

KRISHNAMURTI  
FOUNDATION INDIA  
BULLETIN

---

Volume No. 3, Issue 1, November, 2005-February, 2006

## FROM THE EDITOR

Krishnamurti's 1929 declaration that Truth is 'a pathless land' was a prelude to the disbanding of the powerful organization with a worldwide membership that Annie Besant had built around The World Teacher. At the time he argued, 'Truth being limitless, unconditioned, unapproachable by any path whatsoever, cannot be organized, nor should any organization be formed to lead or to coerce people along any particular path. If you first understand that, then you will see how impossible it is to organize any belief.'

After that declaration, the choice before Krishnamurti was to either forswear further institutionalisation or to place the burden on those individuals who, fulfilling certain conditions, freely came together to take on the task of running the schools and centres he was to establish. From the beginning, in 1929, Krishnamurti chose the latter option, building a very definite requirement into his choice. A 'desire for understanding the Truth', ameliorated by a certain vision of freedom, was to be the bond that held the group together: 'But those who really desire to understand, who are looking to find that which is eternal, without beginning and without an end, will walk together with a greater intensity, will be a danger to everything that is unessential, to unrealities, to shadows. And they will concentrate; they will become the flame because they understand. Such a body we must create, and that is my purpose. Because of that real understanding there will be true friendship.' In this context, freedom for Krishnamurti had the sense of liberation from those emotions and beliefs that break human bonds, and separate one individual from another. He identified these very simply as beliefs, ideals,

Utopian visions and attitudes fuelled by ambition, violence, greed and envy.

More than fifty years of strenuous effort and failed hopes lay in front of Krishnamurti's desire, expressed in 1929, to create 'such a body'. Towards the end, utterly discounting rules, regulations and hierarchical loyalties that usually underpin institutional life, he once again expressed the 1929 hope in more poetic images: if there is nectar, he said, speaking of the places he created and the earth he had sanctified, the bees will come. Adding, with a smile – the reverse also, if they are not bees, that is, if they are wasps or butterflies, they will leave. He wanted to create that kind of culture where rules or custom would not reign; instead a natural order would inspire man-made institutions.

In the last five years of his life Krishnamurti worked strenuously to create a united body of people to carry the institutions which bore his name; the discussions that we publish in this issue of the Bulletin bear testimony to the complexity of his vision and to the energy he brought to it.

R.H.

## A RELIGIOUS MIND IS LIKE CLEAR WATER

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** Achuji and I were talking the other day that this — Rishi Valley — is not only a school. Probably, in India, Rishi Valley is considered a school, but, I think, we ought to also consider it not merely a school but a place — what's the word? — 'spiritual' ... I don't like the word 'spiritual'.

**G. NARAYAN (GN):** You said, 'A spiritual centre; a spiritual and a religious centre'.

**K:** 'Religious', too, it does not .... It becomes another — if you use the words 'religious' or 'spiritual' — one of those ...

**GN:** 'Religious' is slightly better than 'spiritual'.

**K:** Yes.

**P. N. SRINIVAS (PNS):** Sacred.

**K:** So what word would you use — you are the expert in English — for a gathering of people who are 'religiously-minded'? — but not the religion of tradition, orthodoxy and centralized authority.

Sir, what is a religious life? The present religions throughout the world are just words, a great deal of belief and faith, and years of propaganda. Would you consider all that religion? Idol worship and symbolic worship and repetitive rituals day after day — that's not, surely, religion. So, what would you consider a religious life? — Not joining an *asrama* or following a guru, and all that; that

all smells too much. (*Small laugh.*) So, what would you call a religious group, a religious life? I think that's what we should have [here]. At least, I would like to suggest that this place is not only a school but also a centre of a religious people — not of so-called religion but of a different quality. Now, what would you consider a religious man, a religious life?

**A. KUMARASWAMY (AK):** A life of inquiry into the nature of things.

**K:** There are scientists, too, who are doing that: investigating into matter.

**AK:** No, I am not speaking of that.

**K:** Sir, then investigating into what?

**AK:** Into psychological nature.

**PN:** Psychiatrists do this.

**K:** Sir, we are saying that Rishi Valley is not merely a school but also a religious centre — 'religious' in quotes. And from that we began the subject: What is a religious centre, and who is a religious man? (I think that this — Rishi Valley — should be both: a school and that.) What would you consider a religious mind?

**PN:** A mind that is very intelligent, whole. A holistic mind.

**K:** What do you mean by that? What is a 'holistic mind'?

**PN:** A mind that can see things completely.

**K:** No, no, don't, please, just use words. What do you mean? Is it just a theory? Is it just an ideal towards which you are working? Then you would be just like the other gang. (*Laughs.*) What would you consider a religious mind?

**R. SHANKAR (RS):** A mind which is able to see its own state in relation to the outside. That is, it sees what is happening outside, and feels not only a sense of responsibility for the condition that exists outside but also the impact of it on its own self.

**K:** A lot of Socialists do this, sir. A lot of those who want to change the environment, society, feel that we must start near in order to go far. But let's move, sir, a little bit.

**PARTICIPANT (P):** Sir, can I say something?

**K:** You don't have to ask me if you may say something; just say it.

**P:** A religious mind is a mind which sees the importance of not asking anything. To ask, that is, for oneself.

**K:** Just a minute, sir, just a minute. Be careful. To ask for something for oneself — at what level?

**GN:** He says that he's not asking for anything, but sees the importance of something which he can't articulate. Are you saying that?

**P:** No, sir. Everywhere in the world we see that people want to do various things. And we also see that all these processes have led to divisions and chaos. So, perhaps, a

religious mind is one which sees the importance of not asking for anything for itself.

**P:** A religious mind is a mind which looks at things without prejudice, because 'religions' have certain notions, and they go with us.

**K:** What would a religious mind demand? What is most important, essential for a religious mind? (We are all putting a lot of words together, but we will come to the point presently.)

**HARSHAD PAREKH (HP):** Sir, probably it is compassion.

**K:** Compassion. Now, just a minute, sir. Have you compassion? Or is it just an idea?

**RS:** Perhaps the ending of conflict is the first thing ...

**K:** No, sir, just finish what he was saying. He was saying that compassion is the most essential quality of a religious mind. Is that an idea? Is that an ideal? Do you understand my question? Is it just a concept towards which you are working? Then you belong to the rest of them — right? They are all saying the same thing: 'Gradually we will work towards that'.

**P:** Yes, sir.

**K:** So, would you consider that a religious mind? An idealistic mind — see what the implication of it is: a Utopian concept, a formula towards which you are working — would that be a religious mind? The ideal, and then we are going to achieve that: a purpose, a goal, towards which we are walking. Now, would you call that a religious

mind? I wouldn't; would you? I don't know what you would call it; I wouldn't call it a religious mind. So, we can eliminate one thing. Through negation, through elimination, we come to the ... Do we agree to that?

**Achyut Patwardhan (AP):** I think that is a very good way to start, because all that has been said up to now is covered by that.

**K:** Yes.

**AP:** If we negate each of the things that arise in the mind ...

**K:** ... We will find out what it is. Would you agree, Sankar?

**RS:** Yes, sir.

**AP:** In relation to what Dr Parekh was saying about compassion ...

**K:** Yes.

**AP:** We know that we would like to feel compassion, and at that moment we know that we haven't compassion. We might have sympathy, but we don't have compassion.

