological revolution of the human being, so that he is entirely different, that is, he understands the meaning of death; he understands and *lives* and, therefore, loves, and is without fear and all the rest of it.

If we see the necessity of that, then what shall we do? Can we start from there?

Q: Yes.

K: All right. If that is so, first of all, what effect has such a change in the world? I change — suppose — how will it affect the world? If it doesn't affect the world, what is the point of my changing? (I'm looking at it both ways.) I see the necessity of change, and I transform myself completely, and I say to myself, 'Then, what?' You follow, sir? What relationship have I to society? If it doesn't affect society, I'll just live my own life, be concerned with my own salvation or whatever it is, and forget the rest. So, it must not only be the individual transformation, but also it must affect society, society being the whole human structure of relationship, both personal and collective. Right?

Am I different from the world? That's my first question. We are proceeding, inquiring whether it is possible to change human beings. Am I different from the world? Or is it that I *am* the world? If I am the world, and I transform myself, then I affect the world.

So, my first inquiry is, am I different — radically, basically — from the world in which I live? I go to India and I see that human beings there are greedy, envious, anxious, frightened, competitive, ambitious, with their own gods, their own superstitions, and when I come to the West, it is the same thing, basically. I come here, and it is exactly the same: violence, brutality, no proper relationship with each other, and so on.

I *am* the world: that is a fact. So, if I transform myself, I affect the world; I affect it as Buddha affected the world, as Hitler affected the world, Stalin affected the world, Christ affected the

world, through the priests. If a human being transforms himself radically, he must affect the world.

So, I see the necessity for a transformation of the human being, who is the result of the world. I *am* the result of the world: my beliefs, my upbringing, the so-called education I have had, the religious concepts, the violence. This is what is happening in the world, of which I am. And is it possible for me, as a human being, to radically, psychologically transform myself? This is what I want my son, if I have a son or a daughter, to do. I don't want him to grow up into a monkey like the rest of the world.

So, my first step is to see whether I as a human being who is the world — there is no question about it — conditioned by the culture in which I live (and the culture is also created by me, the culture being what we have produced, in which is involved economics, religion, psychology, education) can uncondition myself, and not jump into another conditioning. So, education — for grown-ups as well as students — is the understanding of the totality of the human being, who is the world. Can we start from there? Or do you question that?

The communists maintain, 'Change the environment, and you will change the human being.' That is one of their theses. (I don't know if you know anything about communism — or is it taboo here?)

I used to have a great many communist friends in Europe and in India. And their whole outlook on life is materialistic, that is, change the environment, the social structure — society and environment being controlled by dictatorship, by ideas, by fear, by violence — and that will produce a totally different human being.

You must know all this, the eternal war between — no, I won't use the term *materialist* — between the man who says, 'Everything outside is important, nothing inside is important', because, from the outside, you can change the inside. ... Communists accept this.

Q: No, no, sir.

K: That's one of their tenets; they have all kinds of others. What I am pointing out is, one thing.

Q: But they do not ignore the inside, nor would a socialist ignore the inside.

K: No, but they don't lay emphasis on the inside.

Q: Okay, then that's fine.

K: That's it. [*Pause*] Please, I'm not standing up for the communists, or being against the communists ...

Q: No, nor am I, sir.

K: I'm just examining it. We are saying, it is a total movement; the outer and the inner is one unitary movement: it's like the tide, going out and coming in. And to say the going out is all-important, and the coming in is of no importance, brings about imbalance in the human mind.

We say we are concerned with the transformation of the human mind, which is so heavily conditioned through centuries. And, if we are concerned with that, is it possible to break down this conditioning? That's the first thing. And, if it is possible, what is the process of it?

Organized religions have said that the world is all right, but the other is all-important. But we are saying something entirely different; we are saying that our minds are conditioned, through centuries upon centuries, in a culture which that mind has created. If I am a Christian, living in Italy, as a Catholic I have created Catholicism; my generation has created it. I have lived in that culture, which has conditioned my mind — economically, socially, religiously, — in every way; I am the result of that culture, which human beings have created.

So, can the mind be unconditioned? If it cannot be unconditioned, it becomes entirely mechanical. That's what's happening in the world: a mechanistic attitude towards life. And the mechanistic mind must inevitably create more and more problems. Right, sir? Can we proceed from there? Please, don't let's go back; once we say this is so, let's start from there.

Q: Well, do you think — I mean, obviously you do, I don't mean it as a question *per se* — but I've been reading your writings for eight years, approximately, and ...

