

2 0 0 1 / 3

# Bulletin

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

The Krishnamurti Foundation Annual Gathering was held this year at Rishi Valley School. The theme chosen for the Gathering was 'The Great Denial'. A booklet containing an introductory essay and six pieces from the works of J. Krishnamurti on the theme was prepared and distributed to the participants.

This issue of the Bulletin continues the theme of the Gathering for it contains selections (arranged in chronological order) from the works of J. Krishnamurti on negation, nothingness and denial linking them to 'meditation', 'freedom', 'creation' and 'Reality'. We see that denial and renunciation for Krishnamurti is not isolation from and indifference to the world and others and does not take place in a 'socio-religious' vacuum. To deny, to negate all images, all so-called sacred, spiritual authority, all expectations, and so on, is necessary to come upon truth, for the Real is not in the realm of the known. Denial, negation, self-abandonment is necessary for freedom and love. The *Maitreya Upanisad*, 117, says that 'He who renounces "for the sake of" wealth, food, clothes, or celebrity, falls ... and is unable to attain release'. Krishnamurti warns us time and time again not to compare, not to put his teachings 'into old bottles and, thereby, lose its perfume', yet we cannot help but notice Krishnamurti say that denial with a motive, denial with a purpose, is false denial; it does not bring about a new mind. He says that only 'When I deny and do not know what is in store for me in the future', that it is true denial. Such denial, such negation, such abandonment and renunciation, Krishnamurti says, is meditation. Such meditation is a 'shattering', a 'destruction' and, therefore, a 'new creation'.

## WISDOM COMES THROUGH NEGATION

I am afraid you will say that I have said nothing positive .... But, is not negative thinking the highest form of thinking? — for *wisdom comes through negation*. Do not put what I say into your old bottles and, thus, lose the perfume. Sirs, surely, to transform the world there must be regeneration within ourselves. We think that we have to have blueprints to educate our children but, naturally, blueprints have no love. Therefore, we produce machines. We have brains, but what has happened to them? We are becoming cannon fodder. We are not creators. We are not thinkers. We do not know how to love.

— Madras

16th November, 1947

## NEGATION IS LIKE OPENING THE WINDOW

**QUESTION:** What is religion?

**J KRISHNAMURTI:** Do you want to find out an answer from me, or do you want to find out the truth of what religion is? Are you looking for an answer from somebody — however great or however stupid he is? Or, are you trying to find out the truth of what true religion is?

If you want to try to find out what true religion is, then what have you to do? You must push away everything. If I have many coloured windows, many dirty windows, and I want to see the clear sunshine — if I want to know what real light is — I must either clean the windows, or I must open the windows and go outside. You want to find out what true religion is. First, you must find out what it is not. *To find out or discover* what it is

not, *you have to approach it in negation* — that is like opening the window. You must first find out what it is not, and put that aside, then you can find out; then you are in direct perception.

We are going to find out what true religion is, so let us find out, first, what it is not. Is ritual — *pūja* — religion? You repeat over and over again a certain ritual, a certain *mantra* in front of an idol. It may give you a sense of pleasure, a sense of satisfaction; but is that religion? Is putting on the sacred thread religion? Obviously, it cannot be. So, we have to find out whether calling yourself a Buddhist, a Christian, a Hindu, and accepting a certain tradition, a certain dogma and ritual is religion. Obviously it is not. So, religion must be something which can only be found when the mind has understood and put aside all this.

Religion is not the outcome of separation. Is it? You are a Mussulman, I am a Christian. I believe in something; you do not believe in it. Belief has nothing to do with religion as such. Whether you believe in God or I do not believe in God has nothing to do with it, because belief is conditioned by your society. The society round you imprints your fears and appeals to your mind to believe in certain things. Belief has nothing to do with religion. You believe in one way and I in another way, because I happen to be born in England, Russia or America. Belief is only the result of conditioning; therefore, it has nothing to do with religion.

Is the pursuit of personal salvation religion? I want to be safe; I want to reach *nirvāṇa* or *mokṣa* or salvation; I must find a place next to Jesus, next to Buddha, next to a particular God. Your religion is not a thing that gives me deep satisfaction or comfort; so, I have my own religion. But your mind must be free from all these things, for only then will you find out what true religion is.

Is religion merely doing good? Is religion merely doing service — helping another? Is that all it is or, is it something more? —

which does not mean that we must not be generous or kind. Is that all it is, or is it something much greater, much cleaner, much vaster, much more expansive than any mere conception of the mind? To understand what is true religion, you must know all these things. It is like going out into the sunshine. Then you will not ask what true religion is. Then you will know. Then there will be the direct experience of that which is true.

— *Rajghat,*  
*23rd December, 1952*

## **YOU CANNOT SEARCH FOR REALITY YOU MUST CEASE FOR REALITY TO BE**

Is God to be found by seeking him out? Can you search after the unknowable? To find, you must know what you are seeking. If you seek to find, what you find will be a self-projection; it will be what you desire, and the creation of desire is not truth. To seek truth is to deny it. Truth has no fixed abode; there is no path, no guide to it, and the word is not truth. Is truth to be found in a particular setting, in a special climate, among certain people? Is it here and not there? Is that one the guide to truth and not another? Is there a guide at all? When truth is sought, what is found can only come out of ignorance, for the search itself is born of ignorance. *You cannot search out reality; you must cease for reality to be.*

— From: *Commentaries On Living Series I*, 'Chapter 19, The Search For Truth', Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India, 1994, p. 46. (First published in 1956.)

## TRUTH IS THE NEGATION OF THE FALSE, IT IS NOT THE OPPOSITE OF THE FALSE

What is negative and what is positive? Most of us are used to being told what to do. The giving and following of directions is considered to be positive teaching. To be led appears to be positive, constructive, and to those who are conditioned to follow, the truth that following is evil seems negative, destructive. *Truth is the negation of the false, not the opposite of the false.* Truth is entirely different from the positive and the negative, and a mind which thinks in terms of the opposites can never be aware of it.

— From: *Commentaries On Living, Series II*. 'Chapter 44, Positive And Negative Teaching', Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India, 1994, p. 186. (First published in 1958.)

## IN NEGATION THAT EXTRAORDINARY THING, WHICH WE ALL WANT, WILL COME

I think it would be profitable and worthwhile to find out for ourselves why the mind is so restless. It is as restless as the sea — never stable, never quiet. Though outwardly it may be still, inwardly it is full of ripples, full of grooves and every kind of disturbance. I think it is essential to go into this question rather deeply, and not merely ask how to quiet the mind. There is no 'way' to quiet the mind. Of course, one can take pills — tranquillizers — or follow some system blindly. One can drug the mind with prayers, with repetitions; but a drugged mind is no mind at all. So it seems to me of the utmost importance to go deeply into this question of why the mind is everlastingly seeking something, and why, having found it, it is not satisfied,

but moves on to something else.

There is an unceasing movement from satisfaction to disappointment, from fulfilment to pain and frustration. We must all be aware of this endless cycle of pleasure and sorrow. Everything is passing, impermanent. We live in a constant state of flight. There is no place where one can be quiet, especially inwardly, because every recess of the mind is disturbed. There is no untrodden region in the mind. Consciously or unconsciously we have tried in various ways to bring quietness, stillness, a state of peace to the mind; and having got it, we soon lose it again. You must be aware of this endless search, which is going on in your own mind.

So, I would like to suggest that — with hesitance and without dogmatism, without quoting or coming to conclusions — we try to probe into this restless activity of our minds. And, I think, that we shall have to begin by asking ourselves why we seek at all, why we inquire, why there is this longing to arrive, to achieve, to become something. After all, you are probably here a little bit out of curiosity, but even more, I hope, out of the desire to seek, to find out. What is it that you are seeking? And why do you seek? If we can go deeply into this question by asking ourselves why we are seeking, if we can, as it were, open the door by means of that question then, I think, we may perhaps have a glimpse into something which is not illusory, and which does not have the transient quality of that which is merely pleasurable or gratifying. Why is it that you seek, and what is it that you seek? I wonder if you have ever put those questions to yourselves.

You know, a challenge is always new, because it is something that demands your attention. There is no turning your back on it; you have to respond. And you respond either totally, completely, or partially, inadequately. The incapacity to respond totally to a challenge, creates conflict. The world in its present state is a

constant challenge to each one of us, and when we do not respond with fullness — with all the depth and beauty of the challenge itself — then, inevitably, there is turmoil, anxiety, fear, sorrow. In the same way, these questions — what are you seeking, and why do you seek? — are a challenge, and if you do not respond with your whole being but treat them merely as an intellectual problem — which is to respond partially — then, obviously, you will never find a total answer. Your response to the challenge is partial, inadequate, when you merely make statements, or think in terms of definite conclusions to which you have come. The challenge is always new, and you have to respond to it anew — not in your habitual, customary way. So, if we can put these questions to ourselves as though we are considering them for the first time, then our response will be entirely different from the superficial response of the intellect.

What is it that you seek, and why do you seek it? Does not this very seeking instigate restlessness? If there were no seeking, would you stagnate, or would there then be a totally different kind of search? But before we go into the more complex aspects of our inquiry, it seems to me important to find out what you and I, as individual human beings, are seeking. Obviously, the superficial answer is always to say, 'I am seeking happiness, fulfilment'. But in seeking happiness, in seeking fulfilment, we never stop to ask ourselves if there is such a thing as fulfilment. We long for fulfilment, or satisfaction, and we go after it, without looking to see if there is any reality behind the word. In pursuing fulfilment, its expression varies from day to day, from year to year. Growing weary of the more worldly satisfactions, we seek happiness in good conduct, in social service, in being brotherly, in loving our neighbour. But sooner or later this movement towards fulfilment through good conduct also comes to an end, and we turn in still another direction. We try to find happiness through intellectual pursuits, through reason, logic, or we become emotional, sentimental, romantic. We give to the word 'happiness'

different connotations at different times. We translate it in terms of what we call peace, God, truth; we think of it as a heavenly abode where we shall be completely fulfilled, never disturbed, and so on. And that is what most of us want, is it not? That is why you read the *Sāstras*, the *Bible*, the *Koran*, or other religious books; you read in the hope of bringing quietness to the restless mind. Probably that is why you are here.

Seeking implies an object, an end in view, does it not? *There can be no search for what is unknown*. You can only seek something which you have known and lost, or of which you have heard and want to gain. You cannot seek that which you do not know. In a peculiar way, you already know what happiness is. You have tasted the flavour of it. The past has given you the sensation, the pleasure, the beauty of it, so you already know its quality, its nature, and you project that memory. But what you have known is not what-is; your projection is not what you really want. What you have tasted is not sufficient, you want something more, more, more and, so, your life is an everlasting struggle.

I hope you are listening to what is being said, not as to a lecture, but as though you were looking at a film of yourself struggling, groping, searching, longing. You are sorrowful, anxious, fearful, caught up in tremendous hope and despair, in the extremes of contradiction. And from this tension there is action. That is all you know. You seek fulfilment outwardly: in the house, in the family, in going to an office, in becoming a rich man, or in becoming the chief inspector, or a famous judge, or the prime minister. You know the whole business of climbing the ladder of success and achievement. You climb that ladder till you are old, and then you seek God. You collect money, honours, position, prestige, and when you have reached a certain age, you turn to poor old God. God does not want such a man, sirs. God wants a complete human being who is not a slave. He does not want a dehydrated human being, but one who is active, who knows

love, and who has a deep sense of joy.