**HP:** Yes.

**AP:** So it becomes, again, an aspiration.

**HP:** Yes, but when we speak of something, then it is always an idea. But when we have compassion, we don't speak, sir, at all.

**K:** Would we then say that a religious mind has no ideal?

**SCOTT FORBES (SF):** Krishnaji, how could we even say something like that other than as an idea?

**K:** Verbalization — to put things into words — may be translated as an idea. But not to have ideals! I have no ideals. Personally, I have no ideals, concepts put together by thought. ‘To be a religious man I must be *this*’, is a concept, a pattern, an ideal, the result of careful examination, analysis. You come to a conclusion and say, ‘This is it’, and if you are not *that*, you are not religious.

**SF:** Yes, Krishnaji, but my question really is: We could also make an ideal of not having any ideal.

**K:** Of course.

**SF:** And, so, when we negate things, how do we negate them? Do we negate them just as an idea or do we actually see the validity of something? So, if someone says that a religious mind is one that has compassion or one that has humility ...

**K:** (*Interrupting.*) No, I don’t say anything. I negate what is not.

**SF:** And you make no positive statement?

**K:** No, not positive. Just listen. I say that a religious mind — after this little discussion — has no ideals, no concepts towards which it is working. (*Pause.*) Right? Now, do we move along?

**HP:** Sir, in our daily lives, when we go to classes and we want our students ...

**K:** (*Interrupting.*) I am not talking of students.

**HP:** No, we want our students ...

**K:** Later, later, later. I do not know what a religious life is. I do not know what a religious mind is. After finding out what a religious mind is, I will translate it, as best as I can, to the student. I am not concerned about the student at the moment. Would you go up to this: that a religious mind has no belief, has no ideal, no movement towards the concept? What do you all say, sirs? Don't agree with me.

**HP:** Sir, but if this is true, then when one is doing nothing, just sitting alone ...

**K:** (*Interrupting.*) No, no. I am doing a great deal; I am not doing nothing. I am doing. I am inquiring: What is a religious life? What is the quality of the mind which is religious, not in relation to the school or in relation to some other existing environmental demand? What is a religious mind? Has the saint a religious mind? Has the Pope a religious mind? Sankara, and all the leaders of the old religious organizations — have they religious minds? I am inquiring; I'm not saying either yes or no. Are we together in this? Are you free of belief?

**SR:** And even disbelief.

**K:** No ... belief, not disbelief.

**SR:** You see, sir, saying, 'I don't believe', is also a position.

**K:** Or — if you don't like the word 'belief' — faith. Faith, belief ...

**AK:** Ambition.

**K:** The whole thing. You understand, sir; I don't have to explain this. Are we together in this? — A religious mind has no ideals — sir, that's a tremendous assertion, do you understand? That means it doesn't become something. Would you agree to that?

**AK:** Sir, if I say that, it will, probably, become a verbal assertion, because I don't know whether I have it.

**K:** Sir, see first what the implications are. I don't know Mathematics or History; you are telling me. I listen to you and, then, say, 'Sir, this may be right; this may be wrong'. So, we question it, right? We are in that state. We are questioning the whole religious activity that goes on in the world: the Christian, the Buddhist, the Muslim, the Hindu, the Chinese — the whole religious demand of man. Now, we are asking: What is a religious mind? Does it live in concepts? Does it have ideals? Does it have faith in God, in Jesus, in the Buddha — some external entity to whom I pray? I want help, I look to Him, and all that kind of thing. That is what is generally understood to be a religious life. No? What do you say, sir?

**ALOK MATHUR (AM):** Yes, that is what is generally understood, sir.

**K:** So, would you, to find out what a religious life is, put aside all that? Can you?

**PNS:** That's very simple, sir. It's very simple to put all that aside.

**K:** Will you do it?

**PNS:** I have done it, sir.

**K:** Now, if you have done it, that means you have no — be careful with this — sense of becoming something.

**SR:** Yes, sir.

**K:** This is more difficult, right? I don't become more noble. I have no measurement. You see, this is a little more difficult. I am not 'better'. There is no measurement as 'better', 'less', 'more', and so on.

**SF:** Sir, when there is a sense of the self, is there always a sense of becoming?

**K:** No, no, I don't want to come to the self yet. Don't come to ...

**SF:** I'm trying to see whether one can be free of a sense of becoming if there is still a sense of the self.

**K:** We will come to that later. We are approaching it differently, sir, so leave the self alone. See what happens the moment you stop measuring. I don't know if you are following what I am talking about.

**AP:** Can we put it like this: Each one of us consciously or unconsciously lives in the framework of an environment, in the context of an environment in which there is a constant

interaction, and that this interaction is the becoming?

**K:** (*Denying.*) Just a minute, Achyutji. That is only part ... You know, becoming implies time, measure, a future world. Is one free of all that? When you say, 'No ideal', all that is implied. This is much more difficult than just saying, 'Yes, I have no ideals', in the sense of wanting a bigger nation, a wider nation, a global ... etc. It is the whole feeling of not having — I'm using words so, please, be careful — a future.

**P:** Sir, when he said that he has already done it, isn't that in a sense 'becoming'?

**K:** I can't interpret him; he will tell you.

**PNS:** Sir, I meant these religions, and ...

**K:** All that kind of stuff ...

**PNS:** Yes, they are simple things to discard.

**K:** Of course, they are all childish.

**PNS:** Yes, very childish.

**K:** But you have to go much deeper than that. Not having an ideal implies that there is no measurement; no going from what-is to what-should-be.

**PNS:** Yes, that's important.

**K:** Therefore you will only be dealing then with what-is. If there is no ideal, then I am only dealing with what is actually

going on. Is that right? Would you accept this? (*Small laugh.*) That's why I am asking: Has a religious mind an ideal, a sense of becoming, a sense of measurement, a sense of 'I am this, but in a year's time I'll be different'? Biologically, physically, we are changing all the time; we are not talking of that. Psychologically, there is no measurement. You know, one must be very careful, for otherwise — if there is no future — one gets depressed. The ideal *is* the future.

**P:** Yes.

**K:** If there is no ideal, there is no tomorrow. I wonder if you see this.

**P:** Yes, sir.

**K:** Therefore I am stuck — you understand? — when there is no — if I can use the word — hope. I have no hope. I wonder if you see this.

**HP:** Sir, you are discarding effort completely.

**K:** No, sir, do I see this, and not make an effort to put aside ideals? I see that they are meaningless. (Come nearer, Narayan, for they are all so far away. Come right over here, old boy. Come on; don't be nervous! I'm not ...)

**GN:** Sir, when you say, 'I am not interested in becoming', or 'I am denying becoming' ...

**K:** No, I'm not denying. I am questioning; I am not stating anything. ...

**GN:** You are questioning what a religious mind is.

**K:** Yes. I say that a religious mind has no ideal.

**GN:** You also said that there is no becoming.

**K:** The ideal *is* the becoming.

**GN:** Yes. Then there is a danger that I will fall into being. As I am not becoming, I am in a state of being.

**K:** (*Immediately interrupting.*) No!

**GN:** What would you say to that?

**K:** No, no ...

**PNS:** I am what I am.

**K:** No, just a minute, sir; Narayan is asking a question, sir. He says, 'If I am not becoming, I am'. Sir, according to the Jewish tradition — I have been told this, I haven't read it — it is only Jehovah, the Nameless One, who can say, 'I am'. Do you understand the implications of that?