K: Too bad! [*Laughter*]

Q: ... I really don't know if it's possible to uncondition ...

K: We'll do it, we'll work at it; I'll show you, we'll go into it.

Is it possible? If we say, as many people do — the psychologists, the environmentalists, the communists — you cannot change: you can decondition and recondition, in a different way; you cannot possibly be unconditioned We say, it *is* possible; otherwise, you're just a mechanical entity, moving from this circle to that. (All this is said in relation to the education of our children — not only that, but grown-up people too.)

I realize I am conditioned, not as an abstraction of the fact. Wait a minute! We live in abstractions, right? We are not facing facts. We observe a fact, then draw an abstraction from it, which becomes an idea; then we live according to that idea, not according to fact. Right, sir?

I see I am conditioned. Do I actually *see* it, or is it the idea I am perceiving, not the fact? I have heard my mind is conditioned. The hearing of it makes me draw a conclusion, an idea, and according to that idea I say, I must uncondition myself. Or, do I actually *see* I'm conditioned? The two are entirely different.
[Pause]

Can we proceed from there?

Q: Yes.

K: So, which is it? Have I drawn a conclusion from a statement or do I see, through the words, the fact? What, sir?

Q: That's clear, but ...

K: Ah, wait! This is an important question. First, I want to see ... No, let's put it a different way. The word is not the thing. Do I see the thing, or is it the word, then the thing? My wife is not a word: she is a fact. But I draw a conclusion from the fact as *my wife*. The two are entirely different.

Which is it I am doing? Am I dealing only with facts, or with ideas? The word *idea* comes from the Greek *to see*. And we have drawn an abstraction from it as the idea, and not *seeing*. So, am I seeing, or am I drawing a conclusion and acting from it? Am I looking at the conclusion and not at the fact? I must be very clear on this matter. If I am only looking through the screen

of ideas, then I'm not looking at the fact.

So, am I looking at the fact that I am conditioned? — not what to do about it, what not to do — do I see the fact that I am conditioned? Not because you tell me, not because I have heard I am conditioned and therefore I see it. When I am hungry, nobody has to tell me I am hungry. Similarly, do I see that I am conditioned? Then, if I see that I am conditioned, the problem arises, what is the quality of this seeing? Am I seeing as an observer, looking in? Or, there is no observer, but merely seeing?
[Pause]

One of our problems, sir, is that we have always observed things from the outside. I see the tree, and there is the observer seeing the tree; there is a distance between the observer and the observed. The distance between the observer and the observed is time, distance, measurement. Right? The observer thinks he is different from that which he sees. Of course, the observer is different when he sees the tree: he is not the tree! But when the observer says, 'I am conditioned', is there a distance, there is a time interval, there is a difference between the observer and the observed, and therefore a conflict between the observer and the observed. *Why* is there this distance?

This is really a very important point because, unless we understand it basically, we can't go any further. I'll tell you why. As long as there is a division between the observer and the observed, there must be conflict; as long as there is the Jew and the Arab, there must be conflict. The Catholic and the Protestant are everlastingly in conflict; through they believe in Christ and all the rest of it, the division itself implies conflict. The division between me and my wife is the essence of conflict.

So, as long as there is a division between 'me' as the observer

and the 'me' which is observed, there must be conflict. Look, put it this way: I am greedy and I say, I must not be greedy. There is a division between the *must* and *must not*, the *what is* and *what should be*: Am I going too fast?

Q: No, no.

K: As long as there is a conflict, a division, how can I understand what the conditioning is? I can only understand the conditioning, look at it completely, when there is no division about anything. If I want to understand my wife, there must be no division; I must be able to look at her *completely*.

Q: And accept.

K: Ah, no: not *accept!* Who is to accept it? The fact is there, why should I accept or reject it?

Q: Because there is no division, you would neither accept nor ...

K: That's it.

Q: Okay, fine.

K: My education and culture have told me I am different from the thing which I observe in myself, and so there is conflict: 'I am this, and I must be that,' or, 'I will become that.' Sir, if I am greedy, am I different from the quality of greed?

Q: I don't follow that.

K: I am greedy, right? Is the quality different from me? *[Pause]*
Or, I am greed; there is no difference.

Q: By *quality* do you mean *degree* or *essence*?

K: Sir, when I am angry, is anger different from me?

Q: No.

K: So, anger is *me*! But we have said, anger is different from me, which means, I can control anger, I must change anger. So there is conflict between me and anger, and I am living in everlasting battle with myself: I am this, and I should be that. If I had a son I would say, 'For God's sake, avoid that conflict! Because that's your death!'

