

2 0 0 3 / 2

Bulletin

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

FROM THE EDITOR

Why does Krishnamurti eliminate the role of the great teachers of the past in humanity's search for enlightenment? Even the Buddha, whom Krishnamurti greatly respected, and whose dying words to Ananda: 'Be a light unto yourself; hold fast to the light of truth,' form a cornerstone of Krishnamurti's philosophy, is set aside. The simple explanation, presented in the talk below, is that human individuals use traditional religion as ideologies to define themselves. This self-definition, being an artificial construct, creates barriers between the individual and his or her instinctive and emotional being; ideas, words and theories take priority over ground realities. Living in this unnatural state, human beings forget to look at the real world: *'You don't look at the skies, you never look at the beauty of the trees, you never look at a human being properly, even your wife or husband'*. (Madras, January 5, 1980)

Krishnamurti believed that simple acts of listening and looking directly at emotions, say, fear, is sufficient to dispel this world of ideas and words that have gathered around our core fears that, by clouding our understanding of ourselves, wreak havoc in our lives. Direct perception restores human ability to 'care and the capacity to think very clearly, objectively, not personally'. (Madras, January 5, 1980)

In the first selection, a talk given in Madras, Krishnamurti, demonstrates to his Indian audiences the web of words

in which they live, and the unexamined fears that drive them towards abstraction. In his unique way, he simultaneously addresses the predilections of his largely Indian audience as well as their humanity. There are very important lessons here for us Indians, living as we do in times of unprecedented violence.

An examination of our emotional lives lays the foundation of Krishnamurti's enlightenment teaching. He holds out the hope that fear, which drives the primordial responses of attack and escape, need not hold human beings in its thrall, but will yield to the art of listening. 'Fear is a very complex business, as ancient as the hills, ancient as humankind and it has a very extraordinary story to tell. But you must know the art of listening to it and there is great beauty in that listening. There is only listening and the story does not exist.' (*Letters to the Schools: Volume One*, Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India, 1981, p 18.) Listening is liberating.

Subsequent selections in this issue describe Krishnamurti unraveling the ancient emotion of fear and the complex story it tells.

—R.H.

HUMAN BEINGS ASCEND ONLY WHEN THERE IS NO FEAR

It would be rather interesting if you could find out for yourself why you come to these talks. What impels you to sit here for an hour or so and listen to something? If you could find out the art of listening, you would, perhaps, learn a great deal. Listen not only to what is being said, but listen also to the whisper among the leaves. Listen to music. Listen to your wife or husband. Listen totally, completely, with that quality of attention which is not just attending *to* something, that is, not just directing attention to listening to what is being said. Have the quality of attention, if you can. As we said before — during the last four talks or dialogues or whatever you like to call it — I think we would learn a great deal, not from somebody, not from books, not from hearsay, or from following a particular tradition, but by really attending.

To attend implies not directing your thought in a particular direction, with a particular motive, or intention, but merely observing with total, complete attention. When you so attend there is no centre from which you are attending. I do not know if you follow this point. What we are going to talk over together this evening is why we live on concepts, on theories, on assumptions. Why does the mind, your mind, the human mind, whether in India, or Europe, or America, and so on, live on concepts? Can the human mind be free of concepts? A scientist, for example, has a hypothesis; he tests it, and it becomes either a fact or a non-fact. There it is beneficial, necessary. But in the psychological world, that is in our daily life, in our struggles, in our miseries, confusion, and so on, why does the mind conceive ideas? Just as one conceives a baby, why does the mind, your mind, the human mind — of which we are a part — conceive

ideas, live on concepts? Either the concepts have been thrust upon us through education, through tradition, or we conceive of life as a problem and try to resolve that problem. We first conceive, make an idea, a concept, and then try to resolve — through that concept — our problems. Please, give this a little attention, if you don't mind.

That is, most people throughout the world — especially the philosophers and the so-called religious people, the so-called moral people, who have great values and all the rest of it — first have theories, and then concepts, and then twist life to those concepts. Marx conceived a society, after historical study and so on, and then tried to fit man into that concept, into that framework. Everybody — Mao, all the scientists, all the philosophers — does this. I do not know if you are aware that you are doing it now. And what takes place when we act through concepts? Are you following this?