But unfortunately, in our search for happiness, fulfilment, there is an endless struggle going on. Outwardly we do everything possible to assure ourselves of that happiness; but outward things fail. Our house, our property, our relationship with our wives and children — they can all be swept away. And there is always death waiting around the corner. So we turn to inward things, we practise various forms of discipline in an effort to control our minds, our emotions, and we conform to a standard of good conduct, hoping that we shall one day arrive at a state of happiness that cannot be disturbed.

Now, I see this whole process going on, and I ask myself: Why do we seek at all? I know that we do seek. We join societies which promise a spiritual reward. We follow *gurus* who exhort us to struggle, to sacrifice, to discipline ourselves, and all the rest of it. We are seeking — endlessly. Why is there this seeking? What is the compulsion, the urge that makes for seeking — not only outwardly, but inwardly? And is there any fundamental difference between the outward and the inward movement of seeking, or is it only one movement? I do not know if I am making myself clear. We have divided our existence into what we call the 'outward' life and the 'inward' life. Our daily activities and pursuits are the outward life; and when we do not get happiness, pleasure, satisfaction in that area, we turn to the inward as a reaction. But the inward also has its frustration and despair. So, to come back: What is it that is making us seek? Do, please, ask yourself this question; go into it with me. Surely, a happy, joyous man does not seek God. He is not trying to achieve virtue; his very existence is splendid, radiant. So, what is it that is urging us to seek, and to make such tremendous effort? If we can understand that, perhaps we shall be able to go beyond this restless search.

Do you know what the cause of your seeking is? Please do not give a superficial answer, because then you will only blind yourself to the actual. Surely, if you go deeply into yourself, you will see that you are seeking because there is, within each one of us, a sense of isolation, of loneliness, of emptiness; there is an inner void which nothing can fill. Do what you will — perform good works, meditate, identify yourself with the family, with the group, with the race, with the nation — that emptiness will still be there, that void which cannot be filled, that loneliness which nothing can take away. That is the cause of our endless seeking, is it not? Deep within one there is this sense of emptiness, of loneliness, of utter isolation. If the mind can go into this void — call it by a different name, it does not matter — and understand it, then perhaps it will be resolved.

At one time or another — perhaps while you were walking, or while you were sitting by yourself in a room — you must have experienced this sense of loneliness. You must have experienced the extraordinary feeling of being cut off from everything — from your family, from your friends, from ideas, hopes — so that you felt you had no relationship with anybody or anything. And without penetrating into this, without actually living with it, understanding it, the mind cannot resolve that feeling.

I think there is a difference between knowing and experiencing. You probably know what this feeling of loneliness is, from what you have heard or read about it. But knowing is entirely different from the state of experiencing. You may have read extensively, you may have accumulated many experiences, so that you know a great deal; but *knowledge is not living*. If you are an artist, a painter, every line, every shadow means something. You observe all the time, watching the movement and the depth of shadows, the loveliness of a curve, the expression of a face, the branch of a tree, the colours everywhere; you are alive to everything. But knowledge cannot give you this perception, this capacity to feel,

to experience, something that you see. Experiencing is one thing, and experience is another. *Experience, knowledge, is a thing of the past*, which will go on as memory; *but experiencing is a living perception of the now*; it is a vital awareness of the beauty, the tranquillity, the extraordinary profundity of the now. In the same way, one has to be aware of loneliness; one has to feel it, actually experience this sense of complete isolation. And if one is capable of experiencing it, one will find how really difficult it is to live with it. I do not know if you have ever lived with the sunset.

You know, sirs, there is a radiancy of love which cannot be cultivated. Love is not the result of good conduct. No amount of your being kind, generous, will give you love. Love is both extensive and particular. A mind that loves *is* virtuous; it does not seek virtue. It cannot go wrong, because it knows right and wrong. It is the mind without love that seeks virtue, that wants God, that clings to a system of belief, and thereby destroys itself. Love — that quality, that feeling, that sense of compassion without any object, which is the very essence of life — is not a thing to be grasped by the mind. As I said the other day, when the intellect guides that pure feeling, then mediocrity comes into being. Most of us have such highly developed intellects, that the intellect is always corrupting the pure feeling. Therefore our feelings are mediocre, though we may be excellent at reasoning.

Now, this sense of loneliness is pure feeling, uncorrupted by the mind. It is the mind that is frightened, fearful, that says, 'I must get away from it'. But if one is simply aware of this loneliness, if one lives with it, then it has the quality of pure feeling. I do not know if I am making myself clear. Have you ever really observed a flower? It is not easy. You may think that you have observed it, you may think that you have loved it, but what you have actually done is this: you have seen it, you have given it a name, you have smelt it, and then you have gone away. The very naming of the

species, the very smelling of the flower, causes in you a certain reaction of memory and, therefore, you never really look at the flower at all. Just try — sometime — looking at a flower, at a sunset, at a bird, or what you will, without any interference on the part of the mind, and you will see how difficult it is. Yet it is only then that there is the complete perception of anything.

This loneliness, this pure feeling which is a sense of total isolation, can be observed as you would observe the flower: with complete attention, which is not to name it, or try to escape from it. Then you will find, if you have gone so far in your inquiry, that there is only a state of negation. Please, do not translate this into Sanskrit, or any other language, or compare it with something you have read. What I am telling you is not what you have read. What has been described is not what-is.

I am saying that if the mind is capable of experiencing this sense of aloneness — not just verbally but actually lives with it — then there comes an awareness of complete negation — negation which is not an opposite. Most of us only know the opposites: positive and negative; ‘I love’ and ‘I do not love’; ‘I want’ and ‘I do not want’. That is all we know. But the state of which I am telling you is not of that nature, because it has no opposite. It is a state of complete negation.

I do not know if you have ever thought about the quality or the nature of creation. Creativity in the sense of having talent, being gifted, is entirely different from the state of creation. I do not know if it has happened to you that, while walking alone, or sitting in a room, you have suddenly had a feeling of extraordinary ecstasy. Having had that feeling, you want to translate it. So you write a poem, or paint a picture. If that poem or that picture becomes fashionable, society flatters you, pays you for it, gives you a profit, and you are carried away by all that. Presently you seek to have again that tremendous ecstasy, which came un-

invited. But, as long as you seek it, it will never come. However, you keep on seeking it in various ways: through self-discipline, through the practice of a system, through meditation, through drink, women. You try everything in an effort to get back that overwhelming feeling of radiance, of joy, in which all creation is. But you will never get it back. It comes darkly, uninvited.

So, *it is from the state of negation that all creation takes place.* Whether you spontaneously write a poem, or smile without calculation, whether there is kindness without a motive, or goodness without fear, without a cause, it is all the outcome of this extraordinary state of complete negation, in which is creation. But you cannot come to it if you do not understand the whole process of seeking. In understanding the whole process of seeking, all seeking completely ceases. *The understanding and cessation of seeking is not at the end, but at the beginning.* The man who says, 'Eventually I shall understand the process of seeking and, then, I shall no longer seek', is thoughtless, stupid, because the end is at the beginning which has no time. If you begin to inquire into yourself and perceive why you seek, and what it is you are seeking, you can capture the whole significance of it instantaneously; and then you will find that, without any intent, without any causation, there is a fundamental revolution, a complete transformation of the mind. It is only then that truth comes into being.

Truth does not come to a mind that is burdened with experience, that is full of knowledge, that has gathered virtue, that has stifled itself through discipline, control. *Truth comes to the mind that is really innocent, fearless.* And it is only the mind that has completely understood its own seeking, that has gone to the fullest depth of this state of negation that is without fear. Then that extraordinary thing, which we are all wanting, will come. It is elusive, and it will not come if you stretch out your hand to capture it. You cannot capture the immeasurable. Your hands, your mind,

your whole being, must be quiet, completely still, to receive it. You cannot seek it, because you do not know what it is. The immeasurable will be there when the mind understands this whole process of search, not at the end, but at the beginning — which is the continuous movement of self-knowledge.

— Madras  
6th December, 1959

### **THE ACTION OF THE MIND THAT DOES NOT BELONG TO ANYTHING IS A BLESSING, NOT A CURSE**

I would like this evening, if I may, to think aloud with you about virtue, sensitivity and what we call love and beauty.

I do not know if we have ever asked ourselves, at any time, why it is that we lose our sensitivity, not to any particular thing but to everything: to the open skies, to the rain on the road, to the vast, moving clouds, to the moonlight on the waters, to the smile on a face, to the weary bullock drawing a cart? Why is it that we lose this quality of nearness to things? Why is it that, as we grow up, we lose all sense of innocency, which is the very essence of sensitivity? Why do we lose the appreciation of what is beautiful, the sense of astonishment, of amazement, of wonder at the whole process of living?

I think it would be good if we could approach this problem very attentively and hesitantly, so as to find out for ourselves why our minds become dull. Fundamentally, it seems to me, one cause of this dullness of the mind is its cultivation of virtue. (Please listen; I am going to explain.) And dullness also comes about when the mind has committed itself to a course of action, when one belongs to a particular group and must act within the framework of that

commitment. The mind is likewise made dull by the desire to possess power, to dominate. I think these are three of the principal causes of the mind's dullness.

Surely, what is essential is a very sensitive, alert mind, a mind that, being intense, creates its own efficiency. Sensitivity, intensity, is denied to a mind that is merely cultivating virtue. There is a virtue which is not the product of the mind. What we generally call virtues — the moral sanctions, the professional ethics, the codes of righteous behaviour, and so on — are all creations of a particular society, are they not? Whereas, *virtue in the true sense is not a product of the mind, and it is not recognizable as virtue by society.*

I think one has to see very clearly that when a mode of conduct becomes respectable and is, therefore, recognizable as being virtuous, it is no longer virtuous. A virtue like being non-violent, being kindly, being humble, and so on, when recognized as virtue by society, or by oneself, ceases to be a virtue and becomes mere respectability. When the mind struggles to acquire a particular quality — be it humility, sympathy, non-violence, or what you will — it is surely not virtue; it is merely a form of resistance in which the mind is approximating itself to a pattern.

Please, do feel your way into what is being said — but not in order to accept or deny. A mind that merely accepts or denies is really an unreasoning mind. It is not a thoughtful, intelligent mind, because it has already taken a stand from which it judges and it is, therefore, incapable of exploration, inquiry.

We are inquiring into the nature of virtue. The mind must obviously be virtuous, because only a virtuous mind is orderly, sensitive, capable of acting out of its own clarity. The mind that is induced, influenced, disciplined to be virtuous, is not a virtuous mind, because it knows only resistance, a constant adjustment

to the demands of respectability. Any effort to be virtuous, to be moral, any endeavour to be something other than what one is, naturally creates a resistance to what one is, and this resistance prevents the understanding of what one is. Yet such effort, which is really an avoidance, an escape from what one is, is generally regarded as virtue.

Take a very simple thing. In this country there is a great deal of talk about non-violence. All the political and so-called religious leaders talk about non-violence; but the fact is that man is violent. You are violent, and your violence is expressed not only through everyday ambition, but also through this tremendous effort you make to control, to discipline yourself, to force yourself to conform to a particular pattern. There are various kinds of violence, are there not? There is violence as cruelty to others; and the very essence of self-fulfilment is also violence. The cultivation of non-violence is a form of violence. This is a fact and, yet, you cultivate non-violence as though it were a tremendous virtue. The acceptance of non-violence as an ideal is a process by which you become respectable through being recognized by society as a virtuous person. To be respectable, you must have the earmarks of non-violence; you must show that you are non-violent, and your virtue must be recognizable by the people around you, by society.