In the state of anger there is no division. Division comes later and, when the division comes, then there is an observer different from the observed. And the observer says, 'I must control anger,' or, 'Why should I get angry?' — the various explanations, justifications, and so on. But if I am the world, why should I fight the Arabs? Why should I fight the Jews? I know the division exists and, therefore, there is national division, patriotic division, economic division — man has *created* all these.

And I send my son to be killed in a war.

Q: Or to kill.

K: Or to kill, same thing: defense, offense are both the same thing. So, I see I am conditioned as a *fact*, not as an idea. That's what I want to get at.

Q: It's not easy.

Q: Can't we know something but not understand it? Just like we can know Einstein's theory, but that doesn't mean we understand

it. Isn't that what ...?

K: No, no. We must go into it much more (I'm a little careful in the use of words). When you say, 'I know,' what do you mean by *know*?

Q: It's what you're talking about.

K: No, no. We are using the word *know*. I know you because I met you the other week. Knowing implies, always, the past — I can't know *you*. You understand? I know England. I know London exists because I've been there. I believe Moscow exists — I've never been there, but it's a fact that it exists because thousands have lived there.

When we use the word *know*, that word is limited. All knowledge is limited and all knowledge, therefore, is in the past. So when I say, 'I know I am conditioned,' it's finished. I won't say, 'I know I'm conditioned.' Either it is a fact, or it is not. It is a fact that human beings are conditioned. Why should I *know* about it? I can investigate the fact; I can examine it, explore it, find out why the human mind is conditioned, and so on. But if I say, 'I know I am conditioned,' I have blocked myself from further examination.

I was travelling once in India with a European priest, and he said, 'I know Jesus exists.'

I said, 'Like the Hindus, they know their god exists.'

'Oh,' he said, 'that's just their belief.'

I said, 'Sir, what about you, what's the difference?'

'Ah, we *know*.'

And that was the end of the conversation. The moment you say, 'I know,' it is finished.

Q: I don't think I meant it that way.

K: Can I say 'I know,' about anything — especially in human relationship? Can I say, 'I know my wife'?

The fact is, I am conditioned. *Fact* means, again, that *which is*. *That which is* is, my mind is conditioned. Now, please, is it a fact or an idea to you?

Q: Fact.

K: No, you must be very clear on this point. If it is a fact to you, then what will you do about it?

Q: I think you've already answered it.

K: I want you to *look* at it!

Q: Well, you *have* answered it before.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: All right.

K: Is it a fact to me that I am conditioned? And what shall I do? Who I the doer? The doer is also conditioned. Right? So any action I, the doer, takes about the fact is conditioned.

Q: It's still a conflict.

K: No, do you see the truth of it, sir?

Q: [*Laughs*] Yes.

K: Not the idea, the *truth* of it: I am conditioned, and if I do anything about the conditioning, it is another part of that same conditioning. So, what shall I do? This is really very important to find out.

Q: The dichotomy.

K: Dichotomy? All right. So there is only anger.

Q: Anger.

K: Not 'me'.

Q: Anger *is* me.

K: Therefore, anger ...

Q: Or me.

K: ... is that with which you have identified yourself as 'me'. There is only anger. Now, wait a minute, how do you know it is anger?

Q: I don't need to.

K: Because it has happened before.

Q: And I know.

K: You know, and you label it *anger* because of the past. So, can you look at that anger without the word?

Q: No, you can't identify it then.

K: Therefore, what happens?

Q: Anger is me, I am anger whatever is *is*.

K: If you don't identify yourself with anger, and you are free of the word, then what happens?

Q: You are free of the action.

Q: Then it's gone?

K: Yes.

Q: And it's the same with the conditioning — which is what I'm trying to say, taking it a step further — I am the conditioning; the conditioning is me; therefore, if I understand — not *know* — if it is a fact, then just like anger, not being labeled, isn't there, then conditioning will also not be there ...

K: That's all.

Q: ... since anger and all the rest is a form of conditioning.

K: Therefore, there is no 'I' who says, 'I am unconditioned.' There is no fact and no entity that says, 'I am free.' There is only freedom, not, 'I am free.'

Q: Yes.

Q: So, what if you're still acting that way but you don't name it?
[Laughter]

K: This is really very serious, because it affects our whole life. You see, we have identified the 'me' with all the qualities, with all the struggles — 'I am in conflict, I am angry, I am jealous, I am ambitious, I must fulfill' — the 'me' all the time. So you have to investigate, what is the 'me'? Who, what is 'me'? The 'me' is the form, the name. What else besides? *[Pause]* My house?