**GN:** Yes. That is what I am saying. I can't say, 'I am'.

**K:** Narayan, see the implications of it. A tradition — the Jewish tradition — says that no human being can say, 'I am'. Only Jehovah can say that. I may be misrepresenting this, but ...

**GN:** Yes, I have heard this.

**K:** I have heard this. It means: 'I am' is non-movement.

**GN:** But there is always some movement in the mind.

**K:** No, no. You are missing my point.

**GN:** I understand what you are saying. I can't say ...

**K:** No, I am not saying what you can say or I can say. We are asking: What is a religious mind?

**GN:** Yes.

**K:** A religious mind — from this discussion — has no ideal, no sense of, 'I am this, but I will become that', 'I am greedy, but give me a year's time, and I'll be out of it' — which is measure, time, and so on. (No, not time; that's too difficult; we won't go into it.) Would you say that a religious mind is free of all this: measurement, becoming, ideals?

**AK:** Comparison ...

**K:** Measurement *is* comparison. Go on, sir, what do you say to that?

**HP:** All these things come from thinking.

**K:** This comes from thinking, obviously. We are thinking together to find out, first by using words which is a way of communication. And words are the expression of thought. So [with words] we can communicate with each other and say, 'A religious mind is not that'; that's all. It's only one step .... Where were we?

**PNS:** Sir, can one really 'see' without any movement?

**K:** Wait, sir; we'll come to that. First, old boy, don't ask future questions before you have understood this.

**PNS:** I have understood what you say.

**K:** No, inwardly. If there is to be a religious mind, *this* cannot exist. The negation of that which is false is the truth.

**PNS:** Yes, sir.

**K:** Idealistic existence, for me, is nonsensical. Sir, since the 5th century B.C. the whole world has been based on ideals.

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** And you and I who are nobodies (*Laughs.*) get up and say, 'Nonsense'. Do you understand what we're doing?

**PNS:** Yes, sir.

**K:** Either it is absolutely, irrevocably true, or we are just playing around.

**PNS:** We have to be very sceptical about what we think.

**K:** Yes, and sceptical about our denial ...

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** Or sceptical about the experience which we have had, and which makes us hold on to this nonsense. Now, we must come back. A religious mind is free from all ideals. Would you agree? Are we thinking together in this? All the

students have ideals. Right, sir? You were talking about students ...

**HP:** Right.

**K:** All the parents of these children have ideals: the ideals of Mr Reagan (*Small laugh.*), the ideals of Mrs Thatcher, the ideals of this country. Sir, do you understand what we are up against?

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** Either we are totally right or they are totally wrong. You cannot have a middle way.

**PNS:** All the religions have ideals.

**K:** That's what I am saying. Either they are utterly nonsensical, false, illusory, or they are right and I am — we are — wrong. You can't ...

**PNS:** Have both.

**K:** You can't. So: ideals are the projections of thought escaping from what-is. The word 'idea' means, in Greek, 'to observe', 'to see' — and not what we have made out of it. Are we free of ideals? If we want to have a religious centre — 'religious' in quotes — in Rishi Valley, there must be a group of people who are totally free of ideals. (*Pause.*)

**HP:** But, sir, does not the fact of wanting it make it an ideal?

**K:** No, of course not; of course not. Do you see how you have said that, sir?

**HP:** It has to happen.

**K:** No, not has to happen; you see the absurdity of having ideals.

**PNS:** I see it very clearly, sir.

**K:** Then you can't make that into an ideal.

**PNS:** Yes, if we did, we would be playing.

**K:** Are we together in this? The ten of us, fifteen of us, twenty of us — are we together in this?

**SUNANDA SANGADI (SS):** Sir, this is very difficult to understand, because when one uses the word 'religious', it normally means something other than what one can see.

**K:** Of course, of course, but I don't mean that.

**SS:** No, what I am trying to say is that if you discard ideals altogether, you will be discarding a path to something.

**K:** What?

**SS:** You discard ideals, and all goals. You, therefore, discard all paths.

**PNS:** All routes.

**GN:** She is saying that when you discard all ideals, you are discarding all the goals you have and the paths to those

goals.

**K:** Of course, of course; that's right. A path towards a goal, an end, a purpose: all that is implied in the word 'ideal', Narayan.

**GN:** Yes; that's what she is saying. And she is also saying that 'religious' means what you are saying.

**SS:** Yes. I said that it is very difficult to see that.

**K:** To see what?

**SS:** To see that you don't have a specific path. Because once you discard one path, you also have to ...

**K:** Of course, of course. A specific path, a system, a method leading you from this to that — we are denying *that*. Sir, what's the difficulty in this?.. I know that this is a very complex thing. If you denied the what-should-be — which is the future — then, how would you face what-is? Do you understand what I'm saying? In India, especially after years of propaganda for non-violence, we are all caught in the ideal of non-violence — right? — which seems so absurd. When I am violent, pretending that I am non-violent, or that I am practising non-violence, or that I am doing my best to become non-violent is all such idiotic nonsense. You may agree with me but, sir, the whole of India believes in this stuff.

So, I am asking: What is a religious mind? That's what I am asking; I am sticking to that, and say that an idealistic mind is not a religious mind. That's what *I* say; I may be wrong, so correct me. For God's sake correct it; work at it. Tell me I

am totally wrong; we'll discuss it.

**HP:** Sir, I completely agree with you, but my question is: Can one live twenty-four hours a day without ideals?

**K:** You are going to find out, sir. You are going to find out whether it is possible to live for a twenty-four or a hundred hours without ideals. Why do we want ideals?

**P:** What you are saying is, sir, 'Don't have an ideal, a goal, or a path, but live from moment to moment'...

**K:** (*Interrupting.*) No, don't state that yet.

**P:** Just do the right thing.

**K:** Don't say, 'From moment to moment'.

**P:** Well, otherwise you will have a goal for something.

**K:** Look at it, sir. I am violent. If I have no ideal of non-violence, I will have only that. Would you agree to that? I will only have the feeling of violence, and not that I must change violence into non-violence, which is the ideal. I am violent.

**PNS:** I have a doubt, sir. What is the quality of a mind which sees that it is violent? *You* may see it. But there is the murderer who wants to live with violence. He wants to be violent.

**K:** I am not talking of that man.

**PNS:** He doesn't want to be non-violent. He wants to stay with his violence.

**K:** No, what he wants is to express his violence ...

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** He wants to kill somebody, to hurt somebody, to criticize somebody. Violence.

**PNS:** He wants to be that.

**K:** Now, are you like that?

**PNS:** No, sir. I am not like that ... I don't know, sir. I don't know.

**K:** Do you want to express your violence? Do you want to beat me up?

**PNS:** No.

**K:** Hit somebody?

**PNS:** No.

**K:** Imitate somebody, or conform to something which you think is right?

**PNS:** No.

**K:** All that is part of violence.

**PNS:** But all those are very simple.

**K:** Begin with that; don't probe more. (*Laughs.*) Begin with what we can understand. Right?

**PNS:** But all those are very simple. Those I can easily see, and ...

**K:** Yes. That's all you have — violence. Right? What is the difficulty in this?

**PNS:** Sir, I see, but I have a doubt, sir ...

**K:** I see your difficulty. Look, sir, what we generally do is: I am violent but I am attempting to become non-violent.