So, recognition plays an immense part in what we call virtue. But virtue which is cultivated by the mind, which is recognized and accepted by society and has, therefore, become respectable, is not virtue at all. I think that this is very important to understand, because it is one of the major factors which is making the mind dull. What matters, surely, is to see the fact that one is violent, to go into it, to understand it and not resist it — which does not mean that you must become violent and hit somebody! The important thing is to understand deeply the feeling of violence, which expresses itself in so many ways. If you begin to understand

that every form of so-called virtue which is brought into being through effort, through resistance, through suppression, is destructive to sensitivity, then you will see that there is a virtue which is entirely different, because it is not the product of a cunning mind.

I wonder if you have ever felt a sense of humility? Most of us, I am sure, have felt respect. And where there is respect, there is also disrespect. You are respectful to your boss, to the great of the land: to the people who have power, position, authority. You show respect in order to get something in return; you give a garland in order to receive a blessing. You bow very low to the man above you, and push aside others who don't matter to you — they are the servants, the underlings, the underdogs. Now, there is a quality which has no element either of respect or disrespect, and that is the sense of humility. The mind in a state of humility is neither respectful nor disrespectful. The mind that wants something in return is full of respect and disrespect. Having disrespect, it cultivates respect, which is a resistance to disrespect; so disrespect goes on festering like a wound in the mind. But the mind that has a sense of humility is in an entirely different state.

Now if we — as we are listening this evening — can be sensitive to and directly experience that state of humility, we will have touched something which cannot be recognized. Do you understand? You cannot say, 'Well, my mind is humble, and I know what it means'. The moment the recognizing process takes place, there is no longer a state of humility. Please understand this. Love is not recognizable. When we say that we love someone, we are using a word to communicate a feeling; but the moment we have recognized and expressed that feeling, the quality of it has already changed. What we can do, surely, is to see for ourselves that as long as the mind is in a state of respect and disrespect, it has not the quality of humility.

As I was saying, the quality of humility is not recognizable. Anything that is recognized by the mind as humility, is not humility. So one has to be aware of the manner of one's speech, the manner of one's being; one has to discover what is behind the words, the gestures, the actions. *Through negation one comes to the positive, which is humility.* Though humility is not recognizable, not describable as respect and disrespect are, it has a positive quality which can be felt when the other state is not. A mind that is conscious of itself as being virtuous is really an immoral mind, and however much it may cultivate virtue, morality, it is still immoral. Now, just leave it at that.

Let us go on to the next thing, which is: Why do most of us have an urge, a compulsion to commit ourselves to something? We belong to a party, to a group, to a sect. We commit ourselves to a framework of ideas, to a set of beliefs, to a system of philosophy. We regard ourselves as Communists, socialists, imperialists, capitalists, as followers of a particular *guru*, and all the rest of it. Why? Please, I am going to answer the question; and if you who belong to something find out, as I am talking, why you belong, then my explanation will have a meaning, a significance.

Now, the politicians all over the world talk about peace, and we all want peace. A mind in conflict is destructive. Obviously, conflict, war, is destructive, and we realize that there must be peace. So what do we do? We immediately begin to join organizations, we commit ourselves to the Communists or to some other group which says that it is going to bring about world peace. And what happens? You are committed to one group, and I to another so, inevitably, we are in conflict with each other. If I am in the capitalists' camp, I say that the Communists' talk about world peace is double talk, and *vice versa*. So, the moment we belong to a group which promises peace, we are already in conflict with another group which promises peace in a

different way; and the result is that we all talk about peace while perpetuating conflict.

Surely, we have to begin by understanding why we commit ourselves, why we belong to something or other. Why do you call yourself an Indian, a Moslem, a Buddhist, a Christian, a Communist? Obviously, for a very simple reason. You desire to be identified with a group, to belong to something, because it gives you a sense of security. You say, 'Action is necessary; therefore we must join together'.. And the moment you join together and have formed a group, you are battling with another group which wants to act in the same way. In other words, the action which comes from commitment to a party, to a political or religious group, to a particular society, *guru*, culture, or way of life, invariably leads to conflict. And this is fairly obvious in the world at the present time.

Now, I think there is a totally different kind of action when the mind does not belong to anything, when it is not committed to any group. But first let us investigate why we have this compulsion to belong.

It is not only the little man who has this compulsion, but also the great intellectual, the saint; they all want to belong to something. Why? Observe yourself and you will see that if you do not belong to something, you feel insecure. Insecurity means fear, insecurity means economic loss. And, also, belonging to something gives to the self a feeling of expansion. Being a Communist, or a Catholic, or belonging to any other big, wide-spread organization, with all the implications involved in it, gives you an immense feeling of security. It also gives you a sense of importance; and from this sense of importance there springs action which invariably produces conflict with others.

Do, please, look at the phenomenon that is going on in the world.

**First we create this ugly thing called nationalism, thereby dividing ourselves into conflicting groups and, then — still holding on to our nationalism — we say that there must be internationalism, brotherhood, and all that nonsense. What will bring peace to the world is really comprehensive action, that is, action outside the patterns which divide people and create conflict. When you and I do not belong to a thing, when we are not Indians, Americans, Christians, Buddhists, when we have put aside all these political and religious divisions which are destroying people, it is only then that we can meet as human beings with dignity, and set about solving our many problems. The Communists are not going to solve our problems; nobody can solve them except you and me *when we have not committed ourselves to any group, to any pattern of action. When we have not committed ourselves to any group, to any pattern of action, then there is an action which is much more dynamic, much more creative, much more vital.* Most of us have committed ourselves; we belong to something, and that is one of the major reasons for our minds being so stupidly dull. It is a fact which we do not see, though it is right under our noses.**

Sirs, do think it out; don't just agree with me. Your agreement or disagreement has very little significance. What has significance is to purge your thought, your whole system, of the urge to belong to something. You cannot be free of that urge unless you are aware of it in yourself, unless you examine it, go into it, understand it. If you do not condemn or justify it, if you do not say that it is natural, that everybody wants to belong to something, and so on, but understand it, really grasp the truth of it, then you will find that you are entirely free of it instantaneously. That is one of the strange things about truth. *The perception of what is true in a problem, frees the mind from the problem. You don't have to do a thing.*

In the same way, one has to see the fact that to belong to any

group, to be committed to any religious or philosophical system, to any pattern of action, is destructive, because it divides men and makes the mind dull. When you are committed, when you belong to something, you cease to think beyond the prescribed pattern, because the moment you do, you become critical, and then you are thrown out, you are made insecure. Belonging to a group may make for very effective, efficient action, but that action is destructive. You resist seeing this fact because you do not know an action which is not the outcome of commitments, of belonging to something. But it is only when you don't belong to anything, to any organization, to any group, that *there is a possibility of discovering, through that sense of negation, a positive action which is total*. Do, please, understand this.

So one sees that virtue, as we know and cultivate it, is one of the factors that make the mind dull, mechanical. Another factor that makes the mind dull is the feeling of belonging to something. And there is a third factor which makes the mind dull: the desire for power.

I do not know if you have ever noticed in yourself this desire for power. You want to be prominent, famous; you want your opinion to be known, whether it is to a small circle of people, or on a worldwide scale. There is in each one of us this intense urge to be somebody, to be recognized by society as a successful person. If you watch your own mind you will see how, in a small way or in a big way, you crave recognition.

Please, sirs, this is very important to understand, because, as you will see, *a mind that is established in power is an evil mind. All power is evil*, whether it be political power or so-called religious power. The moment you have achieved power, position, success, your mind has already lost its suppleness, its alertness, its quickness, its extraordinary quality of natural growth, of gentleness.

You know, it is a most difficult thing to be anonymous. Many of us have a craving for anonymity. We reach a point when we want to be anonymous, because there is beauty in complete anonymity and, invariably, one feels extraordinarily free. So, what do we do? — We put on a loincloth, or enter a monastery, or take another name; but inwardly we are still full of ambition, only of a different kind. As we now want to be known as a spiritual man, we only discard one cloth and take another, we get rid of one name and assume another. Outwardly we put on a show of anonymity but, inwardly, we are burning with vanity and pursuing power. Our ‘humility’ consists in putting on a loincloth, or a robe, or taking only one meal a day — all of which is recognizable by society as being respectable.

I know you all smile and agree, but you are all after exactly the same thing. (*Laughter*) Don't laugh it away, sirs. You all want power, you all want position, prestige — though there may be one or two exceptions. And the mind that is seeking power, thinking it will do good, is a very destructive mind, because it is concerned with itself. Sirs, *truth cannot be found unless the mind is totally anonymous*. I wonder if you have noticed that *love is anonymous*! I may love my wife, my children, but the quality of that love is anonymous. Like the sunset, love is neither yours nor mine.

So there is evil, corruption, when the mind is immersed in power. And the desire for power is one of the most difficult things to wipe out. It is not easy to be nobody, to be inwardly anonymous. You may say, ‘In sitting on the platform and talking, are you not expressing yourself?’ Outwardly one may be talking, but inwardly one can be totally anonymous. And when there is this sense of complete anonymity, then you will find that there comes a comprehensive action which has nothing to do with the past, or with the thirst for power that creates such animosity and evil in the world. All power is evil, whether it be the power of nations,

the power of leaders, the power of a wife over her husband, or of the husband over his wife and children. If you observe yourself when you are not posing, you will see, in the secret recesses of your own mind, that you, too, want power to dominate, to be known, to have your name appear in the newspapers; and when a mind is seeking power, it is a destructive mind, it can never bring about peace in the world.

So, these are factors that make the mind dull: the virtue which is cultivated by the mind and recognized by society as being virtuous; the thought and the action of a mind which is committed to a particular pattern of ideas; and the search for power, position, prestige. All these imply a self-centred activity, a self-importance, a self-expansion — do they not? It is this process that makes the mind dull, and a dull mind loses all its sensitivity.

Now, I do not know if you have ever considered what is beauty. I am not suddenly talking about something entirely different, because it is related to all that has been said this evening. I wonder if you have ever stopped of an evening to look at the sky. On your way here, did you notice the stormy clouds, their shape, their darkness, their depth, the extraordinary sense of power behind them? If you saw all that beauty, did you have a reaction to it, or was there only a sense of total perception in which there was no reaction?

Please, I am afraid this is going to be rather difficult, in the verbal sense; but if you have ever felt the quality of beauty, you will be instantaneously aware of the significance of what is being said. Most of us are insensitive to the sky, to the road, to the passer-by, to death. But I am talking of a mind which is sensitive; I am inquiring into the nature of a mind that perceives beauty. Surely, when you perceive something totally, there is no reaction. You may express it in words, saying, 'What a lovely sunset it is', but the moment of total perception is a moment when your whole

being is in a state of non-identification through memory.