Q: That is not 'me', though, in the accepted terms of conditioning.

K: No, I'm just examining it: What is the 'me', apart from conditioning? The 'me' is the form, the name identified with the house ('my house, my wife'). So, remove my house, my wife, my furniture, what am I?

Q: You're still there.

K: *[Pause]* I consider this my house because I have lived in it for twenty years or forty years. I have identified myself with this house, so the house is 'me'. Right? Of course. I treasure this house, I am attached to this house, so the house is 'me'. *[Taps chest]*

Q: Do you mean, sir, the house is you as I know you because it is your past, it is part of you?

K: All that.

Q: All right.

K: Sir, I treasure that table. *[Laughs]* Look at it. I treasure that table. So, the table becomes me.

Q: Why?

K: Of course, because if I lose that ...

Q: You still exist if you lose that.

K: Look, my lady, if I lose that, what happens to me?

Q: Nothing. You're still here; you suffer a sadness, perhaps, but you're still intact.

K: I have lost something: I have lost this house, if you take it away from me; I have lost my wife, if she runs away from me.

Q: But the entity you refer to as yourself, the 'me', is still there.

K: I'm just showing you: the 'me' is the form.

Q: What is that?

K: The body, the form.

Q: Oh, the form, yes.

K: The name, the memories, the remembrances, the hurts ...

Q: The past.

K: I'm naming them all, sir: the suffering, the pleasures — sexual, ten different pleasures — I am all that. Of course I am that! And also, 'I am the spirit, I am God.' [*Laughs*] All that is 'me', right, sir? What's the difficulty?

Q: The difficulty lies in discussing *knowing* someone. Now, I can know you as you used the word *know* earlier with the lady here: I know you because we met last week, because I've read

something of yours. ...

K: Yes, sir, you know me.

Q: I know you because of the past. And yet, you say that we never truly know each other.

K: I'll show it to you. You know me because you met me the other day. That's a memory, that's the past. And so, what happens? You recognize me. In the interval between last week and now, there might be tremendous changes in me. You only know me as the form, the name, but you don't know what has happened inside. Wait a minute, sir, I'll put it a little differently.

We say, 'I know my wife.' I know her because I have an image of her, a picture of her. That picture is made up of pleasure, comfort, nagging, irritation, all that. So, I have an image about her, and that image says, 'I know her.' And she has an image about me, and she says, 'I know my husband.' So the image is speaking, not what is behind the image. (This is a little complex.)

I am saying, when there is a division between the fact and the so-called observer, there will be constant struggle between the two. The observer is the observed. Right? Externally, I am not the tree. [*Laughs*] But, internally, I am all that which is me; there is no division between 'me' and the thing I observe in me. What takes place, then, when there is no division?

Q: There is a tranquility, because there is no conflict.

K: Sir, if there is no conflict, but only the fact that I am conditioned, what takes place? [*Pause*] Is there a conditioning?

Q: No.

K: One of the factors of conditioning is division. When there is no division, where is the conditioning?

One has to go much more deeply into this, really, because conditioning exists not only at the conscious level, but deep down, deep in the unconscious, in the layers that are hidden. It's the whole circle of conditioning — outwardly, inwardly — and the different layers of conditioning. Do you want to go into all that now?

We must come back to education, presently.

Q: This *is* education.

K: Yes, sir, this is education! How am I going to translate all this to the student, so that he never has a conflict in life? I love my son — I don't send him off to get rid of him — I love him. I don't want him to be killed, or to kill, in a war. I say, 'Find out how to live without a single conflict.' Because the moment you have conflict, you distort your mind; the moment you have conflict, your whole emotional nature is perverted.

So, can you find out how to live without a single conflict? I say, that conflict exists only when there is division; therefore, you have to go much deeper, to find out why desire is so contradictory.

Q: Why desire is so ...?

K: Desire. I desire this, and I don't want it the next day. I repent, I do penance, I go through *hell* with desire! So, I have to find out why my mind is caught in desire; I have to say, what is desire? One year I desire a nice house, and I get it; the next year I want something else. You follow? I'm always in conflict, always in contradiction — denying this, accepting that — I'm caught in

the battle of desires: 'I am not beautiful, I must be beautiful; I am not intelligent, I must be intelligent.' [*Laughs*]

So I must find out, what is desire? This is a real problem for the monks, and for all religious people. They have said, 'Don't have desire,' therefore, 'I'll become a monk and devote myself to Jesus.' Which is a ...