Please, as we said the other day — and I hope you will not mind if I repeat it again — this is not a lecture by the speaker; you are not being told what to think, or what not to think. This is not propaganda. We are, together, trying to observe and, therefore, act. We are concerned with the extraordinary complex society in which we live. We are concerned with the complexity of our own minds, the narrowness of our own minds, our minds which have become specialized. We are concerned with whether it is possible to bring about a mutation in the very nature of the mind — which means the senses, emotions, affections — so that there is care and the capacity to think very clearly, objectively, not personally.

And we are asking why the human mind conceives an idea from study, from reading, from listening to philosophers, and from listening as you are now. First you conceive an idea and, then,

try to put that idea into action. Why does the mind do this? All the so-called great philosophers have done it. All the religions — Christianity, Buddhism, Zen, and so on — are based on concepts. A concept means ‘to conceive’ — but I won’t go into the etymological meaning of the word. To live on concepts means that from abstractions you act. Either these abstractions are thrust upon you by the specialist — the philosopher, the sociologist, and so on — or you yourself, on observing, hearing, make an abstraction of what you have observed, heard, and from that abstraction, act. This is obvious, isn’t it?

Now why does the mind do this? If you observe your own mind — I am not being disrespectful or impudent — you will see that you live in concepts. The word ‘idea’ comes from Greek; it means ‘to observe’ and not to make an abstraction of what you have observed into a concept. Now why do we do this, that is, make abstractions, concepts? I think that it is very important to understand this, because the culture in which we have lived for three thousand years — whether you like that culture, the so-called Brahmanical culture, or not — has disappeared. Sir, the speaker is not either for or against the so-called Brahmanical culture. So if some of you are anti-Brahmin **don’t jump up and fight**, and those who are rabid Brahmins — whatever that may mean — do not be encouraged by what is being said. We are just inquiring why a civilization, a culture, which has existed for three thousand years and more has disappeared overnight. Do you follow the question? Why? The speaker has discussed this question with a lot of professors, so-called scholars, politicians, various gurus — I don’t know why they come to see me, but they do. The speaker has asked all these people — the experts, the philosophers — why this has happened. Please follow all this carefully. I am not taking sides; I am neither pro, nor anti. We are inquiring why a civilization, pre-Buddha, has completely disappeared. Is it that western culture, with all its vast technological

knowledge, technological output — communication, railways, aeroplanes, science, medicine — has smothered this country? Or is it that in this country you really have no culture at all? You have tradition, you have all kinds of theories. If you observe your religion, you will find that it — like all the rest of the world's religions — is purely conceptual; it is put together by thought. Which means that this culture has lived on words. And a human being that lives on words, obviously goes down the drain. And that's what is happening in this country (and elsewhere).

Sir, we are in a crisis — not an economic crisis, or a moral crisis, or a population crisis, but a crisis of consciousness, of the mind. A mind that lives on words — just think of it, sirs, what kind of mind it is! You specialize as an engineer, or a scientist, or a sociologist, or a businessman, and you get fixed there for the rest of your life, and you don't look at the skies, you never look at the beauty of the trees, you never look at a human being properly, even your wife or husband. So one is always asking why the human mind is living on concepts, what is the process of it? Why do you live on words — Hindu, Christian, Buddhist? Why do you live on any conceptual activity? Why? It is very interesting, if you go into it very carefully. We believe that concepts will lead to action. That is, first conceive or plan a pattern of action and, then, act. I hope that you are following all this. Why does the mind — your mind — do it? Is it an avoidance of action — because you can postpone it? That is, you have an idea of what you should do, but you never completely act according to the idea. So there is a contradiction between conceptual action and action. Right? Are you following this?

So is that what is the root cause of any civilization disappearing? — that it lives on words? All the symbols of Christianity are just symbols, ideas. When you call yourself a Muslim, or a Hindu, or a Sikh, or God knows what else, it is just a concept. You are

first, essentially, a human being.

So is the making of concepts an escape from action? Has conceptual activity become much more important than action? A conceptual movement has cultivated the brain, the intellect, and the intellect dominates everything. The function of the intellect is to discern, to understand, to gather information, to act. And when the intellect — that is, the capacity to think conceptually — becomes all important, as it has in the world (all our education in schools, colleges, and universities is based on that), then the rest of the area of the mind is disregarded. You can observe it in yourself.