**PNS:** Yes sir, that's very clear to me.

**K:** Now, what is the action of a human being who is only violent and not non-violent? What does he do with that violence?

**PNS:** He doesn't act violently; he just sees.

**K:** Then what?

**PNS:** Then I don't know. I am stopped many times — knowing nothing.

**K:** Everybody is a bit lost, aren't they?

**GN:** Sir, the violent man expresses his violence in some way or other. But what Krishnaji is implying is something very different. The violent man can have an ideal of non-violence and *pretend* to be non-violent.

**PNS:** No, take a very violent murderer — he doesn't have an ideal at all.

**AP:** No, leave the murderer; take ourselves.

**PNS:** No, we are all confused human beings, so let us not take ourselves.

**AP:** No, let's take only ourselves, because we can only be sure about ourselves.

**PNS:** Yes, all right.

**AP:** So, let us watch ourselves, and find our reactions, for only then can we speak authentically about what we feel.

**PNS:** Yes, sir.

**AP:** Otherwise it becomes theoretical.

**GN:** So, from this discussion I feel that we have: A violent man — the murderer — who wants to express his violence.

**K:** Yes.

**GN:** Then we have the subtle forms of violence: The violent man who is violent all the time but, having an ideal of non-violence, pretends to be non-violent and, therefore, never sees violence as a reality in himself. Then there is the third possibility, namely, of seeing violence in oneself and not escaping to any ideal.

**PNS:** That is an ideal to me.

**GN:** Yes. You can start seeing it intellectually just as you would classify various axioms in Mathematics.

**PNS:** The whole thing is an ideal, because I have got stuck many times.

**GN:** No. The third possibility is that you see something and do not escape into its opposite. Sometimes the scientific attitude requires it. If you are observing something through the microscope, you can't escape into a previous knowledge or to something else. That is an attitude of study. So when you study something, you will be looking at something without projecting its opposite.

**K:** Sir, are you studying violence — in yourself? Study it, and not say, 'I must not be', or 'I am'. Are you learning about your violence? Learn it.

**PNS:** Sir, I obviously don't know what I am doing about all this, but I know that I am stuck all the time.

**K:** No, sir, look. Be simple; be really simple. You are violent, obviously; every human being is. Do you want to learn the content of it?

**PNS:** Surely, sir. I seriously want to learn.

**K:** Which means what? When you want to learn something, what is implied in that?

**PNS:** A lot of care.

**K:** (*Emphatic denial.*) No! (*Laughs.*) You are all so blasted clever. That's what the matter is with all of you. I don't know Mathematics; I am learning from you. I know nothing about it. What does that mean?

**PNS:** You start from scratch.

**K:** Yes. I know nothing about it. You are going to teach me. This means that I am curious; I want to know; I listen. Now, I want to learn about violence. I cannot learn about violence if I have the concept of non-violence. Right? So I must put that aside. Will you?

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** The concept, the ideal, the I-must-not-be-violent — put all that aside and, then, learn about violence. You cannot learn about violence if you have all this chattering going on in your mind. It is so simple.

**PNS:** It is very simple, sir.

**K:** Will you do it? Are you doing it? Violence implies wanting to hurt somebody. Violence implies getting angry. Violence implies imitation, conformity, the sense of righteous indignation.

**PNS:** What do you mean by that, sir? I don't know the meaning of 'righteous indignation'.

**K:** Getting angry righteously, getting angry because we are not feeding the poor: How could you not help these villagers even after sixty years? I get worked up about it. You know what righteous anger is.

**GN:** *Satyagraha.*

**AP:** You know, our whole life is based on this fact: we are quick to respond to an injustice done by somebody else and not by ourselves. I want to correct that injustice, and I get worked up about it. I also feel that I have a right to injure the person who is the 'author' of that injustice or who is in

some way related to it. I clothe my anger in justification. I say that I am acting in the interest of justice and kindness. This is righteous indignation.

**PNS:** Yes, sir.

**AP:** Righteous indignation means to cover anger with a justification which gives it a sanctimonious right.

**K:** Yes. I am learning about violence. You see that instead of becoming non-violent, I am learning about it. It opens the door a tremendous lot. So, we are saying, a religious mind is a non-violent mind *because* it has studied violence in itself and not in somebody else. I have studied my violence. I am violent because I want to hurt somebody. I am angry; I am jealous; I am furious about something or other. I am learning and it may be an endless learning — do you follow? — because anger has got such varieties of expression. Right?

**PNS:** Yes, sir.

**K:** I learn about it, but I am not *becoming* something. It isn't — when I learn about anger — that I have read the book of anger, and come to the end of the book. I am learning. So, would you say that a religious mind is always learning, and never coming to a conclusion? What do you say to that?

**P:** Do you mean to say that it is living in the present?

**K:** You don't know what it means. How can you live in the present if you don't understand the past? What is 'the present', sir?

**P:** It is the past. The present is the past in a different form.

**K:** What is the present? Tell me, what is the present? — The second by the watch?

**P:** No.

**K:** Then what do you mean by 'the present'?

**P:** It is what-is. It is what-is inwardly.

**K:** So, are you separating the present from the past?

**P:** No.

**K:** The past is the present — modified, slightly altered. You see, sir, that is why if we say, 'We must live in the present', I would not know what that means.

**AP:** Sir, I feel that it is actually like this. Let us take a problem like anger. A present instance of anger may be triggered off by an immediate, present contact but, in actuality, the whole mind would have had this anger in a suspended condition. The present incident would have merely ...

**K:** Triggered it off.

**AP:** Yes. So we have to probe deeper for this violence.

**K:** Sir, look, I want to find out what a religious mind is. It may be intellectual first, or it may not be. I am saying that all this is not; I am pushing out everything that's not. I say: An idealistic mind is not a religious mind. My God, do you

realize what we are saying? (*Short laugh.*) This means that we are totally against the whole world of ideation. I don't know if you realize all this. So, we are saying that a religious mind has no ideals, it doesn't function with concepts, with anything other than what-is.

**RS:** Sir, you mentioned that imitation is also a form of violence. This has a strange implication. You see, children in the learning process are always imitating. Would you say that there is violence in this imitation?

**K:** Forget the children. We are talking about you and not the children. I am not connected with the schools. You are not connected with the schools. You are not teachers. We are human beings first, and teachers afterwards. We human beings, if we want to establish a 'religion', in quotes, or inquire into what a religious mind is ...

**RS:** Yes, sir, but would you please explain to me how imitation is actually violence?

**K:** All right. Why do I imitate? Imitation is: I have an example, and I am copying that example. This means that I am conforming to that ...

**P:** Ideal.

**K:** To that image, to that principle, to that concept. I am imitating that. What are the implications in imitation?

**RADHIKA HERZBERGER (RH):** Sir, I am condemning what-is.

**K:** That's it. I am condemning what-is, what I am — which is violence.

**RS:** Not only that. I think that imitation also implies ambition, and ambition is a form of violence, isn't it?

**K:** Of course, I said that earlier. So, sir, are we clear on this? Are we all of the same mind? For God's sake, come to the point! Do we all see the same thing together: that ideals have no place in a mind that is, in quotes, 'religious', or in a mind that is tremendously watchful?