Q: Desire.

K: They are the same thing. I change my name and call myself something else; it is still the movement of desire. So, I have to find out, what is desire? Because desire, apparently, leads to illusion.

Q: But can all desire be eliminated? Or is it ...?

K: *All* desire. This is really a tremendously important thing, if you want to go into it. I can't keep a few desires ... [*Laughter*] ... the desires which don't hurt me: 'For God's sake, save me from that, and take away everything else!'

Q: Or the desire for that table, our favourite table over there: wanting to keep it, that's a desire.

K: Of course, of course. I treasure it; it's *my* table. *My* God, *my* Jesus — same thing, sir — whether it's a table or Jesus, it's the same thing.

So what is desire?

Q: The result of conflict?

K: No, what is desire? Not, desire for something.

Q: No, but if you're without conflict, then you would not have desires.

K: Ah, no. To be without conflict, I must understand desire; I can't end conflict without understanding desire.

Q: It sounds like desire would be, to puff ourself up ...

K: Desire to improve, desire to become, to sit next to God, ten different desires; therefore, I must find out what is the root of desire.

Q: Sounds like it would be, to build our ego.

K: No, no. Desire *per se*, not for something.

Q: Desire would be the whole universe, or the world as I observe it, as long as I'm still looking at ...

K: Yes. So, I must know the root of desire. What brings desire into flower? I see something beautiful — desire. I see a beautiful car — desire.

Q: It seems to be to build us up.

K: No, no: that's the end result.

Q: Well, it's a derivation of conditioning; it derives from the conditioning.

K: I don't want to ... I wouldn't put it into words ...

Q: All right, what you're saying is, it comes out of conditioning, because you say, I want a beautiful car, a beautiful woman, a

beautiful home. What is beauty? Well, we hear the old cliché, it's in the eye of the beholder. The conditioning places it there.

K: Yes, but the conditioning comes from desire.

Q: Conditioning comes *from* desire, you say?

K: Of course. *[Pause]* Sir, this is a very, very complex problem, because all of us are brought up, conditioned, to pursue our desires. Immediate fulfillment: I want something, I must have it; I want peace inside me, I go to Transcendental Meditation.

So, I must find out what is the root of *all* desire — sexual desire, noble desire, ignoble desire, the desire to be holy — the whole tree of desire. *[Pause]* May I explore it together with you?

Q: Sounds like fear.

K: What, sir?

Q: I looked at myself and I just found a fear.

K: No, no, before then. Please, sir: we are not talking about the results of desire; we are talking about the very beginning of desire.

Q: You think it's pleasure and pain, and the memory of it?

K: No, no, much deeper, sir. *[Laughs]* Wait a minute, sir. I see this piano. It's not a Steinway, but good enough! It's beautiful, and I must have it.

What has taken place? There is perception, the seeing, the sensation; then thought says, 'I must have it.' So, sensation plus thought is desire. Right? Don't accept, please. Question, go into it.

Q: Sensation plus thought ...

K: If you have no thought, what happens to sensation?

Q: You just see and enjoy it, but ...

K: You just say, 'That's beautiful.' But thought comes in and says, 'Let's work at it; let me get it.' [*Laughter*]

Q: Well, it has to say, 'I want it.'

K: *Want*, same thing, sir. So, desire equals sensation plus thought.

Q: But what does sensation do? Sensation makes you feel.

K: *Feel*, which is, sensory perception. You sense, touch, taste, see, hear — sensation. If there is no thought, what happens? It senses, and disappears. But thought comes along and says, 'How nice!'

Q: You need it.

K: I need it; I'd like to have it; what I can do with it? So, desire is sensation plus thought.

Q: It's sensation plus conditioning, then.

K: What, sir?

Q: It's sensation plus conditioning.

K: No, no. Thought is the factor of conditioning, not sensation.

Q: That's what I'm saying: it is sensation plus conditioning.

K: Yes.

Q: But what sensation do we get in seeing the piano, if it's not modified by the thought of what the piano is and knowing the piano?

K: No, sir, just a minute. I see the beautiful car: perception, sensation.

Q: Sensation, yes, I see that *thing*.

K: Yes.

Q: Which I do not know. That's sensation.

K: Quite right.

Q: As soon as I know it, that's thought.

K: Thought. That's what happens. You're perfectly right. (This is real discipline, real perception.) There is sensation; then thought comes, and all the trouble begins.