So what, then, is action without the formulation of concepts? Do you understand? Are we in communication with each other? I hope so, for otherwise I will be talking to myself, which is not much fun. Is there an action which is not born out of concepts? The word 'action' means acting, not *having* acted, or *will* act. Please understand this. We are used to this idea of acting according to a precept, according to a belief, which are all concepts. And when you act according to an ideal, which thought has created, your action is limited. Are you following all this? Your action is born out of the past and, therefore, it is not action. I wonder if you understand this because, apparently, we are incapable of applying. You hear, say for example, that it is possible to bring about transformation in the very structure of the brain cells and mind. You hear it. If you pay attention, you hear it. If you watch yourself, your immediate reaction is: How? Which is, when you ask the question 'how?' you have already entered into the field of concepts. Right? So, then, you have systems, methods, practices, discipline, and the whole circus begins. Now, can you listen and not make a concept, but apply? Do you understand? That is, most of us — practically ninety-nine per cent of the people of the world — are caught in fear, fear of some kind or

another. Now: Is fear a concept? Go very slowly, please; this is a very complex problem. Is fear born of a concept? If it is, therefore we have never been able to resolve the problem. Are you following this? We have carried this burden of fear for generation upon generation; it is born in us; it is part of our brain, part of our life, part of our activity. And from time immemorial this question has not been resolved. Man through fear goes to temples — you have the whole business of it. You have fear of the future, fear of losing your job, fear of losing your wife, fear of not fulfilling, fear of not becoming a success, fear of the past, fear that what you have done might catch you up and do something, and so on. There is this enormous movement of fear. Now we are asking whether fear is a word — please listen carefully — which is a concept, or whether there is fear — that reaction — without the word? Are you following this?

Look, sir, if you are a Hindu, that word — ‘Hindu’ — has tremendous meaning, just like the word — not the fact — ‘Christian’ would if you were a Christian. Now we are, together, observing, fear. We are not analyzing fear. We are not inquiring into the cause of fears, because if we do, that will involve time. Right? That is, to analyze implies time. To find the cause also involves time, and each one will say, ‘My cause is different from yours’, and so on, and we will, everlastingly, struggle with it. So, can we just observe whether there is an end, in every way, to fear? Is there an end, both physically as well as psychologically, to it? And, if you observe, then is ‘fear’ a word?

I’ll explain. There this reaction, and this reaction is associated with the memory of a word called ‘fear’. Are you following this? So the response, the reaction — violence, and so on — is immediately taken over by thought as the word and, then, the word becomes more important than the fact. Are you following all this? Please, do it as we are talking. You see, otherwise it is

no fun; it just becomes a tawdry lecture.

So, can you look, can you observe, without making an abstraction of what you observe? Are you following this? It needs great attention. You are afraid; that is the common lot. Can you observe it? That is, can you look at the arising of fear? And can you watch whether it is the product of a concept, a word, an association with previous fears — which all means knowledge — and that it is knowledge that then says, 'It is fear'? I wonder if you follow this. This is very important to understand so, please, spend a little time on this. Spend a little time on this because it is possible to be totally free of fear: fear of examinations, if you are a student. (I hope you are not the kind of student who merely studies to pass a lot of examinations. Then your brain is very limited, and you will end up as a glorified clerk, or a glorified something or other.)

One recognizes, if one observes, that the brain in its very process of responding to memory, which is thought, is thinking in words. And the nervous response to any emotion is immediately translated in terms of concepts, and those concepts then act upon the fact. So the question is: Can you observe this reaction without the word? The moment you observe with the word — of 'fear', for example — then the past memory, past reactions, past knowledge, will have taken over. And the past cannot act. I wonder if you meet this point. The past can only act according to experience, to knowledge and, therefore, it will always be limited. Can you observe your wife or your husband without the word? Can you observe your wife, or your husband, or your friend, without the image, the associations that you have: the quarrels, the whole implications of a relationship between man and woman, which has been built up through a million years? Can you observe without the image that you have — the image being the word, the concept. Can you do it? No, don't, please,

say

We have learnt — I think mostly in this country — to, easily, say, ‘Yes’. And when we say, ‘Yes’, we don’t mean it. We say, ‘Yes; now let us get on’. This leads to total dishonesty. So if you have integrity, do not say anything that you do not know yourself, that is not your own direct perception; do not say anything that is taken over from somebody else’s experience. We have no integrity; we have lost it in this country, right from the top to the bottom. With money, apparently, you can do anything. Integrity means saying things that you actually mean.