**RS:** Sir, can I raise another question? Doesn't this imply that in a place like this there can be no pattern of behaviour which is implicit? You see, implicitly, there seems to be a pattern of behaviour, and it is ...

**K:** Yes; all right, there is no pattern.

**RS:** There is no pattern of behaviour?

**K:** No.

**RS:** I feel that all of us must concur in this.

**K:** That is what I'm trying to say, sir. Are we all together in this? What do you say, sir? This is our homework.

*(Laughs.)*

**P:** If violence is the end-product of all my thoughts, then do you think I can just negate it like that?

**K:** Sir, 'end-product' — what do you mean by that? Would you put it thus: Violence has always been with me?

**P:** Yes.

**K:** As I have inherited violence from the animal, it has always been with me. I am part of, my existence is part of, violence. That's all I know. I don't know anything about non-violence.

As long as I exist, a part of my life is violent. And a violent mind cannot be a religious mind. That's all I am saying. So, is it possible for me to be *totally* free from violence? Though I have inherited it, and it has been my life — my breeding, everything — can I be free of that — not as an ideal? Is it possible to be free of something that I have inherited, and that is part of me — part of my nose, part of my face, part of my life? Go on, sir. Somebody comes along and says that you can. He says that unless you are free from it, you cannot be a religious man. And religion is important because that is the only factor that brings about a new culture. So you say, 'Help me to be free of violence'. Or you may say, 'Show me; let's talk about it. Let's have a dialogue about whether man can ever be free from violence — not intellectually, but factually'.

**PNS:** Sir, but I don't know how I can have a dialogue.

**K:** Why don't you know?

**PNS:** Sir, you see, this is not like a classroom dialogue. In a classroom I know ...

**K:** No, no, no. Don't you know what violence is?

**PNS:** I know what violence is.

**K:** That's all.

**PNS:** That's all?

**K:** That's all. Let's talk about it. Let's go into it. Let's read this. It is a book, isn't it?

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** So, let's read the pages, the chapters.

**PNS:** It can't be read only now; it has to be read every day.

**K:** You are going through it now. You see, the moment you admit time ...

**PNS:** I am not admitting time.

**K:** You are; by saying, 'Can I?' you are admitting time.

**PNS:** No, no. I am not admitting time. I am not saying that I will do it tomorrow or that I ...

**K:** Sir, can you read that book?

**PNS:** Now?

**K:** Yes.

**PNS:** At this moment?

**K:** Yes, sir.

**PNS:** Sir, at this moment I am a very harmless man.

**K:** No, no, no, no. (*Laughter from the audience.*) Pick up all the threads of violence, and look at it.

**AP:** It is all there inside.

**PNS:** There may be a chance of making it very conceptual.

**K:** No, this is not conceptual.

**AP:** That which is in the subconscious must come up in the conscious. It is all there. I may be very harmless just now, but it is all there, simmering inside me. At the right moment it comes out. So I can't say that there is no violence in me at this moment.

**PNS:** All that is a theory.

**K:** No, sir; how will you study violence? Come on, sir.

**PNS:** I will definitely not study violence like I study Geography or History.

**K:** No. So, how will you study it? Go on, sir. Move; don't stay. You're going to find out — right? — how to learn, how to study, it. To learn — what does that mean? How do you learn? What's the difficulty, old boy?

**PNS:** One starts from basics.

**K:** How do you learn? What is the first thing? Let's say that you want that boy to learn Geography. What is the first thing that you want him to do?

**PNS:** Attend.

**K:** Yes. Which means that you want him to listen to what you are going to say, listen to what you want to tell him — right?

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** Now, here you must listen to what your violence is telling you.

**P:** Is it that I must have contact with the violence?

**K:** Yes.

**AK:** I can observe violence only when it is expressed.

**K:** No, sir. I understand your difficulty but, please, first look at this. Are you going to learn page by page what violence is, page by page read the history of violence — not only in the world but also in you?

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** Now, how will you study the violence which is in you? First you would look, wouldn't you? What do you mean by 'looking'? Tell me, sir, how do you look at violence which is part of you? Sir, how do you look at your face when you are shaving? You look in the mirror, don't you?

**PNS:** Yes. I just look, sir.

**K:** Where? In the air?

**PNS:** In the mirror.

**K:** In the mirror. What is the mirror in which you can look to discover the whole movement of violence — your violence? Have you understood? What is the mirror?

**PNS:** Relationship?

**K:** No, don't answer quickly. (*Laughs.*) What is the mirror

in which you can see the whole movement of anger, violence, and so on? Is there a mirror in which you can look at the whole movement of violence? You can see your face — can't you? — in a mirror. My question is whether there is a mirror in which you can see the whole of this, namely violence, and so on. Find out, sir; don't just say that you don't know, and stop there.

A mirror has been invented with mercury and all kinds of stuff. When you shave or comb your hair, you look into a mirror and say, 'How nice I look'.

**PNS:** I'm doing it, sir.

**K:** Now, do it with me.

**RAJESH DALAL (RD):** Up till now, you have been my mirror. You have been the mirror which has shown me what violence is. The question is whether there is a mirror within oneself as it were.

**K:** No. I am sticking to that word 'mirror'.

**RD:** Sir, I'm saying that you have been my mirror.

**K:** Throw me out.

**RD:** No, sir, you have been a mirror. I wouldn't have understood a bit of all this — violence, and so on — if I had not been with you, heard you and watched with you.

**K:** Yes.

**RD:** Now, what I am saying is, is that as far as I am concerned you have been the mirror.

**K:** Right. Now, is there a mirror which will show you the whole movement of violence? Just as you see the whole of your face in a mirror — if the mirror is large enough — can you see the whole of this movement?

**HP:** Sir, what do you mean by ‘The whole of the movement’? That implies duality.

**K:** I see the whole movement of my face in the mirror. Right, sir?

**HP:** Yes, if there is a mirror, and if there is something beyond it.

**K:** You don’t even listen to what I am saying. There is a mirror in which you can see your whole face. If the mirror is large enough, you can see your whole face, can’t you? You can turn that way or you can turn this way, but you will be able to see the whole thing. Now, is there such a mirror in which you can see the whole of violence? There may not be. I am asking: Is there such a mirror? I put that question to you. What’s your answer?

**PNS:** We stop thinking.

**K:** No. What’s your answer?

**PNS:** I will find out.

**K:** That’s it. How will you find out? (*Laughs.*)

**RD:** Sir, there is a mirror. My very ‘looking’ is the mirror. But it is not a clear mirror. It shows a distorted image.

**K:** If it is your own, why isn’t it clear?

**RD:** I'm watching.

**K:** You are all so complicated. God, what minds you have!

**GN:** I thought that he said that the mirror is relationship.

**K:** He said it, I know. I want to find out whether that was just repetition or ...

**PNS:** No, sir.

**K:** Wait, wait. I know that you have said it. I haven't let that go. It is at the back. (*Laughs.*) I am going to bring it out later. If you say that the whole of violence can be seen in one's relationship with another, then relationship is the mirror.