We are examining, what is desire? We said, desire is sensation plus thought. So, what is thought?

Q: What is thought?

K: I know what sensation is.

Q: It is the conditioning.

K: No, no, not yet: we must go into it. What is thought? I know what sensation is: seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, tasting.

Q: That's sensation.

K: That's sensory. What is thought?

Q: Memories, the past.

K: I don't know. What is thought? What is thinking? Not thinking about something. What is thinking? [*Pause*]

Isn't it memory? What is memory? Accumulated experience, stored up in the brain. (I'm not a brain specialist -- I observe.) Thought is the response of memory. Right? So, thought is a material process, and whatever it has created is a material process.

Q: The process itself is material, you say, sir?

K: Thought itself is material.

Q: Thought is matter.

K: No, please, go a little slowly.

I met you yesterday, or last week. It is stored up in the brain as memory; it is there, inside the head, which is the brain. And the brain is composed of many cells: matter, material processes. The brain contains the whole structure of memory. It records, and holds it. (All these are facts, sir.) So, what thought has created — all the churches, all the temples, all the mosques — these are material processes.

Q: That I agree on.

K: There is nothing holy about it. This is very important, sir.

Q: I know it's important; I'm just smiling because I agree so readily with you.

K: So, thought plus sensation is desire. Desire has created all this. Wait, sir, look at it a little more! Then, what is sacred?

Q: What is sacred?

K: Yes.

Q: I was going to ask you: Can there be a desire that is good?

K: We're not saying, good or bad desire: we are examining desire. But the translation of that desire into good or bad depends on the environmental conditioning.

Q: Can we then call it sacred?

K: What?

Q: It's still a conditioned thing, to call it ...

K: Of course, sir. (I'm sorry, I am not making myself clear.) If all things that thought has created — the technological world, as well as the religious world, everything — is a material process, then what is sacred, holy?

Q: Sense, anything without thought.

K: Therefore, I must find out — wait, sir! — I must find out the ending of thought.

Q: Run that again.

K: I must find out, what are the limitations beyond which thought cannot go? That is real meditation — not all this phony stuff!
[Laughter]

I have found out what thought is. And there must be exploring, investigating, understanding: to find out where thought is necessary, where thought is necessary, where thought has its limitation, where thought realizes its own limitation, so that it doesn't flow over into something else and create illusions.

In this school the teachers are conditioned, the boys and girls are conditioned; and I say, 'Please, help my son to uncondition himself, so that he will live a life without a single conflict.' Personally, I have never had a conflict — forgive me for saying it.

Q: No, *we* have conflicts, you and I. *[Pause. K shakes his head]*

We do not have conflicts? Would you think of marriage?*[Laughs]* No, seriously, if we do not have conflicts, you and I, do not have a conflict in anything we discuss, when I ask you something ...

K: I say, please look at it — I don't say it is right or wrong — look at it. There is no conflict. If both of us agree to call that thing a book, there is no conflict, but if you insist on calling it a serpent and I call it a book, then there is conflict.

Q: If I say it's a serpent and you say it's a book ...

K: Then we don't meet each other.

Q: Right. Then we have a conflict. Do you also have a conflict?

K: No, I see the fact. And I want you, please, to see the same thing. If you don't see the same thing, what am I to do? If you insist on calling that a serpent, I say, 'Please, touch it.' And you say, 'I refuse.' That's the end of it! I'm not in conflict with you, unless you want to prove to me that it is a snake by hitting me on the head.

Q: But if I want to prove to you that it is a snake, would there not be a conflict within you, trying to ...?

K: No, why should I? When all of us have agreed to call that a book, and you don't — you call it a serpent — it's your conflict, not mine.

Q: Here, we may have a conflict: you were saying earlier, desire is sense plus thought.

K: It's not what I say, sir: either it is, or it is not.

Q: All right, I accept that, there's no conflict there. Now, one of the things you mentioned was sexual desire. Is there a sexual sense without desire?

K: Find out.

Q: I am asking if you feel ...

K: I don't answer that; I say, this is a matter of investigation, find out. Then it's yours, not my telling you.

Sirs, move further. I want to help my son, a student in the school, to live a life without conflict. Do you know what it does to human beings, not to live in conflict? They flower, they love, something extraordinary takes place in them. So, I want them to grow up

like that: my son, my daughter, or other children. That's my concern, that's my responsibility. And when we meet together I say, 'Look, it's your responsibility as well as mine, as a teacher living here.' We must both see the necessity of bringing about an education which will help the student to live a life without a shadow of conflict.