So we are saying that there is the possibility of wiping out — totally, absolutely — all sense of fear. You might say that that is nonsense, because you haven’t tried it; you haven’t applied. So, the question is: Can you observe your fear without its associations? Can you observe your wife or husband without the past associations of pleasure, of comfort, of bullying, of nagging — you know all the stuff that goes on between man and woman?

As for physical fear ... we generally don’t meet a tiger, so we are pretty safe. But we do have the fear of pain — physical pain — which we once have had. Please do follow this a little bit. You may have been to a dentist or to a doctor, because you have had some kind of illness that had given you pain. The brain registers that pain, because the function of the brain is to register in order to protect itself. Are you following all this? So you have had physical pain, and it has been registered as ‘pain’ in the brain, and you are frightened that it might happen again. Now, can you end the pain? That is, pain arises, and when it is over, finished, you do not carry it over? Do you understand what I am saying? Please do it; you will see what extraordinary things take place. That is not a reward! If you are interested, if you are

concerned with the freedom of fear, I am just pointing this out. Fear burdens your lives; fear narrows it. Fear is the greatest shadow in life; it is the most destructive reaction. If you are interested, and if you feel the utter importance of being free from fear, you have to look at it without any sense of association. That requires a great deal of attention. I am not speaking of 'attending to fear', but of the quality of attention that observes. Do you understand what I am saying?

Now, you have heard this. Have you made it into an abstraction, into a concept? And, then, do you say, 'Please tell me how I am to be free of fear'? Do you follow? That is, you do not hear the whole thing. Your mind is so trained, so caught in this conceptual world, that when you hear this about fear, you have already moved into an abstraction. From that abstraction you say, 'Please tell me what to do; how am I to get rid of my fear of my wife?' That is, you have not — if I may point out — listened. When you make a concept, you are not acting. You hear about this whole movement of fear; you hear about the root of fear: that it is, obviously, put together by thought. In fear — of the past, of the future — time is involved. Fear *is* time. And somebody like the speaker says that you can end it completely. What is your reaction to it? How do you respond to it? Are you so caught up in concepts that you cannot free yourself from it; therefore, you cannot immediately act? Please examine your own minds. Time will not solve the problem of fear. 'Time', we say, 'will quieten the fear'. But it has not. It is like having cancer; it is there. Death might be postponed; it might wait, but the disease is there. So, too, there is fear; time will not solve it. On the contrary, time will complicate the issue.

So when you listen, if you at all listen completely, then there is no movement of thought but merely observation. Do you understand this? And, as we said, observation *is* action; it is not observation,

concept, action.

Also, one of your problems is pleasure. The mind that seeks pleasure is invariably attached — right? — attached to the action that brings pleasure. That is why you depend sexually. Sex is mutual exploitation based on pleasure and, therefore, the attachment begins. Observe the various forms of pleasure: the pleasure of possessions, the pleasure of achievement, the pleasure of being able to control your body excellently, the pleasure of knowledge. Observe the pleasure of those professors, philosophers, who have carved in a corner of this universe a little hole. And there they remain — in that little hole. So, pleasure takes multiple forms.

Please observe all this yourself. There is an action that brings pleasure, and that pleasure is registered in the brain. And thought says, 'I want it to continue, to have more of it'. That is, pleasure is always within the field of time. And, so, one inquires: What is time? There is time — time in which it takes for you to go from here to your house. That is to cover the distance from here to there horizontally or vertically. Then, time is necessary for a seed to grow into a tree. Biologically time is necessary. Right? And we have introduced time as a means of psychological progress. 'I am violent; I will take time to be non-violent.' Like the League of Nations — I mean the United Nations: all the nations there are separate, but the hope is that one day it will all be united, which will never take place. So, for us, time is a movement to cover from one point to another, both physically as well psychologically. Now we are questioning whether there is time at all psychologically. Question it, sir; ask. Or is it one of our concepts that time is necessary? That is, if one is violent, one invents non-violence which is non-fact, and pursues the non-fact, which is illusion. The word 'illusion' comes from *ludere*, which means 'to play with something which is not actual'. Sirs,

the dictionary does not say so; I say so.