Sirs, I am not talking apart from you, I am thinking aloud with you; and to go beyond, you must move with me, playing with the words. *A mind that is not sensitive to beauty is a very sordid mind.* It may build great dams, it may help to carry out any number of five-year plans, it may do this and that; but *a mind that is insensitive to beauty is essentially a stupid mind, and it cannot create anything except that which is mechanical.*

We are talking of beauty. Where there is a complete experiencing of something, there is no reaction of memory and, hence, no furthering of memory through reaction. Such a mind is in a state of beauty; and beauty is related to love. Sirs, love is a passion.

Now, one has to be clear in the use of words. Most of us dread that word 'passion', because we live in a society which considers passion to be ugly, not respectable. But lust is different from passion. Love invariably goes with passion, not with lust. You have destroyed passion, carefully rooted it out, because you have said that passion is an ugly thing. And you are not passionate human beings. You may be lustful, and probably you are: sexually lustful. You are lustful after power, position, but you are not passionate human beings. And *you cannot be passionate if there is no self-abandonment.*

Do you understand? There must be that inward sense of austerity which in its very nature is simplicity. But you cannot cultivate austerity. If you do, it becomes a virtue which is recognizable and, therefore, respectable — a horrible thing. You know, sir, without passion, there is no passionate action. Mostly, the action that we have at present is not passionate; it is a calculated, cunning action.

Intensity, or passion, is the outcome of self-abnegation — not

the abnegation which is a denial of this and that. *Total self-abnegation brings about a state of austerity.* In this state of austerity, the mind is simple; and such a mind is a passionate mind. Only the passionate mind knows love, and only the mind that knows love — and not the artist who paints a picture and is full of his own egocentricity — can perceive what beauty is. Love is passionate; therefore love is beauty. Without beauty there is no love, and without love there is no beauty. *It is only the mind that perceives the everlasting to everlasting that can act without creating misery.*

Do, please, listen with your heart to what is being said, and do not regard it as a talk being given on a topic. It is your own mind of which you have to be aware. It is your own action that matters, not the action of the political or religious leaders. It is what you are, what your mind is that counts. *It is only the mind that has not committed itself, that does not belong to anything, that is not strengthening its own egocentricity through the cultivation of virtue, that is no longer seeking power — it is only such a mind — that knows love and, therefore, beauty. Such a mind, surely, is totality; it has no beginning and no end, and its action is a blessing, not a curse. Only such a mind can receive the real, can receive that which is immeasurable.*

— New Delhi  
9th March, 1960

## THE ESSENCE OF BEING IS NON-BEING

*The essence of thought is that state when thought is not.* However deeply and widely thought is pursued, thought will always remain shallow, superficial. The ending of thought is the

beginning of that essence. *The ending of thought is negation, and what is negative has no positive way*; there is no method, no system to end thought. The method, the system is a positive approach to negation and, thus, thought can never find the essence of itself. It must cease for the essence to be. *The essence of being is non-being, and to 'see' the depth of non-being, there must be freedom from becoming*. There is no freedom if there is continuity, and that which has continuity is time-bound. Every experience is binding thought to time, and a mind that's in a state of non-experiencing is aware of all essence. This state in which all experiencing has come to an end is not the paralysis of the mind; on the contrary, it's the additive mind, the mind that's accumulating, that is withering away. For accumulation is mechanical, a repetition; the denial to acquire and mere acquisition are both repetitive and imitative. *The mind that destroys totally this accumulative and defensive mechanism is free* and, so, experiencing has lost its significance.

Then there's only the fact and not the experiencing of the fact; the opinion of the fact, the evaluation of it, the beauty and non-beauty of it is the experiencing of the fact. The experiencing of the fact is to deny it, to escape from it. The experiencing of a fact without thought or feeling is a profound event.

— From: *Krishnamurti's Notebook*, 'Part 3, Gstaad, Switzerland, 20th August, 1961', London: Victor Gollancz, 1977, pp.57-58.

## DENIAL IS AN ACT, NOT AN IDEA

Most deny certain superficial and easy things; there are others who go far in their denial, and there are those who deny totally. To deny certain things — church and its gods, authority and the

power of those who have it, the politician and his ways, and so on — is comparatively easy. One can go pretty far in the denial of things that apparently do matter: relationships, the absurdities of society, the conception of beauty as established by the critics and of those who say they know. One can put aside all these and remain alone — alone not in the sense of isolation and frustration, but alone because one has seen the significance of all this and has walked away from them casually and without any sense of superiority. They are finished, dead, and there's no going back to them. But to go to the very end of denial is quite another matter; the essence of denial is the freedom in aloneness. But few go that far — shattering through every refuge, every formula, every idea, every symbol — to be naked, unburnt and clear.

But how necessary it is to deny: to deny without reaching out, to deny without the bitterness of experience and the hope of knowledge, to deny and stand alone, without tomorrow, without a future. The storm of denial is nakedness. To stand alone, without being committed to any course of action, to any conduct, to any experience, is essential, for this alone frees consciousness from the bondage of time. Every form of influence is understood and denied, giving thought no passage in time. Denying time is the essence of timelessness.

To deny knowledge, experience, the known, is to invite the unknown. Denial is explosive; it is not an intellectual, ideational affair, something with which the brain can play. In the very act of denial there is energy, the energy of understanding and this energy is not docile, to be tamed by fear and convenience. *Denial is destructive; it is unaware of consequences*; it is not a reaction and, so, not the opposite of assertion. To assert that there is or that there is not, is to continue in reaction, and *reaction is not denial. Denial has no choice and so is not the outcome of conflict*. Choice is conflict and conflict is immaturity. Seeing the

truth as truth, the false as false, and the truth in the false is the act of denial. *It's an act and not an idea.* The total denial of thought, the idea and the word brings freedom from the known. With the total denial of feeling, emotion and sentiment, there's love. Love is beyond and above thought and feeling.

*The total denial of the known is the essence of freedom.*

— From: *Krishnamurti's Notebook*, 'Part 3, Gstaad, Switzerland, 29th August 1961', London: Victor Gollancz, 1977, pp. 78-79.

### **WHEN THE BRAIN IS IN A STATE OF NEGATION, IT IS CHOICELESSLY STILL**

To see wholly, the brain has to be in a state of negation. Negation is not the opposite of the positive; all opposites are related within the fold of each other. Negation has no opposite. *The brain has to be in a state of negation for total seeing*; it must not interfere with its evaluations and justifications, with its condemnations and defences. It has to be still, not made still by compulsion of any kind, for then it is a dead brain, merely imitating and conforming. When it is in a state of negation, it is choicelessly still. Only then is there total seeing. In this total seeing which is the quality of the mind, there is no seer, no observer, no experiencer; there is only seeing. The mind then is completely awake. In this fully wakened state, there is no observer and the observed; there is only light, clarity. The contradiction and conflict between the thinker and thought ceases.

— From: *Krishnamurti's Notebook*, 'Part 4, Paris, 25th September 1961', London: Victor Gollancz, 1977, p.126.

## NEGATION IS A MARVELLOUS MOVEMENT OF LIFE AND MEDITATION IS PUREST NEGATION

The flowering of meditation is goodness. Meditation is not a virtue to be gathered bit by bit, slowly in the space of time; it is not morality made respectable by society, nor is it the sanction of authority. It is the beauty of meditation that gives perfume to its flowering. How can there be joy in meditation if it is the coaxing of desire and pain? How can it flower if you are seeking it through control, suppression and sacrifice? How can it blossom in the darkness of fear, or in corrupting ambition and in the smell of success? How can it bloom in the shadow of hope and despair? You will have to leave all these far behind, without regret, easily, naturally. You see, meditation has not the strain of building defenses, to resist and to wither; it is not fashioned out of a sustained practice of any system. All systems will inevitably shape thought to a pattern, and conformity destroys the flowering of meditation. It blossoms only in freedom and the withering of that which is. *Without freedom there is no self-knowing, and without self-knowing there is no meditation.* Thought is always petty and shallow however far it may wander in search of knowledge. Acquiring expanding knowledge is not meditation. It flowers only in the freedom from the known and withers away in the known ....

Meditation is not a play of imagination. *Every form of image, word, symbol must come to an end for the flowering of meditation.* The mind must lose its slavery to words and their reaction. Thought is time, and symbol, however ancient and significant, must lose its grip on thought. Thought then has no continuity; it is then only from moment to moment and, so, loses its mechanical insistency; thought then does not shape the mind and enclose it within the frame of ideas and condition it to culture, to the society, in which it lives. *Freedom is not from society but*

*from idea*; then relationship, society, does not condition the mind. The whole of consciousness is residual, changing, modifying, conforming, and mutation is only possible when time and idea have come to an end. The ending is not a conclusion, a word to be destroyed, an idea to be denied or accepted. It is to be understood through self-knowing. Knowing is not learning; knowing is recognition and accumulation which prevents learning. Learning is from moment to moment, for the 'self', the 'me', is ever-changing, never constant. Accumulation, knowledge, distorts and puts an end to learning. Gathering knowledge, however expanding its frontier, becomes mechanical, and a mechanical mind is not a free mind. Self-knowing liberates the mind from the known. To live the entire life in the activity of the known breeds endless conflict and misery. Meditation is not personal achievement, a personal quest for reality; it becomes one when it is restricted by methods and systems and thereby deceptions and illusions are bred. *Meditation frees the mind from the narrow, limited existence to the ever-expanding, timeless life ....*

A country without a river is desolate. It is a small river, if it can be called a river, but it has a fairly large bridge of stone and brick\* which is not too wide, and the buses and cars have to go slowly and there are always people on foot and the inevitable bicycle. It pretends to be a river, and during the rains it looks like a deep, full river; but now, when the rains are nearly over, it looks like a large sheet of water with a large island, with many bushes in the middle of it. It goes to the sea, due east, with a great deal of animation and joy. But now there is a wide sand-bar and so it waits for the next rainy season. Cattle were fording on to the island and a few fishermen were trying to catch some

---

The Elphinstone Bridge over the Aday - River. The house where he was staying was on the north-west side of the bridge.

fish; the fish were always small, about the size of a large finger and they smelt dreadful as they were being sold under the trees. And that evening, in the quiet waters, was a large heron, utterly frozen and still. It was the only bird on the river; in the evening crows and other birds would be flying across the river but there were none that evening, except for this single heron. You couldn't help seeing it; it was so white, motionless, with a sunlit sky. The yellow sun and the pale green sea were some distance and as the land went towards them, three large palm trees faced the river and the sea. The evening sun was upon them and the sea beyond, restless, dangerous and pleasantly blue. From the bridge, the sky seemed so vast, so close and unspoiled; it was far from the airport. But that evening, that single heron and the three palm trees were the whole earth, time past and present and life that had no past. Meditation became a flowering without roots and so a dying. *Negation is a marvellous movement of life and the positive is only a reaction to life, a resistance.* With resistance there is no death but only fear; fear breeds further fear and degeneration. Death is the flowering of the new; meditation is the dying of the known ....

What an extraordinary thing meditation is. If there is any kind of compulsion, effort to make thought conform, imitate, then it becomes a wearisome burden. The silence which is desired ceases to be illuminating; if it is the pursuit of visions and experiences, then it leads to illusions and self-hypnosis. Only in the flowering of thought and, so, ending thought does meditation have significance; thought can only flower in freedom not in ever-widening patterns of knowledge. Knowledge may give newer experiences of greater sensation but a mind that is seeking experiences of any kind is immature. Maturity is the freedom from all experience; it is no longer under any influence to be and not to be. Maturity in meditation is the freeing of the mind from knowledge for it shapes and controls all experience. A mind which is a light to itself needs no experience.