**PNS:** I can't see the violence if I am sitting alone in a room.

**K:** So, you are saying that in relationship you can see the whole movement of violence. Can you? Or, is it just an idea? Do you understand what I am saying? You are all getting tired. Poor chaps, you are not used to all this. (*Laughs.*) It's all right.

Sir, you said, a few minutes ago, that you can see the whole movement of violence in relationship. Why did you say that?

**PNS:** I have seen that even though I have thought that I was not a violent man, I have, in dealing with some people, very subtly, expressed my violence.

**K:** Yes. So you realize that in relationship you can see these things.

**PNS:** Yes, in a way.

**K:** In a way. Now, can you see the whole of it immediately, and not just a little by little, little by little, day after day? Do you understand what I mean?

**PNS:** Yes, I know. I know.

**K:** If you say, 'A little', you will have already measured it.

**PNS:** Yes, sir, I have measured it right now. Maybe that is because I hope.

**K:** Watch it, and catch yourself. Sir, you are going to find out how important relationship is. In relationship you see your reactions, and your responses. In that mirror of relationship (it is an actual mirror — you understand? — as actual as the mirror hanging on the wall), you see your violence. Now, my question is: If you can see part of it, namely, violence, why don't you see the whole of it? What is preventing you from seeing the whole thing — the ugliness, and so on? Go on, ask yourselves what is preventing you from seeing the whole.

**PNS:** Maybe I am not ...

**K:** No, don't ... You see, you are ready to answer. Have you understood the question? If you can see one part of it, namely, the part of violence, why don't you see all of it?

**PNS:** Maybe we don't look at it completely.

**K:** No. Don't say these things. When you look at that part, don't you also want to see the whole of it? Or, are you only concerned with that part?

**PNS:** I want to see the whole.

**K:** No, you are missing my point.

**PNS:** No, no, sir. I really want to see the whole.

**K:** (*Laughs.*) You see, if you are fixed on one part, you will not be able to see the rest. If you see only one part, you will move. So look. I wonder if I am making myself clear. So, there is a mirror, apart from the physical mirror, in which you can see the whole movement — if you are quick. That's it. You can't see the whole movement if you are slow. If you say, 'Yes, I see one part, so why don't I see the other part? What's wrong with me? I must cultivate observation', and so on — that's it. Do you follow? (*Laughs.*) Do you get it? So, it means, to observe the whole movement of violence you must be as quick as the movement. Right? That means your brain must be so extraordinarily alert as to be able to watch the whole of it. Your brain has to be extraordinarily alert to be able to look at the whole tree — you understand? — and not at just a few branches. Have you seen one of those trees? How extraordinary it is when you see the whole of it. You don't have to study it leaf by leaf; the whole thing is there.

Now, would you say that a religious mind is a mind that sees the whole and not merely a part? So, if you see the whole movement of religious organizations — I'm taking of the whole movement — you will be out of it. You won't join something else or create something else. Do you follow? Are you completely out of the whole so-called religious movement? If you are, then you will have wiped out all the propaganda, the doctrines, the rituals. All belief, all faith will be wiped out; gone. Right? So that is one thing. Then — and this is much more difficult — you will

not think in terms of measurement, of 'progress'; 'I am better than I was yesterday', or something to that effect. (*Laughs.*) Are you out of that? Do you have no sense of measurement whatsoever? To have no sense of measurement means no comparison — no comparing yourself with somebody else, and saying, 'My God, how good he is. I would like to be like him', and all that business. So, if you deny this religious movement — the religious movement as it is established in the world — you will be free of ideals. Then what will be happening to you? What will happen to the brain, to the mind that is free of all this? What happens to it, sir? What happens to you, sir, when you are free of just these two? Let's begin with these two, namely, ideals and all the extraordinary things that are going on in the name of religion.

**PNS:** It has more strength.

**K:** No. What has happened to you?

**PNS:** You are free.

**K:** All right. Then what? What's the state of your mind — we'll call it the mind for the moment — what's the state of your being when you have finished with this and wiped all this out?

**P:** It has strength.

**K:** Unless you are clear, don't say anything.

**PNS:** Yes, sir.

**K:** Do you see what it means?

**PNS:** It means to have integrity.

**K:** Which means what? You will have a tremendous, immovable quality regarding these two because, sir, you will have realized that ideals — measurement — and belief are absurd. You will have such tremendous integrity and will, therefore, be like a rock in the middle of an ocean.

Now, we come back. You meet these students. What is their relationship to you? You are immovable, you understand? Religion — beliefs — and ideals — measurement — are absolutely out. Therefore, you are like a rock. What is their position with regard to you? What is their relationship to you? How do they treat you? Don't you know? Put yourself in the position of those boys, sir.

**PNS:** Very affectionate.

**K:** No! Don't use those words. They have always met human beings who have ...

**PNS:** All this.

**K:** Yes, ideals and beliefs, and so on. Therefore, there is nobody they have met who is immovable. Do you understand what I am saying? Good Lord, come on, old boy! They are always meeting people who are moving, changing, having ideals, trying to become. Suddenly they come upon a man who is immovable.

Look at the boy. What does he feel towards you? He has always met people who wobble, who move from one thing to the other. Or he has meet obstinate people. You are not obstinate. So, what happens? What happens when you meet somebody who shows you — after good arguments and

everything — that this is so? You will say, 'My God, I have never met a human being like that before'. Do you follow this? That individual will be communicating something which you have never met, never even heard of before. I don't know if ...

**PNS:** Like my relationship with you.

**K:** (*Laughs.*) Cut me out. I purposely avoided that.

**PNS:** Why? Why did you purposely avoid it, sir?

**K:** Because I will be gone. The day after tomorrow — dead.

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** Yes, sir. Do you know what it does to you when you meet somebody who is like clear water — without any reflection; solid? When you meet these boys, are you in that solid position? — Immoveable?

So we were saying, that a religious mind is free from the organized religions of the world which have been put together by thought, and has no ideals of any kind. It is only concerned with facts, with what-is, and with the ending of what-is. What else is there for a religious mind?

**PNS:** Energy.

**K:** You will have energy. You see, when you are not playing with false things, you will have energy. What is the other thing? I would say: No conflict — no conflict within oneself and, therefore, no conflict with anybody. No conflict, contradiction. Only then there can be love, there can

be compassion and intelligence. So, can you end conflict in yourself? When you talk to the students, can you have no conflict? You see, unless *this* is inside you (*Laughs.*), the students will become cynical, and they will say, 'You are a hypocrite. There is no point in listening to this man'.

— Rishi Valley  
December 14th, 1982

## BEGIN SIMPLY

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (K):** I think some of you were not there, [in Rajghat], so let's make it clear again....

In Banaras, in Rajghat, there were a few of us who formed a nucleus — that is, a group of people who are concerned entirely with the Teachings. And we formed, if you can use the word, a 'religious' group. And, so, we thought that at Rishi Valley, too, there should be such a group: a nucleus of people who are concerned with the world and, so, naturally with the Teachings. (We will use the word 'Teachings', for the moment, for what K has been talking about.) And [we said that] Rishi Valley should become not only a first class school but also a religious centre. We mean by religion not the orthodox, traditional, fanciful, romantic, nonsensical so-called religions.