So is there time psychologically? For fear to end must there be time — which is a psychological process? Can fear — the whole of it and not just one fragment of it — end immediately? Are you following all this? I hope you are working. That is, our brain is conditioned to the idea of time. The brain itself has evolved through time, from the anthropoid ape down to now. And that same concept of time is taken over psychologically. That is, 'I am', 'I have been', and 'I shall be'. Now our brain has used time as a means of healing the wound of fear. And we are asking: Can the brain free itself from its tradition? Do you follow what I am saying, sir? You can free yourself from your *pūja*, your rituals, and all the rest of it; that is fairly simple. You see the nonsense of it: it is just a lot of words which have very little meaning. Whether it is a Christian, garbed in marvellous clothes, or a man who is half naked, it is the same thing.

So the brain has been conditioned; from generation to generation it has been handed down that fear can be resolved only through time. Can you break that tradition now? Do you understand what I am saying? And can you see if fear — the whole complexity of it and not just one part of it — can be completely and immediately dissolved? The speaker says that it can, for otherwise we will be just playing with words. So, it means that your mind must be extraordinarily alert; your senses must be fully active. Are you all asleep? Are you being mesmerized by the speaker?

We kind of disregard our senses. Or we cultivate just one sense; we have never looked at all our senses. To encourage all the senses to be active means to be highly sensitive. We have never been able to encourage all the senses because of religious doctrines and various forms of inhibitions. Because of various inhibitions, we have never been able to say, 'Now let us find out

if all our senses — everything — can be physically, extraordinarily active'. When there is clear and total sensory response, there is no centre from which we observe. Are you following this? Do this, sir. When you look at a sunset, or at a tree, or at water — the sea — look at it with all your senses, not with just your eyes — the optical response. Do not just look, but hear, smell, taste; let the whole thing operate. Then you will see that the centre which has been associated with the self comes to an end. All self-centred activity comes to a total end. Now, wait a minute. It may come to a total end for a second, but we ask, 'Can that second continue?' Then do you see what has immediately happened? You have made a concept of that second and you want to carry that concept out. Are you following all this? That means you have moved away from the actuality.

So pleasure, like fear, is the movement of time. Got it? Look, go into it very carefully, and you will see it for yourself. There is pleasure — sexual, for example. There is the image of it, the thinking about it, the associations of it, and the attachment to it. Now, where there is attachment, there is no love. Just a minute. The speaker says, 'Where there is any form of attachment, there is no love'. You hear that. How do you hear it? Do you understand my question? What is your response to that statement? Do you say, 'It is nonsense'? Or do you ask: 'What do you mean by it?' Which means, 'Explain'. And you live on explanations and commentaries. So you have not listened to that statement: Where there is attachment, there is no love. I will explain why; I will go into it, but the explanation has no meaning if there is not the immediate response to that. Right?

Sir, there's so much to talk about; there is today and tomorrow. I want to cram everything into these two days.

Where there is attachment of any kind, any dependency, any

memory of pleasure, it is not love. Can you listen to that statement? Now if one is asked, 'Do you love your wife or your friend?' you would say, 'Of course'. Perhaps here in this country you do not even know that word, because if you really loved your wife, you would treat her differently. The woman's place in India is really quite terrible. You have no 'Women's Lib' here. So when you ask, 'What is love?', are you asking the question in order to have a concept about it, to have an explanation of it? If you do, then you are off. We do not know what love is, because if we did, there would be no jealousy, no hatred, no competition; this sense of ambition will be gone. Personal desire for fulfillment and all the rest of it — everything goes. So if there is to be that love one must be completely free of jealousy, completely free of attachment. Can you? But, you see, you do not want to be free of attachment and the complications of your personal relationship. You would rather tolerate all that; you would put up with anything, just as you do put up with everything in this country. From the extraordinary squalor, the dirt, and a government that is so corrupt — you put up with anything. So you say, 'This is all right; what is all this about love? Why should I have it? I will not bother about it. I have carved for myself an unpleasant corner in this universe with my wife, with my job, with my little children, and that is good enough'. And that is death. That is why, now, you are all dying. Right sir?

So how will you have this flower, this great beauty of love? Beauty is not mere form. A tree is not beautiful just because of its form: its trunk, its leaves. Beauty is not outward show. Beauty comes with integrity, with freedom. The word 'freedom' originally, etymologically, meant love. So either you want to come to that water which is everlastingly pure — that water can never be polluted by thought — and, therefore, your life will become like a flower, full of beauty, or you want to live in the squalor that you are living in, the squalor of your minds. (Perhaps your house is

fairly clean, but I doubt it.)