Immaturity is the craving for greater and wider experience. *Meditation is the wandering through the world of knowledge and being free of it to enter into the unknown ....*

Every act of meditation is never the same, there is a new breath, a new shattering; there is no pattern to be torn down for there is no building of another, a new habit covering the old. All habits, however recently acquired, are old; they are formed out of the old, but meditation is not shattering the old for a new pattern. It was new and shattering; it was new, not in the field of the old; it had never entered into that ground; it was new as it had never known the old; it was shattering in itself; it was not breaking down something but it itself was destruction. It destroyed and, so, it was new and there was creation ....

There is no toy in meditation which absorbs you ... It is the destruction of all toys, visions, ideas, experience that goes to the making of meditation. You must lay the foundation for true meditation otherwise you will be caught in various forms of illusion. *Meditation is purest negation*, negation which is not the outcome of reaction. To deny and to remain with the denial in negation is action without motive, which is love.

— From: *Krishnamurti's Notebook*, 'Part 7, Madras, November-December, 1961', London: Victor Gollancz, 1977, pp. 197- 217.

## **TO BE NOTHING IS THE MOST NATURAL AND INTELLIGENT THING TO DO**

It is strange, the desire to show off or to be somebody. Envy is hate and vanity corrupts. It seems so impossibly difficult to be simple, to be what you are and not pretend. To be what you are without trying to become something is in itself very arduous; trying to become something is not too difficult. You can always pretend,

put on a mask. To be what you are is an extremely complex affair, because you are always changing; you are never the same, and each moment reveals a new facet, a new depth, a new surface. You can't be all this at one moment, for each moment brings its own change. So, if you are at all intelligent, you give up being anything. You think that you are very sensitive, but an incident, a fleeting thought, shows that you are not; you think that you are clever, well-read, artistic, moral but, turn round the corner, you find that you are none of these things; you find that you are deeply ambitious, envious, insufficient, brutal and anxious. You are all these things turn by turn, and you want something to be continuous, permanent — of course it has to be only that which is profitable, pleasurable. So you run after that and all the many other 'yous' are clamouring to have their way, to have their fulfilment. So you became the battlefield with — generally — ambition, with pleasures and pain, with gaining, with envy and fear. The word 'love' is thrown in for respectability's sake and to hold the family together. But you are caught in your own commitments and activities; you are isolated, clamouring for recognition and fame; you are caught: you and your country, you and your party, you and your comforting god.

So, to be what you are is an extremely arduous affair. If you are at all awake, you know all these things and the sorrow of it all. So, you drown yourself in your work, in your belief, in your fantastic ideals and meditations. And by then you become old and ready for the grave, if you are not already dead inwardly. *To put away all these things*, with their contradictions and increasing sorrow, *and be nothing is the most natural and intelligent thing to do*. But before you can be nothing, you must have unearthed all these hidden things, exposing them and, so, understanding them. To understand these hidden urges and compulsions, you will have to be aware of them, without choice, as with death. Then in the pure act of seeing, they will wither away and you will be without sorrow and, so, be as nothing. *To*

*be as nothing is not a negative state. The very denial of everything you have been is the most positive action. (It is not the positive of reaction, which is inaction; it is this inaction which causes sorrow.) This denial is freedom. This positive action gives energy; mere ideas dissipate energy. Idea is time, and living in time is disintegration, sorrow.*

— From: *Krishnamurti's Notebook*, 'Part 7, Madras, 27th November, 1961', London: Victor Gollancz, 1977, pp.201-202.

## NEGATION IS THE DEPTH OF LIFE

One of our unfortunate deceptions is that we can use time as a means to something: as a means of change, revolution, mutation. It is not possible. No amount of time, no amount of authority in any form, no following, no asking someone else to tell me what to do, no looking to a religion, to a pope, is going to make a complete revolution in the mind. Knowing that they are absolutely empty — a circus — I deny all those totally. Then, what has taken place in a mind that is serious, that has denied time — time being today or tomorrow, the extension of today — as a means of bringing about a mutation within oneself?

I deny authority — which means no following, no looking to another, no depending on anyone: no *guru*, no teacher. I deny all that intelligently — not as a reaction, not as a revolt but because I see the truth of it, because I see the intelligence of it. When I have put aside all that, what has taken place in the mind? In the past I have believed. I have had faith in someone to tell me what to do; I have followed the scriptures, or Marx or Engel or the latest theologian. Or, perhaps, I don't believe in anything and have merely become cynical, hopeless — which is another

reaction and, therefore, I do not have a serious mind at all. If I see all this, understand all this — if I am not in revolt, but have understood it and seen the worthlessness of it, and put it all away — then what has taken place in my mind? Through negation of what has been accepted as the norm, as the pattern, as the way to something — to this or that — through the denial of all that, the mind has become astonishingly sensitive and, therefore, extraordinarily alive and intelligent. *Through what is called the positive, it has become negative.* It is only when the mind has completely denied all that we have called the positive way of existence that there is a state of negation. That very state of *negation is the depth of life, because it is only in total negation that there is something new, something which is not the result of seeking, wanting, groping after; it has nothing whatsoever to do with any system or philosophy.* The mind, seeing the whole significance of every conditioning, seeing (not as a reaction) the worth of every influence — all the encrustations of centuries — and getting rid of the whole of it, putting it totally aside, becomes astonishingly alive, sensitive and intelligent. It is only when the mind is completely empty of the old that there is the new. Then, there is no longer the question of whether one is leading a superficial life, because then one lives. And the very living is a movement which is not the movement of the old pattern, the old life. It is a totally different way of living in which there is not the animal at all. That is really the revolution, because it is like love. Love must be always new. Love is not memory; love is not desire. A mind which has understood all this, which has understood time and authority is free. Only a mind that is totally free knows the beauty of life. That mind is not bound by any boundary, and that life is one of extraordinary peace and beauty.

— Saanen  
24th July, 1966

## THE COMPLETE STATE OF NEGATION IS THE HIGHEST FORM OF PASSION

Can the mind be completely quiet — neither thinking, nor afraid — and, therefore, extraordinarily alive, intense? Do you know the word ‘passion’? That word, so often, signifies suffering. The Christians have used that word to symbolize certain forms of suffering. But we are not using that word ‘passion’ in that sense at all. *The complete state of negation is the highest form of passion.* And passion implies total self-abandonment. For such complete self-abandonment there must be tremendous austerity — austerity that is not the harshness of the priest agonizing people, of saints who have tortured themselves, who have brutalized their minds. Austerity is really an extraordinary simplicity — simplicity not in clothes, not in food, but inwardly. *This austerity, this passion, is the highest form of total negation.* And then, perhaps if you are lucky, — no; there is no luck there — the thing comes uninvited. Then the mind is no longer capable of striving. Then you do what you will, because then there will be love. And, without this religious mind a true society cannot be created. We must create a new society in which the terrible activity of self-interest has very little place. It is only with such a religious mind that there can be peace — outwardly as well as inwardly.

— Paris  
30th April, 1967

## WHEN YOU HAVE TOTALLY DENIED THE WORLD YOU HAVE SPACE AND SILENCE

You know we are never silent. We are either having a dialogue with ourselves, or with somebody else. The machinery of thought is incessantly active, projecting itself — what it should do, what

it must not do, how it has been, and so on. It is endlessly chattering, chattering, chattering. It is conforming, accepting, comparing, judging, condemning, imitating, obeying.

Now, there are various forms of meditation which tell you how to control thought. But controlling thought is not meditation at all. Anybody can concentrate, from the schoolboy to the general preparing for war. And it is not a chattering mind, not a controlled mind, not a mind that is either tortured, suppressed, or yielding, and indulging that can perceive, that can actually see. *It is only a very silent mind that can actually see.* You only see a cloud — with its full light and beauty — or a leaf, when your mind is completely silent. Then you actually see it. Then, in that silence, the space between you and the leaf disappears — which doesn't mean that you identify yourself with the leaf (that is idiotic). The mind must be completely silent — *not* made silent. You can make the mind very silent by taking a tranquillizer, a drug, or by controlling, forcing, it; but such a mind is a stagnant mind, a dull mind. But when one understands the nature of chattering, comparing — the endless dialogue, gossip, that goes on within oneself — the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet. Now, to understand it, to be actually aware of it as it is taking place, is not an intellectual process. It is out of that alertness, out of that watchfulness, that the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet. (Which doesn't mean that the mind goes to sleep, or becomes blank.)

That is, when you have totally denied the world, the psychological world which man has created for himself, and you have totally denied the society in which you live — that is, the psychological structure of society of which you are: the greed, the envy, the brutality, the violence, the jealousies, the hatred — then you have space and silence. And it is only such a mind that is the religious mind; it does not belong to any organized, propagandist religion.

It is only such a mind that can see what is the immeasurable. And such a mind cannot, does not, experience, because it is a light to itself.

— From: *Talks in Europe 1967*, '5th Public Talk, Amsterdam, 30th May 1967', Wassenaar: Servire Publications, 1969, pp.138-139.

### **TO LEARN ABOUT YOURSELF, YOU HAVE TO DENY EVERYTHING YOU HAVE LEARNT ABOUT YOURSELF**

I want to learn about myself. I don't think one sees the extraordinary importance of learning about oneself — not what others have said about one (however great a specialist they may be). I don't think we are very keen about actually learning about ourselves; we accept more readily secondhand information about ourselves. You know, there are all these *Yogis*, *Swāmis*, *Maharshis* — the whole gang of them — wandering through India, and through this country [England], and through Europe and America. People are so gullible; they follow another — one who promises something — so easily. But *to learn about myself demands a total denial of the past, a denial of everything I have learnt about myself, because I am a living thing.* I am a movement, something that is constantly undergoing a change through strain, through pressure, through daily life, through propaganda, through the constant pressure of the world and of relationship.

And that living thing we are trying to translate in terms of the past. We are examining that living thing through the past, and that's why we find it so extraordinarily difficult to learn about ourselves. *We have the standard of the past* — the right and the wrong, the good and the bad (not that there is not good and

bad) — *we have this image established, rooted in the past, and that image prevents the understanding of the present, which is the living me.*

And so the question arises whether it is not possible to discard the outward authority of the whole spiritual system: the church, books, the religious leaders, the theologians, the whole ... I don't know what word to use; I feel they are real exploiters! The question is whether it is not possible to wipe out all that with one blow, as it were, and also to wipe out this accumulative psychological process — through experience, through knowledge, through learning — so that there is a foundation from which to start to learn. This means, really: Can the mind which observes this very simply and very clearly — if it is at all sane and healthy, not neurotic and emotional — then ask itself, 'Is it possible to face the fear that inevitably comes when you stand completely alone?' Because when you deny outer authority as well as inner authority — knowing that you may go totally wrong, knowing that there is, when you are learning about yourself, no guide, no philosopher, no friend, no direction — then, inevitably, this fear arises. This fear invariably comes through comparison. That is: somebody has got this enlightenment, and I haven't got it; I would like to get it. Then there is the fear of making a mistake, of wasting time. And, also, there is the fear of having no support, of being completely alone. After all, *one has to be alone; one is alone.* When you deny the whole psychological structure of society — which is to be outside society (and one must be, psychologically) — then, obviously, you're alone; but it is not the aloneness of the priest, which is isolation. Nor is it the aloneness of a person who has committed himself to a particular course of action. Nor is it the aloneness of the person who is abandoned, who has no place in society. When you repudiate the whole psychological structure of society you are, inevitably, alone, and that breeds a great deal of fear. Most of us are the past, and we live with the past. The older one gets, the more the past becomes extraordinarily

significant; it becomes the guide.