We were inquiring the other day or, rather, a couple of days ago: What is a religious mind? And we are going to go into that again this morning. Etymologically the root meaning of the word 'religion' is not very clear. None of the dictionaries have made the root meaning of the word 'religion' clear. But we can, more or less, by negating what is not religion, a religious mind, come to discover for ourselves what a mind that is truly religious is. We said that an 'ideal' mind, that is, a mind that thinks in terms of ideals is not a religious mind. Ideals are a projection of what-should-be, what-might-be, what-ought-to-be: the end, the goal, the purpose, the conceptual statement of other than what-is. (Am I speaking too many words?) We said that a mind which functions in ideas, in ideals — pursuing a certain direction laid down by thought — such a mind is not a religious mind. (I do not know what you will say to

all this.) And, also, we said that a religious mind is not a believing mind. It is, rather, sceptical, doubting, questioning, inquiring and, so, there is no sense of authority, no hierarchical outlook on life. So there is no belief in some strange, fanciful God, or that we shall be *that*, and so on. Also we said — and this is much more complex — that a religious mind has no conflict; that is, perceiving the nature of conflict and eliminating conflict.

I think we reached this point, didn't we?

**G. NARAYAN (GN):** Yes.

**K:** Can we go further into this: a religious mind?

And we want Rishi Valley to be a religious centre and not merely a school — a religious centre in the sense: no beliefs, no ideals (ideals are a very, very complex business), and the cessation of conflict in ourselves and in our relationship to others. This is what we talked about, and came up to the last time we met here. Now, can we discuss this — discuss it — and not me talk and explain? Let us go into it together to find out if one can lead a life without a single conflict, not only in oneself but in one's relationships, in one's communication, in one's activity. Not only the creation of conflict, but also the ending and the understanding of the nature of conflict — can we go into that?

**HARSHAD PAREKH (HP):** When the mind is watching the conflicts going on, would you call this a religious mind?

**K:** Now, let us understand what we mean by conflict. What do you mean by 'conflict'? — A struggle, a sense of what-

is and what-should-be, a sense of contradiction, a duality, a statement and the contradiction of that statement in oneself: saying one thing and doing another. I would call that, for the moment, conflict. In saying one thing and doing another there is a great deal of pretension, hypocrisy, lack of integrity — sorry to use all these words — no honesty. So what do *you* — all of you please discuss it — mean by conflict?

**GN:** Sir, there is a Western way of looking at this. They say: One is tension-reduction, generally a reduction of tension.

**K:** What?

**GN:** There are two ideas with reference to conflict. One is the reducing of tension. The other is, they say, that when a man takes on a big challenge, there can be an increase of tension but not necessarily of the nature of a conflict.

**K:** So, let's find out what we mean by conflict.

**GN:** Yes, and what is the relationship between conflict...

**K:** And challenge...

**GN:** And tension and challenge?

**K:** Yes. What is the relationship — not conflict, but the relationship — of one who is being challenged? Right? I am challenging you now. Is that challenge awakening a defensive mechanism which then would be a conflict, or a resistance which then breeds conflict? Or is it a challenge which you observe without reaction? I wonder if I am

making myself clear. Which is it? I am talking; please, discuss with me.

**PARTICIPANT (P):** Sir, if I may say, if we observe the challenge — if we observe — I don't think there is any conflict in observing.

**K:** No, but there is conflict when there is resistance.

**P:** No. You are just observing without any resistance.

**K:** That is quite a difficult matter. What do you mean by 'observing'?

**P:** That is, you don't come to any conclusion.

**K:** Yes.

**P:** You don't decide that what you are saying is not correct or that what I am thinking is correct. You just listen.

**K:** Which means: you are not reacting to the challenge, you are not resisting the challenge, you are not accepting it or denying it.

**P:** Yes.

**K:** What, then, is your approach to the challenge? If you are not denying it, if you are not accepting it, if you are not resisting it — if you are not creating, in the very observation of the conflict, a resistance — if none of these exist, then what is your approach to the challenge?

**P:** It is a factual approach.

**K:** What, sir?

**GN:** A factual approach.

**K:** What do you mean by a 'factual approach'?

**P:** There is no resistance, there is no image there; you simply face it as it is.

**K:** Sir, I am challenging you now. Sorry.

**P:** With what are you challenging us, sir?

**K:** I am challenging you to find out what you mean by conflict. That is a challenge. What do you mean by 'conflict'? Go on, sir. How does conflict arise?

**P:** Conflict is between the image and the actuality, sir.

**K:** Yes. Which means — what? I have a wife. There is conflict between us, between my brother and myself, my father and myself, my wife and myself, and so on. What do you mean by that conflict?

**P:** Sir, sometimes we feel low and depressed, and some other times we feel high ...

**K:** Sir, I said: What is my relationship with my wife which brings about conflict?

**P:** Disagreements.

**K:** Why is there disagreement? Look sir, here we are. Why is there a disagreement between us?

**P:** Because there is no relationship.

**K:** No, don't reduce it to relationship. Why is there disagreement? Either it is the disagreement of opinion, or the disagreement of judgement, or the disagreement of conclusions. Right? Am I making all this clear, or am I using a lot of words? So my wife and I disagree. She clings to an opinion and I cling to mine. Her values are different from mine. Her evaluation of what is necessary is different from mine, and so on. Why is there disagreement?

**P.N. Sreenivas (PNS):** Because I hold on to my opinion.

**K:** Yes. Go on, sir. Why?

**P:** There is a division, sir, between my wife and me.

**K:** Yes, yes. You are not answering my question.

**P:** Probably I don't want to compromise.

**K:** Sir, I compromise — which is a form of conflict. Compromise breeds conflict.

**GN:** He said, 'I *don't* want to compromise'.

**K:** No. If you don't want to compromise, it means that you have already compromised. (*Laughter.*) I am not being clever.

**P:** Sir, there is no clarity in my vision, in either of our visions.

**K:** Is that it?

**P:** When I cannot see very clearly, I cling on to what I see or what I want to see. Or he or she — whoever it is I m relating to — clings on to his or her own opinions.

**PNS:** At times I may see very clearly, but I don't want to give up my ... myself.

**K:** Go on, sir. Let's talk about it. You have disagreements with people, don't you?

**T:** Yes, sir.

**K:** Do you have disagreements with Radhikaji, or with Mrs Thomas, or with Mr Narayan?

**P:** No, sir.

**K:** Don't say, 'No, no'.

**P:** What do you mean by 'disagreement', sir?

**K:** He does something of which I disapprove.

**P:** It is quite possible, because we can't agree about all ...

**K:** Wait, wait, wait. This is how we have existed — right? — all our lives.

**P:** That is, we do not agree?

**K:** No. I question this whole attitude of disagreement.

**P:** It is not an attitude, sir. In some cases you have to disagree. Why should you agree always?

**K:** Sir, I am coming to that. You are asserting that there must be disagreement.

**P:** Not necessarily, but there *can* be disagreement.

**GN:** Are you saying there can be disagreement, but that it need not be a conflict?

**P:** Yes, not a conflict. It can be resolved.

**K:** Wait a minute, sir. A disagreement can be dissolved — right? But why do I have a disagreement?

**P:** Probably because we have not understood each other.

**K:** Which means — what? I'll stick to my wife and myself — because that is what most of us (*Laughs.*) are caught in. My wife does something and I disagree with it. Or I do something, and she disagrees with it. There is conflict. I am questioning why between two people who have known each other — sex, children, all the rest of it — there is disagreement at all? Don't answer it, sir, too quickly; go into it a little bit.