So, can all this end? Can concepts, the lack of integrity, and fear end? To have no fear of any kind — you do not know what it means. And, also, to have love, this extraordinary jewel which is incorruptible. Either you have that, or remain with this confusion, this misery, this sorrow. Sirs, it is not a matter of decision; it is not a matter of choice. You cannot say, 'I will choose this or that'. The man who is serious, the man who is concerned with the world and with all the terrible things that are going on in the world, and the man who is also concerned about the ugliness, the pettiness and the shoddiness of his own life, sees that. And out of observing all that, comes complete action.

And what is the relationship of love to our daily life? You know, that is one of the most absurd questions ever put. What is the relationship of your breathing to your life? — Right? Exactly! And, also, there is this vast, very complex question of death, of sorrow. But I do not know if we have time No, not now.

Sirs, whether one is aware of it or not, human beings right throughout the world are at the crossroads. And all the scholars — scientists included — say that the ascent of man depends on his knowledge. The more knowledge he has, the greater the ascent. Now, knowledge is memory; it is past experience collected in the brain. So this means that if you are living in the past everlastingly, the past is ascending. Do you get it? Human beings are not ascending. Human beings ascend only when there is no fear. They ascend only when they have understood the nature of pleasure and desire. And when there is love there is a real explosion of the mind. And it is up to you whether you want to break the shackles of time or to live in it.

— Madras, January 5, 1980

FEAR CANNOT EXIST BY ITSELF IT COMES IN RELATIONSHIP TO SOMETHING

Death is inevitable. Continuity can be ended, or it can be nourished and maintained. That which has continuity can never renew itself, it can never be the new, it can never understand the unknown. Continuity is duration, and that which is everlasting is not the timeless. Through time, duration, the timeless is not. There must be ending for the new to be. The new is not **within** the continuation of thought. Thought is continuous movement in time; this movement cannot enclose within itself a state of being which is not of time. Thought is founded on the past, its very being is of time. Time is not only chronological but it is thought as a movement of the past through the present to the future; it is the movement of memory, of the word, the picture, the symbol, the record, the repetition. Thought, memory, is continuous through word and repetition. The ending of thought is the beginning of the new; the death of thought is life eternal. There must be constant ending for the new to be. That which is new is not continuous; the new can never be within the field of time. The new is only in death from moment to moment. There must be death every day for the unknown to be. The ending is the beginning, but fear prevents the ending.

‘I know I have fear, and I don’t know what is beyond it.’

What do we mean by fear? What is fear? Fear is not an abstraction, it does not exist independently, in isolation. It comes into being only in relation to something. In the process of relationship, fear manifests itself; there is no fear apart from relationship. Now what is it that you are afraid of? You say you are afraid of death. What do we mean by death? Though we have theories, speculations, and there are certain observable facts,

death is still the unknown. Whatever we may know about it, death itself cannot be brought into the field of the known; we stretch out a hand to grasp it, but it is not. Association is the known, and the unknown cannot be made familiar; habit cannot capture it, so there is fear.

Can the known, the mind, ever comprehend or contain the unknown? The hand that stretches out can receive only the knowable, it cannot hold the unknowable. To desire experience is to give continuity to thought; to desire experience is to give strength to the past; to desire experience is to further the known. You want to experience death, do you not? Though living, you want to know what death is. But do you know what living is? You know life only as conflict, confusion, antagonism, passing joy and pain. But is that life? Are struggle and sorrow life? In this state which we call life we want to experience something that is not in our own field of consciousness. This pain, this struggle, the hate that is enfolded in joy, is what we call living; and we want to experience something which is the opposite of what we call living. The opposite is the continuation of what-is, perhaps modified. But death is not the opposite. It is the unknown. The knowable craves to experience death, the unknown; but, do what it will, it cannot experience death, therefore it is fearful. Is that it?

‘You have stated it clearly. If I could know or experience what death is while living, then surely fear would cease.’

Because you cannot experience death, you are afraid of it. Can the conscious experience that state which is not to be brought into being through the conscious? That which can be experienced is the projection of the conscious, the known. The known can only experience the known; experience is always within the field of the known; the known cannot experience what is beyond its field. Experiencing is utterly different from experience.