To deny all that is necessary, because I want to learn about myself. And when I do deny all this, is there anything about myself to learn? I've learnt already; I've finished with learning — I don't know if you see this point — because, what am I learning about myself? I want to learn about myself, and I see that to learn there must be freedom from every form of authority, not merely verbally but actually in every second, every minute of the day. I see in myself the inclination to follow, because I am afraid. And I see in myself the danger, the fear, of being utterly alone. And I see in myself the fear of making a mistake, of not arriving, of not achieving, of not gaining that something which lies beyond all thought, all experience.

And when I have examined all this, what is there of 'me' to learn about? I've already learnt; I've learnt the total nature of myself. But there still remains this thing called fear. And if we may, we'll go into it, because a mind that is caught in fear in any form, conscious or unconscious, must live in a darkened world, it must see things in distortion; it can never understand something that is really free. Being afraid, we naturally and inevitably develop a series of networks of escapes — whether those escapes be the football field, the church, or the pub.

So is it possible to be free of fear? Because that's part of myself. I've examined the reactions of authority — following, imitation, acceptance, obedience — and I find that behind all this there is this quality of fear. And to understand fear and go into it, one must be aware of it and not accept it because somebody tells you that you are afraid.

— From: *Talks in Europe, 1967*, 'London, 2nd Public Talk, 17th September 1967', Wassenaar: Servire Publications, 1969, pp. 163-165.

## NEGATION IS A GREAT FORCE IT IS THE MOST POSITIVE ACTION

'Firstly, what is this thing that is going to make us change? And secondly, change to what?'

Surely, the second question is involved in the first, isn't it? If you already know what you are changing to, is that change at all? If one knows what one will be tomorrow, then what-will-be is already in the present. The future is the present; the known future is the known present. The future is the projection, modified, of what is known now.

'Yes, I see that very clearly. So there is only, then, the question of change, and not the verbal definition of what we change to. So we'll limit ourselves to the first question. How do we change? What is the drive, the motive, the force that will make us break down all barriers?'

Only complete inaction, only the complete negation of what-is. *We do not see the great force that is in negation.* If you reject the whole structure of principle and formula and, hence, the power, the authority, derived from it, that very rejection gives you the force necessary to reject all other structures of thought. And, so, you have the energy to change! *The rejection is that energy.*

'Is this what you call "dying" to the historical accumulation which is the present?'

Yes. That very dying is to be born anew. There you have the whole movement of change — the dying to the known.

'Is this rejection a positive, definite act?'

When the students revolt it is a positive, definite act, but such action is only very partial and fragmentary. It is not a total rejection. When you ask: 'Is it a positive act, this dying, this rejection?' — it is and it isn't. When you positively leave a house and enter into another house, your positive action ceases to be a positive action at all because you have abandoned one power structure for another, which you will again have to leave. So this constant repetition which appears to be a positive action, is really inaction. But if you reject the desire and the search for all inward security, then it is a *total negation* which is a *most positive action*. It is this action only which transforms man. If you reject hate and envy — in every form — you are rejecting the whole structure of what man has created in himself and outside himself. It is very simple. One problem is related to every other problem.

'So, is this what you call "seeing the problem"?'

This seeing reveals the whole structure and nature of the problem. The 'seeing' is not the analyzing of the problem; it is not the revealing of the cause and the effect. It is all there, laid out, as it were, on a map. It is there for you to see, and *you can see it only if you have no stand from which to look*; and this is our difficulty. We are committed. Inwardly it gives us great pleasure to 'belong'. When we belong, then it is not possible to see; when we belong, we become irrational, violent — and, then, we want to end violence by belonging to something else. And so we are caught in a vicious circle. And this is what man has done for millions of years and he vaguely calls this 'evolution'. Love is not at the end of time. Either it is now, or it isn't. And hell is when it is not.

— From: *Five Conversations*, 'First Conversation', Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India, 1995, pp. 6-8. (From: 'Holiday Book' — Dictations given in Malibu, 1968.)

## THE NEGATION OF DISORDER IS THE POSITIVE NATURE OF CHANGE

The nature of change is the negation of disorder. Disorder cannot be made into order. But the denial of disorder is the nature of the change: the very denial is the change. *The negation of disorder is the positive nature of change.* That is, I see disorder in myself: anger, jealousy, brutality, violence, suspicion, guilt — you know what human beings are. I'm aware of it. The mind is totally aware of all this disorder. Can it completely negate it, put it away? When it does so, through negation, the nature of change is the positive order. *The positive can only come through the negative.* Look, sir, I see nationalism, the division of religions, the separateness that belief brings about: all the conflict, the disorder: I see that actually; I feel it in my blood. And I put it away, not verbally, but actually — in myself I belong to no country, to no religion; I subscribe to no dogma, no belief. Then that negation of what is false, which is the nature of the change, is truth.

— From: *You Are The World*, 'Chapter 9, 2nd Public Talk at Stanford University, 12th February, 1969', Wassenaar: Servire Publications, 1972, p. 125.

## THE NEGATION OF DISORDER IS SILENCE

**AUDIENCE (A):** What the lady is asking, sir, is: How can you negate that which you are. You said that to negate disorder is change. The lady asks: 'If I am the disorder, how can I negate it?'

**J KRISHNAMURTI (K):** Ah! I will explain. How can I negate disorder if I am disorder? I am the nation, I am the belief, the disorder. If the 'I' negates disorder, that very I, which is separate,

will create yet another form of disorder. That is your question, madame? Right. When you say 'negate disorder', what do you mean by that? Who is there to negate disorder? Please, follow this slowly, step by step. This disorder is the cause of thought: my belief and your belief, my God and your God, my formula and your formula, my prejudice opposed to your prejudice. So, I am that disorder and thought is that disorder, because I am thought. Right? Thought is me and the 'me' is disorder. So, when one negates this, one negates thought, not disorder — it is *not* 'I' negate it. Look, I am disorder. This disorder is created by thought, which is me and which brings about separation. That's a fact. What, then is the negation of this fact? Who is it that is going to deny this disorder and put it aside? What is it that is going to change this? Is that clear? Now *the negation of disorder is silence*. Any movement of thought will only breed further disorder. Then you will ask: How is thought to come to an end, who is to bring to a stop this perpetual motion that is going on night and day?

Thought itself must deny itself. Thought itself sees what it is doing — right? — and, therefore, thought itself realizes that it has to come of itself to an end. There is no other factor than itself. Therefore, when thought realizes that whatever it does, any movement that it makes, is disorder (we are taking that as an example), then there is silence. The nature of the change from disorder is silence.

I do not know if you've ever seen or felt the quality of silence: when the mind and the body are extraordinarily quiet. That is, when you want to see something very clearly, when you want to hear something that is being said with all your heart and mind, your body is quiet and your mind is quiet. It is not a trick. It is quiet. In the same way, disorder and the manner of change are

resolved only when there is complete silence. It is silence that brings about order, not thought.

— From: *You Are The World*, 'Chapter 9, 2nd Public Talk at Stanford University, 12th February 1969', Wassenaar: Servire Publications, 1972, pp. 126-127.

## DENIAL IS NOT OF THE INTELLECT

What is living? The actuality of living is the daily grind, the routine, with its struggle and conflict. The ache of loneliness, the misery and the squalor of poverty and riches; the ambition, the search for fulfilment, the success and the sorrow — these cover the whole field of our life. Gaining and losing a battle, and the endless pursuit of pleasure — this is what we call living.

In contrast to this, or in opposition to this, there is what is called religious living or a spiritual life. But the opposite contains the very seed of its own opposite and, so, though it may appear different, actually it is not. You may change the outer garment, but the inner essence of what-was and of what-must-be is the same. This duality is the product of thought and, so, it breeds more conflict; and the corridor of this conflict is endless. All this we know; we have been told it by others or we have felt it for ourselves. And all this we call living.

*The religious life is not on the other side of the river; it is on this side — the side of the whole travail of man. It is this that we have to understand, and the action of understanding is the religious act, and not putting on ashes, wearing a loin cloth or a mitre, sitting in the seat of the mighty, or being carried on an elephant.*

The seeing of the whole condition — the pleasure and the misery of man — and not the speculation as to what a religious life should be is of the first importance. What-should-be is a myth; it is the morality which thought and fancy have put together. And one must deny this morality — social, religious, and industrial. This *denial is not of the intellect*, but is an actual slipping out of the pattern of that morality which is immoral.

— From: *The Only Revolution*, 'India, 10', London: Victor Gollancz, 1977, pp. 56-57. (First published in 1970.)

### THE NEGATION OF THOUGHT IS ATTENTION JUST AS THE NEGATION OF THOUGHT IS LOVE

That morning, especially so early, the valley was extraordinarily quiet. The owl had stopped hooting and there was no reply from its mate over in the distant hills. No dog was barking, and the village was not yet awake. In the east there was a glow, a promise, and the Southern Cross had not yet faded. There was not even a whisper among the leaves, and the earth itself seemed to have stopped in its rotation. You could feel the silence, touch it, smell it, and it had that quality of penetration. It wasn't the silence outside in those hills, among the trees, that was still; you were of it. You and it were not two separate things. The division between noise and silence had no meaning. And those hills, dark, without a movement, were of it, as you were.

This silence was very active. It was not the negation of noise and, strangely, that morning it had come through the window like some perfume. And with it came a sense, a feeling, of the absolute. As you looked out of the window, the distance between all things disappeared, and your eyes opened with the dawn and saw everything anew . . . .

The immeasurable cannot be sought by thought, for thought has always a measure. The sublime is not within the structure of thought and reason, nor is it the product of emotion and sentiment. *The negation of thought is attention; as the negation of thought is love.* If you are seeking the highest, you will not find it; it must come to you, if you are lucky — and luck is the open window of your heart, not of thought.

— From: *The Only Revolution*, 'India, 11', London: Victor Gollancz, 1977, pp.59-61. (First published in 1970.)

## THE MIND FREEING ITSELF FROM THE KNOWN IS MEDITATION

*The mind freeing itself from the known is meditation.* Prayer goes from the known to the known; it may produce results, but it is still within the field of the known — and the known is the conflict, the misery and confusion. *Meditation is the total denial of everything that the mind has accumulated.* The known is the observer, and the observer sees only through the known. The image is of the past, and *meditation is the ending of the past.*

— From: *The Only Revolution*, 'Europe, 6', London: Victor Gollancz, 1977, p. 123. (First published in 1970.)

## TO DENY ALL MORALITY IS TO BE MORAL

*To deny all morality is to be moral,* for the accepted morality is the morality of respectability. I'm afraid we all crave to be respected — which is to be recognized as good citizens in a rotten society. Respectability is very profitable and ensures you

a good job and a steady income. The accepted morality of greed, envy and hate is the way of the establishment.

When you totally deny all this, not with your lips but with your heart, then you are really moral. This morality springs out of love and not out of any motive of profit, of achievement, of place in the hierarchy. There cannot be this love if you belong to a society in which you want to find fame, recognition, a position. *When you deny all this from the very bottom of your heart, then there is a virtue that is encompassed by love.*

— From: *The Only Revolution*, 'Europe, 12', London: Victor Gollancz, 1977, pp. 144-145. (First published in 1970.)