Now, what shall we do? How shall we teach him? Because everything around him is in conflict: his parents are in conflict with each other, the society, *everything* is in conflict. And I want something totally different for that child. Because I love that child — it's not just love as sensation — I love him, I want him to be totally different, not go through all the agony and the misery of the world.

So I say, let us, parents and teachers, meet, discuss, see that we are totally responsible, together: that we want that boy to be without conflict. It's never been done, sir, you understand?

Q: Sir, what happens to the parent if the boy says, 'I turn my back, I'm not interested. You've talked to me about conditioning; I see that I'm conditioned, but first I'm gonna go make money'?

K: You say, 'Come and stay with us, live with us, get to know us; look at it, see what is implied.' Discuss with him, take time, trouble. If, at the end of six months, he says, 'Go to hell,' all right, it's finished. What can I do?

Q: So, the parent has built up almost a hope through the contact, through the energy, through the sensation.

K: Of course. I as the teacher and you as the parent are both concerned with that boy or girl, and we tell the girl, 'Look, don't have a conflict in life, it isn't worth it.' We'll talk to her; we'll put

our *guts* into it, not just talk. And what happens? At the end of a year she says, 'Sorry, I'm not interested.' What are we going to do? [*Pause*]

I say, 'All right,' but I am not going to leave. I am working, you follow, sir? If it doesn't succeed with one boy, I am going to try it with another.

Q: So you hang in there; it's up to him to leave.

K: 'Come and stay, or leave.'

What will you do if you have a son who says, 'Sorry, mum, this is all rubbish you are talking about. You are a square,' [*laughs*] 'this is nonsense you are talking.' What will you do with him?

Q: You have to still be that — what you want him to be — yourself, and then if ...

K: What will you do with him?

Q: What can you do? You just have to be.

K: He refuses. What will you do?

Q: I will continue to be the way I am.

K: So you say, 'The door is always open, old boy; come in when you want to, leave when you want to.'

Q: Well, no.

K: I am not going to change — for my son, for anybody — the fact that the mind, a human mind, must live without conflict;

otherwise, disaster happens in the world. And my responsibility, my passion, my job — *everything* is involved in that. If it doesn't succeed, I won't be disappointed; I'm not looking for success, thank God!

Q: That's what we have to be, too, right?

K: It's up to you.

Q: Well, that's the way I feel.

Q: You say it has never been done in the world, and yet you have lived without conflict yourself. So it *has* been done in the world.

K: [*Laughs*] If I have a son, I want him to be that.

Q: Sir, in the experience of conditioning, it's so elusive that it can quickly say, 'That's a fact.'

K: No, sir.

Q: And there's that little margin, there's a razor's edge ...

K: I know. Look, sir ...

Q: ... and you don't know when you're on one side or the other.

K: ... you are brought up in America. You know the conditioning of America: money, success, vulgarity, violence, and marvellous country, and some very nice people. You know all the chicanery of politics; you know everything that's going on.

You and your grandparents have created it. Right? That's your conditioning. And if you want to change the world, you have to begin here [*taps chest*] which is the world. If you change, you are bound to affect the world. That is an ordinary fact, sir. You write a very clever, extraordinary book, and it affects millions of people!

So can we, together, create such a school? You follow, sir? We are involved in this, committed to this. If you are not committed, it's all right, I'm not saying you should be. But if you are serious about our children, about education, about human suffering, this is our problem.

— *December 13, 1975*
Ojai

A REPORT ON THE KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA GATHERING, 2000

The KFI Gathering, 2000 began on a beautiful winter morning — the 31st of October, 2000 — at Rajghat, in the ancient seat of learning, Kāśī, a sacred spot on the banks of the Ganga. About 250 people from far and near participated in the Gathering. They were heartily welcomed by the members of the Rajghat Education Centre.

The themes for the Gathering were ‘The Art of Learning’ on the 1st day, ‘On Relationship’ on the 2nd day, and ‘The Religious Mind’ on the 3rd day. On each day, the speaker for the day addressed the Gathering for about 45 minutes creating questions on the theme. After this the whole group split into smaller groups for dialogues facilitated by the coordinator of each group, and then the participants reassembled, and questions from each group were taken up with the speaker for further inquiry. Each day a video on the same theme as that of the day was screened. A booklet on the three themes selected for the Gathering was brought out and distributed to the participants on their arrival. It was entitled ‘Gathering Energy’. The Hindi Bulletin, *Parisamvad* containing the translation of the English booklet was given to Hindi readers.