Experiencing is not within the field of the experiencer; but as experiencing fades, the experiencer and the experience come into being, and then experiencing is brought into the field of the known. The knower, the experiencer, craves for the state of experiencing, the unknown; and as the experiencer, the knower, cannot enter into the state of experiencing, he is afraid. He is fear, he is not separate from it. The experiencer of fear is not an observer of it; he is fear itself, the very instrument of fear.

‘What do you mean by fear? I know I am afraid of death. I don’t feel that I *am* fear, but I am fearful of something. I fear and am separate from fear. Fear is a sensation distinct from the “I” who is looking at it, analysing it. I am the observer, and fear is the observed. How can the observer and the observed be one?’

You say that you are the observer, and fear is the observed. But is that so? Are you an entity separate from your qualities? Are you not identical with your qualities? Are you not your thoughts, emotions, and so on? You are not separate from your qualities, thoughts. You *are* your thoughts. Thought creates the ‘you’, the supposedly separate entity; without thought, the thinker is not. Seeing the impermanency of itself, thought creates the thinker as the permanent, the enduring; and the thinker then becomes the experiencer, the analyser, the observer separate from the transient. We all crave some kind of permanency, and seeing impermanency about us, thought creates the thinker who is supposed to be permanent. The thinker then proceeds to build up other and higher states of permanency: the soul, the *ātman*, the higher self, and so on. Thought is the foundation of this whole structure. But that is another matter. We are concerned with fear. What is fear? Let us see what it is.

You say you are afraid of death. Since you cannot experience it, you are afraid of it. Death is the unknown, and you are afraid of

the unknown. Is that it? Now, can you be afraid of that which you do not know? If something is unknown to you, how can you be afraid of it? You are really afraid, not of the unknown, of death, but of loss of the known, because that might cause pain, or take away your pleasure, your gratification. It is the known that causes fear, not the unknown. How can the unknown cause fear? It is not measurable in terms of pleasure and pain: it is unknown.

Fear cannot exist by itself, it comes in relationship to something. You are actually afraid of the known in its relation to death, are you not? Because you cling to the known, to an experience, you are frightened of what the future might be. But the what-might-be, the future, is merely a reaction, a speculation, the opposite of what-is. This is so, is it not?

‘Yes, that seems to be right.’

And do you know what-is? Do you understand it? Have you opened the cupboard of the known and looked into it? Are you not also frightened of what you might discover there? Have you ever inquired into the known, into what you possess?

‘No, I have not. I have always taken the known for granted. I have accepted the past as one accepts sunlight or rain. I have never considered it; one is almost unconscious of it, as one is of one’s shadow. Now that you mention it, I suppose I am also afraid to find out what might be there.’

Are not most of us afraid to look at ourselves? We might discover unpleasant things, so we would rather not look, we prefer to be ignorant of what-is. We are not only afraid of what might be in the future, but also of what might be in the present. We are afraid to know ourselves as we are, and this avoidance of what-is is making us afraid of what- might-be. We approach the so-called

known with fear, and also the unknown, death. The avoidance of what-is is the desire for gratification. We are seeking security, constantly demanding that there shall be no disturbance; and it is this desire not to be disturbed that makes us avoid what-is and fear what-might-be. Fear is the ignorance of what-is, and our life is spent in a constant state of fear.

‘But how is one to get rid of this fear?’

To get rid of something you must understand it. Is there fear, or only the desire not to see? It is the desire not to see that brings on fear; and when you don’t want to understand the full significance of what-is, fear acts as a preventive. You can lead a gratifying life by deliberately avoiding all inquiry into what-is, and many do this; but they are not happy, nor are those who amuse themselves with a superficial study of what-is. Only those who are earnest in their inquiry can be aware of happiness; to them alone is there freedom from fear.

‘Then how is one to understand what-is?’

The what-is is to be seen in the mirror of relationship, relationship with all things. The what-is cannot be understood in withdrawal, in isolation; it cannot be understood if there is the interpreter, the translator who denies or accepts. The what-is can be understood only when the mind is utterly passive, when it is not operating on what-is.

‘Is it not extremely difficult to be passively aware?’

It is, as long as there is thought.

— From *Commentaries On Living, Series II*, London: Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1976, pp. 59-63.

EDUCATION CAN AWAKEN INTELLIGENCE AND, THEREBY, FREE THE MIND OF FEAR

Q: If all of us were educated rightly, would we be free of fear?