## UNDERSTANDING IS NEGATION

*To live in this world we must deny the world.* By that we mean: deny the ideal, the war, the fragmentation, the competition, the envy, and so on. We don't mean 'deny the world' as a schoolboy revolts against his parents. We mean deny it because we understand it. This *understanding is negation.*

— From: *The Urgency Of Change*, 'Chapter 4, How To Live In This World', London: Victor Gollancz, 1971, p.32. (First published in 1970.)

## TOTAL NEGATION IS FREEDOM

**QUESTIONER (Q):** I know I am not free; I am caught in so many wants. How am I to be free, and what does it mean to be really, honestly free?

**J KRISHNAMURTI (K):** Perhaps this may help us to understand it: *total negation is freedom*. To negate everything we consider to be positive, to negate the total social morality, to negate all inward acceptance of authority, to negate everything one has said or concluded about reality, to negate all tradition, to negate all teaching, to negate all knowledge except technological knowledge, to negate all experience, to negate all the drives which stem from remembered or forgotten pleasures, to negate all fulfilment, to negate all commitments to act in a particular way, to negate all ideas, all principles, all theories — such *negation is the most positive action*. Therefore, it is freedom.

— From: *The Urgency Of Change*, 'Chapter 24, Conditioning', London: Victor Gollancz, 1971, p. 148. (First published in 1970.)

### **TO NEGATE IS OUR DIFFICULTY**

One must totally negate all that man has put together in his desire to find reality, and that is going to be our difficulty.

— From: *Krishnamurti in India 1970-'71*, 'Chapter 4, 4th Public Talk, New Delhi, 20th December, 1970', Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India, 1971, p.37.

### **TRUTH IS NOT SOMETHING TO BE BOUGHT THROUGH ANOTHER**

You must negate not merely verbally, or intellectually, theoretically, but actually every thing that man has said. One has to find out for oneself, because *truth is not something to be bought through another*. It is not something fixed, something that you can repeatedly 'add to' in order to discover it. Please, do realize that if one is really serious, one must totally negate all the

propaganda, for religion is a continuous propaganda. You are told what to do, what to think — either for over 5000 years or for the past 2000 years. So you must, if you are serious, totally put aside all that and find out for yourself what truth is — if there is such a thing. So it is important to understand yourself — not what others say about yourself. If you followed a psychologist or a philosopher or an analytical, intellectual person, or one of the teachers, however ancient, respected and all the rest of it, you are merely following what they are telling you about yourself. Therefore, you have to deny all that, for only then you begin to find out what you are.

— From: *Krishnamurti In India, 1970-'71*, 'Chapter 8, 3rd Public Talk, Madras, 13th January 1971', Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India, 1971, pp. 83-84.

### **TO FIND OUT WHAT LOVE IS, APPROACH IT NEGATIVELY**

An ambitious man, an aggressive man can never understand what love is — can he? A violent man — can he understand what love is? And you are violent, aggressive, ambitious, competitive. What you call love is pleasure. You say that you love your family. Do you know what it means to love somebody? It means no division; so it is not 'your family'. Do you understand, sir? 'Your family' is a deadly, inclusive, corrupt thing — but that is all you know — and that family is against everybody else. How can you love your wife or your children when you are ambitious. When you in your office are cheating, wanting a bigger position, playing up to the big man — how, then, can you love?

Therefore, to find out what love is, approach it negatively — negatively means do not be ambitious. You say, 'If I am not

ambitious I will be destroyed by this world'. Be destroyed by this world. It is a stupid world anyhow; it is a monstrous, immoral world. If you really want to find out the beauty, the real quality of love, you must deny all the virtue which man has cultivated. What you have cultivated is ambition, greed, envy, competition, holding on to your little self and your little family. Your family is yourself. You have identified yourself with the family, which means that you love yourself and not the family, not your children. If you really love your children, the world would be different; you would have no wars, sir. So, to find out what love is, you must put aside what it is not. Will you do it? You see, you will do anything but that. You will go to temples, you will go to a *guru*, you will read endless sacred books, repeat *mantras*, play tricks upon yourselves, and you will talk about love of God, your devotion to your *guru*. You won't do this one thing — which is, just to find out for yourself what it means to love, to find out for yourself what it means to be aggressive.

So a man who has not love, but the things made by thought in his heart, will make a monstrous world; he will construct, put together, a society that is totally immoral. And that is what you have done. So, to find out, you must undo everything that you have done — not through time, not saying 'I'll gradually undo it'. That is another trick of your mind. Then you say it is my *karma*. When you really understand aggression, how terrible it is, in a little way or a big way, you drop it instantly, and in that dropping there is great beauty.

— From: *Krishnamurti in India 1970-71*, 'Chapter 14, 3rd Public Talk, Bombay, 14th February 1971', Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India, 1971, pp. 168-169.

## DO NOT SEEK THE POSITIVE, COME TO IT BY UNDERSTANDING WHAT IT IS NOT

I want to find out how to live and act in this world. To go off into a monastery or escape to some *nirvāṇa* as asserted by some *guru* who promises, 'If you do this, you will get that' is nonsense. Putting that aside, I want to find out how to live in this world without any resistance, without any will. I also want to find out what love is. So my mind which has been conditioned to the demand of pleasure, of gratification, of satisfaction and, therefore, of resistance, sees that all that is not love.

So, what is love? You know, to find out what-is, one must deny, put aside totally what is not. *Through negation, come to the positive. Do not seek the positive, but come to it by understanding what it is not.* That is, if I want to find out what truth is — not knowing what it is — I must be able to see what is false. If I do not have the capacity to perceive what is false, I cannot see what truth is. So I must find out what is false.

What is false? — Everything that thought has put together — psychologically not technologically. That is, thought has put together the 'me', the 'self' with its memories, with its aggression, with its separativeness, with its ambitions, competitiveness, imitation, fear; all that has been put together by thought. And thought has put together the most extraordinary things mechanically. So thought, as the 'me', which has in essence no reality whatsoever, is the false. *When the mind understands what is false, then the truth is there.* Similarly, when the mind really inquires deeply into what love is, without saying that 'it is this' or that 'it is that', then it must see what it is not and completely drop it; otherwise it can't find the real. Is one capable of doing that? For instance, I say, 'Love is not ambition'; but if my mind is ambitious, wanting to achieve, wanting to become powerful, if

my mind is aggressive, competitive, imitative, then such a mind cannot possibly understand what love is. We see that — don't we?

Now can the mind see the falseness of it? Can it see that a mind that is ambitious cannot possibly love? Can it drop something instantly because it is false? *Only when you deny the false completely, the other is.* So, can we see very clearly that a mind seeking gain or achievement — either in the world or in the so-called spiritual seeking of enlightenment — cannot love? The drive to find out, to achieve is ambition. Therefore, can the mind see the falseness of it and completely drop it — instantly? Otherwise you won't find out what-is, and you will never find out what love is. Love is not jealousy — is it? Love is not possessiveness; it is not dependency. Do you see that? Do not carry it over with you to the next day, but drop it instantly. *The dropping of it instantly does not depend on will. It depends on whether you actually see the falseness of it.* When you drop that which is false — that which is not — then the other is.

— From: *The Awakening of Intelligence*, 'Part VII, Chapter 6, 6th Public Talk, Saanen, 29th July, 1971', London: Victor Gollancz, 1973, pp.358-359.

## **DENIAL WITHOUT A MOTIVE BRINGS ABOUT A NEW MIND**

We have been talking about creating a generation with a new quality of mind. How do we do this? If I were a teacher here, it would be my concern — and a good educator obviously has this concern at heart — to bring about a new mind, a new sensitivity, a new feeling for the trees, the skies, the heavens, the streams. It would be my concern to bring into being not the old

consciousness remolded into a new shape but a new consciousness, a totally new mind, uncontaminated by the past. How do I set about it?

First of all: Is it possible to bring about such a new mind — a mind which is not a continuity of the past in a new mould but a mind that is uncontaminated? Is it feasible? Or, must the past continue through the present to be modified and be put into a new mould? In which case there would be no new generation, but only the older generation repeated in a new form. I think that it is possible to create a new generation.

Now, how do I bring about a mind that is uncontaminated? You and I are not newborn. We have been contaminated by society, by Hinduism, by education, by the family, by newspapers. How do we break through the contamination? Do I say that it is part of my existence and accept it? What do I do, sir? Our minds are contaminated. The problem is to 'uncontaminate' the mind. How is it to be done? Either it is possible, or it is not possible. Now, how is one to discover whether it is or is not possible?

Do you know what is meant by the word 'denial'? What does it mean to deny the past, to deny being a Hindu? What do you mean by that word 'deny'? Have you ever denied anything? There is a true denial and a false denial. The *denial with a motive is a false denial*. The denial with a purpose, the denial with an intention, with an eye on the future, is not a denial. If I deny something in order to get something more, it is not denial. But there is a denial which has no motive. *When I deny and do not know what is in store for me in the future, that is true denial*. I deny being a Hindu, I deny belonging to any organization, I deny any particular creed and in that very denial I make myself completely insecure. Do you know such a denial, and have you ever denied anything that way? Can you deny the past — deny — not knowing what is in the future? Can you deny the known?

We are discussing the bringing about of a new mind and if it is possible. A mind that is contaminated cannot be a new mind. So, we are talking of decontamination, and whether that is possible. And in relation to that I began by asking what you mean by denial, because I think denial has a great deal to do with it. *Denial has to do with a new mind.* If I deny cleanly, without roots, without motive, it is real denial. Now is that possible? You see, if I do not completely deny society in which is involved politics, economics, social relationships, ambition, greed — if I do not deny all that completely — it is impossible to find out what it is to have a new mind. Therefore, the first breaking of the foundation is the denial of the things I have known. Is that possible?

Obviously, drugs will not bring about a new mind. Nothing will bring it about except a total denial of the past. Is it possible? What do you say? And if I have felt the perfume, the sight, the taste of such denial, how do I help to convey it to a student? He must have in abundance the known — mathematics, geography, history — and, yet, be abundantly free of the known, remorselessly free of it.

**TEACHER (T):** Sir, all sensations leave a residue, a disturbance which leads to various kinds of conflict and other forms of mental activity. The traditional approach of all religions is to deny this sensation by discipline and denial. But in what you say there seems to be a heightened receptivity to these sensations so that you see the sensations without distortion or residue.

**J KRISHNAMURTI (K):** That is the issue. Sensitivity and sensation are two different things. A mind that is a slave to thought, sensation, feeling, is a residual mind. It enjoys the residue. It enjoys thinking about the pleasurable world; and each thought leaves a mark, which is the residue. Each thought of a certain pleasure you have had, leaves a mark which makes for

insensitivity. It, obviously, dulls the mind, and discipline, control and suppression further dull the mind. I am saying that sensitivity is not sensation, that sensitivity implies no mark, no residue. So, what is the question?

**T:** Is the denial of which you are speaking different from a denial which is the restriction of sensation?

**K:** How do you see those flowers? How do you see the beauty of them? To be completely sensitive to them is to have no residue, no memory of them, so that when you see them again an hour later you see a new flower. That is not possible if you see as a sensation, and that sensation will be associated with flowers, with pleasure. The traditional way is to shut out what is pleasurable, because such associations awaken other forms of pleasure. So you discipline yourself not to look. To cut association with a surgical knife is immature. So how is the mind, how are the eyes, to see the tremendous colour and, yet, have it leave no mark?