The inaugural address by Śrī. S.P. Kandaswamy, Secretary, KFI touched upon the significance and need for free inquiry, questioning with an open mind, a mind that is listening and not trapped in grooves of patterns of thought, and belief and tradition.

Initiating the theme ‘The Art of Learning’ on the 1st day, Prof. Rimpoché talked about the process of learning and the role of a teacher. He questioned whether the participants had gathered as participants of a learning process or as part of a

crowd — in which case, learning was not possible. Some questions which emerged from the 1st day's talk and discussion were:

- * How can we remain in a state of attention which seems to facilitate learning?
- * How do we know that what we are learning is not merely the influence of certain conditions?
- * Since the main function of the human brain is to record, how is it possible to negate the memory of past experiences?
- * Why do I lose the sense of spontaneity in learning as I grow up?
- * Where does accumulation stop and where does learning begin?

The speaker for the 2nd day, Śrī G. Gautama, Principal, The School, Chennai, spoke on the theme of 'Relationship'. Defining relationship as a sense of direct contact not through images, he spoke of 3 kinds of relationship: (1) Relationship with non-living things (2) Relationship with feelings, ideas, actions and (3) Relationship with nature, 'other creatures'. He also asked whether there was a relationship between all the participants, in that they were inquiring together or whether inquiry was an individual process. He also went into what K meant when he said, 'To be related is to stand alone'.

A few of the questions that emerged from this were:

- * What is the nature and form of relationship when there are no images? Between whom or what is the relationship?
- * Is there a relationship which is not based on need and gratification?
- * What is right relationship?

Speaking on 'The Religious Mind' on the 3rd day, Śrī Rajesh Dalal inquired into what religion and religious establishments mean to mankind and why we get bound to the ancient or to the modern. The questions that emerged in the small group dialogues were:

- * Is a religious mind an impossible proposition? Why do we lack the energy to inquire into the nature of a religious mind?
- * I am unable to come to terms with the reality around me. Then how can I inquire about the religious mind?
- * Has the human mind undergone a qualitative change in the course of evolution?
- * Why does the mind slip back into inattentive states?

On the final day, before the concluding session, a panel discussion on education was held to discuss 'Education in KFI Schools'. Two biographical films, 'The Challenge Of Change' and 'The Seer Who Walks Alone' were shown on a 16 mm projector after dinner and, in spite of a full day's programme, many people came to view the films.

The cultural programme included a play on the Life of Kabir by Vasanta College students, vocal and instrumental music by the music lecturers from the College, and a light-music programme by teachers of the KFI Schools. The participants enjoyed boat rides in the river, walks in the campus and also trips to the city and Sarnath.

On all the days of the Gathering an informal atmosphere prevailed, and the participants said that they were leaving with a feeling of having attended a meaningful camp.

— Hema Rao

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA GATHERING 2001

The Krishnamurti Foundation India is happy to announce that the next Public Gathering will be held at Rishi Valley School in Andhra Pradesh, from the 22nd of November to the 25th of November 2001.

The intention of the Gathering is to enable interested persons to come together as friends to share, discuss and investigate fundamental questions of life in the light of Krishnamurti's Teachings.

For details please contact:

The Secretary
Rishi Valley School
Rishi Valley — 517 352
Chittoor District
Andhra Pradesh
Tel: (08571) 26037, 68622
Fax: (08571) 68582

E-MAIL, FAX AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION OF AMERICA

e-mail: kfa@kfa.org

Fax: (001-805) 646 6674

Telephone: (001-805) 646 2726

THE OAK GROVE SCHOOL

e-mail: oakgrove@fishnet.net

Fax: (001-805) 646 6509

Telephone: (001-805) 646 8236

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION OF CANADA

e-mail: namurti@islandnet.com

Fax: (001-250) 474 1104

Telephone: (001-250) 474 1488

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION TRUST

e-mail: kft@brockwood.org.uk/info@brockwood.org.uk

Fax: (0044-1962) 771 159

Telephone: (0044-1962) 771 525

BROCKWOOD PARK SCHOOL

e-mail: admin@brockwood1.win-uk.net

Fax: (0044-1962) 771 875

Telephone: (0044-1962) 771 744

FUNDACION KRISHNAMURTI LATINOAMERICANA

e-mail: anadonfk@ddnet.es

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

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

e-mail: 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/kfirvns@nde.net.in/
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
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



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.