K: It is very important to be free of fear, is it not? And you cannot be free of fear except through intelligence. So let us first find out how to be intelligent, not how to get rid of fear. If we can experience what it is to be intelligent, then we shall know how to get rid of fear. Fear is always with regard to something, it does not exist by itself. There is the fear of death, the fear of illness, the fear of loss, the fear of one's parents, the fear of what people will say, and so on; and the question is, not how to get rid of fear, but how to awaken the intelligence with which to face and to understand and go beyond fear.

Now, how can education help us to be intelligent? What is intelligence? Is it a matter of passing examinations, or being clever? You may read many books, meet prominent people, have a lot of capacity, but does all that make you intelligent? Or is intelligence something which comes into being only as you become integrated? We are made up of many parts; sometimes we are resentful, jealous, violent, at other times we are humble, thoughtful, calm. At different moments we are different beings; we are never whole, never totally integrated, are we? When a human being has many wants, he is inwardly broken up into many beings.

One must approach the problem simply. The question is how to be intelligent so that you can be rid of fear. If from your earliest childhood whatever difficulty you may have had has been talked

over with you so that your understanding of it is not just verbal, but enables you to see the whole of life, then such education can awaken intelligence and thereby free the mind of fear.

—From *Life Ahead*, London: Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1977, p 171.

NO OUTSIDE AGENCY CAN SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF FEAR

One asks why human beings, who have lived on this earth for millions of years, who are technologically intelligent, have not applied their intelligence to be free from this very complex problem of fear, which may be one of the reasons for war, for killing one another. And religions throughout the world have not solved the problem; nor the gurus, nor the saviours; nor ideals. So it is very clear that no outside agency — however elevated, however much made popular by propaganda — no outside agency can ever possibly solve this problem of human fear.

You are inquiring, you are investigating, you are delving into the whole problem of fear. And perhaps we have so accepted the pattern of fear that we don't want even to move away from it. So, what is fear? What are the contributory factors that bring about fear? Like many small streams, rivulets that make the tremendous volume of a river, what are the small streams that bring about fear, that have such tremendous vitality of fear? Is one of the causes of fear comparison? — Comparing oneself with somebody else? Obviously it is. So, can you live a life comparing yourself with nobody? Do you understand what I am

saying? When you compare yourself with another, ideologically, psychologically, or even physically, there is the striving to become that; and there is the fear that you may not. It is the desire to fulfil and you may not be able to fulfil. Where there is comparison there must be fear.

And so one asks whether it is possible to live without a single comparison, never comparing whether you are beautiful or ugly, fair or not fair, approximating yourself to some ideal, to some pattern of values. There is this constant comparison going on. We are asking, is that one of the causes of fear? Obviously. And where there is comparison there must be conformity, there must be imitation. So we are saying that comparison, conformity, and imitation, are contributory causes of fear. Can one live without comparing, imitating, or conforming psychologically? Of course one can. If those are the contributory factors of fear, and you are concerned with the ending of fear, then inwardly there is no comparison, which means there is no becoming. The very meaning of the comparison is to become that which you think is better, higher, nobler, and so on. So, comparison is becoming. Is that one of the factors of fear? You have to discover it for yourself. Then if those are the factors, if the mind is seeing those factors as bringing about fear, the very perception of those ends the contributory causes. If there is a physical cause that gives you a stomach-ache, there is an ending of that pain by discovering the cause of it. Similarly, where there is any cause there is an ending.

— From *On Fear*, New York: HarperSanFrancisco (A Division of HarperCollins Publishers), 1995, pp. 2-3 (*Ojai*, 8th May 1982).

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA GATHERING 2003

The Krishnamurti Foundation India is happy to announce that its Annual Public Gathering is being organized by the Rajghat Education Centre, Varanasi from the 1st of November to the 4th of November, 2003.

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

For further details, please contact:

Co-ordinator
KFI Gathering 2003
The Krishnamurti Study Centre
Rajghat Fort
Varanasi — 221 001
Uttara Pradesh
Telephone: (0542) 2430717
Fax: (0542) 2430218
e-mail: kfirvns@satyam.net.in/kfirvns@nde.net.in

* * * *

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

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

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

Date: July, 2003

Sd/- Radhika Herzberger
Signature of Publisher

KRISHNAMURTI SCHOOLS

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

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.

The headings before each passage are taken from Krishnamurti's sentences and phrases in the passage below them.

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

Krishnamurti Foundation India
64-65 Greenways Road, Chennai 600 028, India

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