I am not asking for a method. How does that state come into being? Otherwise we cannot be sensitive. It is like a photographic plate which receives impressions and is self-renewing. It is exposed and, yet, becomes negative for the next impression. So all the time it is cleansing itself of every pleasure. Is that possible, or are we playing with words and not with facts?

The fact which I see clearly is that any residual sensitivity, sensation, dulls the mind. I deny that fact, but I do not know what it is to be so extraordinarily sensitive that, even though experience leaves no mark, I yet see the flower with fullness, with tremendous intensity. I see as an undeniable fact that every sensation, every feeling, every thought, leaves a mark, shapes the mind, and that such marks cannot possibly bring about a new mind. I see that to have a mind with marks is death, so I

deny death. But I do not know the other. I also see that a good mind is sensitive, without the residue of experience. It experiences, but the experience leaves no mark from which it draws further experiences, further conclusions, further death.

The one I deny, and the other I do not know. How is this transition from the denial of the known to the unknown to come into being?

How does one deny? Does one deny the known, not in great dramatic incidents but in little incidents? Does one deny the remembrance of a pleasant time one had in Switzerland? Does one grow aware of it, and deny it? That is not dramatic; it is not spectacular; nobody knows about it. Still, *the constant denial of little things, the little wipings, the little rubbings, off — and not just one great big wiping away — is essential.* It is essential to deny thought as remembrance, pleasant or unpleasant, every minute of the day as it arises. One is doing it not for any motive, not in order to enter into the extraordinary state of the unknown. You live in Rishi Valley and think of Bombay or Rome. This creates a conflict; it makes the mind dull, a divided thing. Can you see this and wipe it away? Can you keep on wiping away? — not because you want to enter into the unknown. You can never know what the unknown is because the moment you recognize it as the unknown, you are back in the known. The process of recognition is a process of the continued known. As I do not know what the unknown is, I can only do this one thing: keep on wiping thought away as it arises.

You see that flower, feel it, see the beauty, the intensity, the extraordinary brilliance of it. Then you go to the room in which you live, and it is not well proportioned; it is ugly. You live in the room, but you have a certain sense of beauty and you begin to think of the flower. But you pick up the thought as it arises and you wipe it away. Now from what depth do you wipe, from what depth do you deny the flower, your wife, your gods, your

economic life? You have to live with your wife, with your children, with this ugly, monstrous society. You cannot withdraw from life. But when you deny — totally — thought, sorrow, pleasure, then your relationship is different. So there must be a total denial, not a partial denial, not a keeping of the things which you like and a denying of the things which you do not like.

Now, how do you translate what you have understood to the student?

**T:** You have said that in teaching and learning, the situation is one of intensity where you do not say, 'I am teaching you something'. Now, has this constant wiping away of the marks of thought something to do with the intensity of the teaching-learning situation?

**K:** Obviously. You see, I feel that *teaching and learning are both the same*. What is taking place here? I am not teaching you; I am not your teacher or authority, I am merely exploring and conveying my exploration to you. You can take it or leave it. The position is the same with regard to students.

**T:** What is the teacher then to do?

**K:** You can only find out when you are constantly denying. Have you ever tried it? It is as if you cannot sleep for a single minute during the day time.

**T:** It not only needs energy, sir, but it also releases a lot of energy.

**K:** But first you must have the energy to deny.

— From: *Krishnamurti On Education*, 'Chapter 4, On The True Denial, Talk to Teachers', Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India, 1995, pp. 114-122. (First published in 1974).

## ALWAYS PUT A NEGATIVE QUESTION IN ORDER TO FIND A POSITIVE ANSWER

**TEACHER (T):** What is that energy which has no shadow of destruction in it?

**J KRISHNAMURTI (K):** Do not ask that question. Never put a positive question. *Always put a negative question in order to find a positive answer which is not the response of the opposite.* Now, what is negative thinking? What is this energy which is not destructive? That is a positive question.

What is this total energy? Would it be right for us to describe this total energy which is not destructive, and can I describe it? If I were to describe it, would it not be merely verbal, theoretical to others?

Energy becomes a destructive thing the moment you want to achieve it. The desire to achieve it becomes the end for which you strive and if you do not achieve it, you are in despair. So your question was a wrong question and, if one is not very careful, a wrong answer will ensue. Now, your next question maybe: How will you help me to experience this total energy? If I were able to help you, you would be depending on the helper, and the helper may be wrong. So, how would you put the question?

**T:** Is it possible in communication to experience this total energy in the present?

**K:** You can ask the same question in a different way. You are asking a positive question all the time about something you do not know. Your question is unrelated to the problem. Now how would you put the question?

**T:** Do you mean to say that the right question should be: ‘When I see the destructive nature of this energy....’?

**K:** See the falseness of this energy which is destructive. That in itself is the answer. You cannot go beyond the destructive nature of this energy and say what the other is.

Can you cease to revolve in creating destructive energy? You will not then ask what the other is. All you can ask is whether it is possible to stop this self-created destructive energy. *You cannot inquire positively into energy; it must be a negative approach — the comprehending of the fact negatively, not positively, in order to get to the other — because you do not know the other.* So, your approach must be negative in the sense that you see the factual nature of this energy which is self-destructive.

Can I comprehend negatively? Can I learn a technique, and can the mind liberate itself from the technique without recompense? Then the mind is open to a different pattern of energy.

The entire world is in a vast mess, in confusion. To have a total response to that, you must have energy of a different quality from the usual energy which you apply to a problem. The usual approach to a problem is in terms of hope, fear, success, fulfilment and so on, with its accompanying despair. This is obvious. These are all psychological facts. Here we have a world issue and you have to approach it not with the energy of despair but with an energy which is not contaminated by despair. To come upon that energy which is not destructive, the mind must be free from the energy of despair. This is a world problem, how do you answer it? Do you answer it idealistically with the intention, the desire and the feeling, ‘This is the right thing to do’? If you do, you answer it with the energy of despair. Or, do you look at it with a

different energy altogether? If you look at the total problem with that new kind of energy, you will have the right answer.

— From: *Krishnamurti On Education*, 'Chapter 9, On The Negative Approach, Talk to Teachers', Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India, 1995, pp. 166-168. (First published in 1974).

## TOTAL NEGATION OF ACTION IS ACTION

The question 'What am I to do?' is, obviously, a rather limited question. When you put that question — What am I to do? — what is the reason of that question, the cause of it? Either you are asking somebody else to tell you what to do — and, of course, there are thousands of people who will help you what to do — or, you are asking that question to find out what *not* to do. Do you understand? If you ask 'What to do?', it is simple enough. They will tell you: meditate, sit like this, breathe like that, levitate, pay so much, and all the rest of it. But, you see, if you ask or you realize that whatever you do is still selfish — because even if you say, 'I must get rid of myself', it is still the movement of the self — if you realize that, then you don't do a thing. That is total negation of action. And *total negation of action is action*.

— Brockwood Park  
30th August, 1981

## **KFI WEBSITE**

Towards the end of March this year, KFI launched its website <http://www.kfionline.org>. It has the following features: A life-sketch of Krishnamurti, and an article on the relevance of his teachings; the vision and activities of the Foundation; the aim of our schools and information on the special features of each school and how to get there; the purpose of the Krishnamurti Study Centres and information on study and accommodation facilities; catalogues of our books in English and translations in Indian languages; catalogues of audio and video tapes and CDs; list of our periodicals; announcements regarding programmes organized by us from time to time; and a Guest Book where you can write your comments. The texts are accompanied by appropriate photographs. The website also has links to the Krishnamurti Foundations abroad. You can now order books, tapes and periodicals through our website, or contact us for any other information that you require.

## KRISHNAMURTI SCHOOLS

<p>THE BHAGIRATHI VALLEY SCHOOL Uttar Kashi Retreat P.O. Ranadi (Via Dunda) Uttar Kashi — 249 151 Uttar Pradesh</p>	<p>Elementary School for local students</p>
<p>RISHI VALLEY SCHOOL (KFI) Rishi Valley — 517 352 Chittoor District Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Boarding School Ages 8 to 17</p>
<p>RAJGHAT BESANT SCHOOL (KFI) Rajghat Fort Varanasi — 221 001 Uttar Pradesh</p>	<p>Boarding School Ages 7 to 19</p>
<p>VASANTA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN Rajghat Fort Varanasi — 221 001 Uttar Pradesh</p>	<p>B.A. &amp; B.ED. (Humanities only)</p>
<p>SAHYADRI SCHOOL Tiwai Hills, Rajgurunagar Taluk Pune District 410513</p>	<p>Boarding School Ages 10 to 15</p>
<p>THE SCHOOL (KFI) 'Damodar Gardens' Besant Avenue Madras — 600 020</p>	<p>Day-Boarding School Ages 3½ to 17</p>
<p>THE VALLEY SCHOOL (KFI) 'Haridvanam' 17th K.M. Kanakapura Road Thatguni Post Bangalore — 560 062</p>	<p>Day-Boarding School Ages 6 to 17</p>
<p>BAL-ANAND 'Akash Deep' 28, Dongersi Road Bombay — 400 006</p>	<p>An After-School Centre for young children</p>
<p>BROCKWOOD PARK Bramdean, Hampshire SO 24 OLQ, UK</p>	<p>Education Centre and Boarding School 14 years upwards</p>
<p>THE OAK GROVE SCHOOL P.O. Box 1560 Ojai, California 93023, USA</p>	<p>Day/Boarding School Ages 3½ to 17</p>

**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 0LQ, 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.

**KFI BULLETIN, ENGLISH  
SUBSCRIPTION FORM**

Annual Subscription (India)      Rs 50.00

Annual Subscription (Foreign)    US \$ 5.00

Life Subscription (India)          Rs 500.00

(DD or MO, payable at Chennai, to the address below)

---

The Secretary  
Krishnamurti Foundation India  
'Vasanta Vihar'  
64, Greenways Road  
CHENNAI 600 028.

Dear Sir,

Please enrol me as a subscriber/renew my subscription to the  
'KFI Bulletin' for the present year/Life.

Name (in block letters)

---

Address:

---

---

---

---

PAYMENT ENCLOSED (Rs 50/Rs 500/\$5) BY D.D. No

---

DATED \_\_\_\_\_ ISSUED BY \_\_\_\_\_

---

**KFI BULLETIN, HINDI  
SUBSCRIPTION FORM**

Annual Subscription	Rs 35.00
Two year's Subscription	Rs 70.00
Life Subscription	Rs 350.00
Single Copy	Rs 10.00

(DD or MO, payable at Varanasi, to the address below)

---

The Secretary  
Rajghat Education Centre, KFI  
Rajghat Fort  
VARANASI 221 001

Dear Sir,  
Please enrol me as an annual subscriber/two-yearly  
subscriber/ life subscriber/ send me a single copy of the  
'Parisamvad'.

Name (in block letters)

---

Address:

---

---

---

---

PAYMENT ENCLOSED (Rs 35/Rs 70/Rs 350/Rs 10) BY D.D. No

---

DATED \_\_\_\_\_ ISSUED BY \_\_\_\_\_

---