**PNS:** There is no care, sir, between each other. We don't care for each other.

**K:** So, what does that mean? Go on, sir; explain to me a little more; I don't understand what you mean by it.

**PNS:** Suppose you say something to me. If I have to really understand you, I should care to listen to you, and try to understand what you mean by that.

**K:** So, my wife doesn't care to listen to me, and I don't care to listen to her because we have lived for ten years or twenty years or fifty years, and we know each other's reactions very quickly, and say, 'Oh God, here it begins again!' Right? (*Laughs.*) Sorry. Is this all very familiar? Now, I am questioning this whole divisive agreement and disagreement. There is divisiveness in this. Do you understand, sir?

**PNS:** Even in agreement?

**K:** Even in agreement. I question why there is divisiveness, why there is division, which brings about agreement or disagreement. Before that there is conflict, and then there is compromise: 'Darling, you do what you want to do', and she says, 'Today I will', (*Laughs.*) and all the rest of it. Now, you tell me: Why is there this divisive process in human relationship, which is really the essence of conflict?

**P:** Can we approach it from the idea of attachment? —  
Because each individual ...

**K:** That arises later, sir. I am attached to my wife. Why am I attached? (I don't want to enter into that for the moment; it leads us somewhere else.)

Why is there division between my wife and myself, between myself and society, between myself and the community, myself and God, myself and the nation, and so on, and so on? Why is there this divisive, fragmentary process going on in one? I wish you would discuss this. Put your brain into it, sir.

**T:** Because I have an idea of how I think it should be.

**K:** Yes; we said that. Where there is a separative attitude towards life — I want my way and you want your way, or I think it should be that way and she thinks it should not be that way — that process is divisive, fragmentary, and breeds conflict. Now, I want to know why there is this division.

**P:** Is it dependence, sir?

**K:** No, sir.

**P:** Mustn't it start off from the sense of being a separate entity, and being apart from the other?

**K:** Yes; go ahead, sir ... What were you going to say, madame?

**P:** Is it selfishness?

**K:** What do you mean by that word 'selfishness'? Sir, please bear in mind what we are discussing. We want Rishi Valley to exist not only as a school but as a religious centre — which is far more important than the school. From the religious centre, schools can be something excellent, super-excellent. So, we are trying to understand: What is a religious mind? We said that a religious mind doesn't belong to any of the rituals, and *puja*, and all the verbal statements, and so on. It doesn't belong to any group, any sect, any ideal, utopia, etc. We also said that it has no beliefs, no ideals. And we said that for a religious group, for a religious mind, there must be no conflict. Conflict exists between me and you: my husband, my wife, my father, etc. I say, 'Why does it exist?' and *not* 'I should compromise, I should tolerate, I should adjust'. I don't

want to adjust, I don't want to compromise; I want to understand why there is conflict between me and you.

**A. KUMARASWAMY (AK):** Each one carries an image of himself and also of others. This conflict arises because of these images.

**K:** Why do you have an image?

**AK:** Because of the past, the experience.

**K:** Don't, please don't just throw out a lot of words; go into it, sir, a little bit. Why do you have an image about yourself? Why? And a wife has an image about her husband. Do you understand? Both the wife and the husband have an image about each other. Why?

**PNS:** It is some form of security, sir, to be mechanical ...

**K:** Be clear; don't be hesitant. Think it out. You will accept it when it is truthful. Right?

All right, let's begin the other way. Forget my wife. Why do I have an image about myself? You all have it, haven't you? Agreed? Why?

**P:** The image is based on some feeling, whether it is pleasurable or painful.

**K:** Yes, sir. But why do I have it?

**P:** That is memory.

**K:** No, no.

**PNS:** It is some form of insecurity. I want to have something to be sure of.

**K:** So, are you saying that having an image about myself gives me a certain sense of security?

**PNS:** Yes, sir.

**K:** Are you doubtful?

**PNS:** No, sir, I am sure.

**K:** (*Laughs.*) You are sure. Do we? He and I agree — no, not agree; we see the same fact. Sorry, forgive me. You and I see the same fact just as you and I see that this is a microphone. We have called it a 'microphone'; you can call it a 'giraffe', but then we would both call it a giraffe, and there would be no sense of agreement or disagreement. So, do we both see — you and, I for the moment — that having an image about oneself gives a sense of security? Now, do we — all of us — see this fact? Do you see the same fact, that is, the same red flower on that tree? So there is no agreement or disagreement about the demand for, the creation of, an image which gives us security. Right? You and I — we — see the same fact. Therefore, there is no agreement or disagreement. Are we clear about this?

**P:** Could we go into that a little more, sir?

**K:** Why do I have an image about myself? From childhood this image has been built up. My father and my mother say, 'You must be like somebody else; you are not as good as your brother, you are not as beautiful as ...' You know what they do. And not only the parents do; you also create your own image. Right? Don't you? And that gives you a sense

of identity, a sense of having roots somewhere, a sense of stability. Do you see it? For God's sake!

**P:** That is only one part of it, sir.

**K:** Wait; that's good enough. Begin with that, sir.

**GN:** What would be the other part? He said that is one part. I was wondering what the other part would be.

**K:** Let me; I was going to ask him that. So this building up of an image from childhood is 'me'. Take away that image — what have I?

**GN:** Is this sense of location necessary? A point, it must have a location — is it necessary?

**K:** I may have an image as an Indian, as a communist; we all have some kind of image.

**GN:** Right, but what I am asking is: This point of location, this point of security — is that a human necessity?

**K:** We are going to find out. But do we all see that we have images? It is so obvious. We all have them.

**P:** Yes, we all have them.

**K:** If you inquire why we have them, then you begin to find out — as you have found out for yourself — that it gives us a sense of identity, a sense of being, a sense of non-isolation.

**P:** Isolation, actually.

**K:** Yes. But, wait, wait. That comes later. In that there is security, and so on. Do we all see this point before we go further? This is a class. (*Laughs.*) Do you see it? Can we go on from there? Now, why do I have it? And why has it become so extraordinarily important? And what is the nature and the structure of this image? Do you understand? I know the nature and the structure of a microphone; it has all been very carefully put together by thought, by experience, by knowledge. Now, this image which I have built of myself — what is the nature of it, what is the structure of it? This building is a structure; it — the structure — has been put together. The meaning of the word structure is 'movement'. This is a movement.

**P:** But a ...

**GN:** Something may appear static, but the movement is inside.

**K:** Let's leave it for the moment ... Now, what is the nature of this image? How has it been put together? It's a structure. How has it been put together? It is a movement: adding, adding; taking away; adding.

**P:** Yes, yes.

**K:** I am asking you: What is the nature of it? What is the content of it?

**PNS:** All that has happened.

**K:** Go on, sirs.

**P:** The accumulation of all past experiences whether they are pleasurable or painful.

**K:** Sirs, I don't want to tell you; go on, sir.

**P:** Sir, it is also built on all the ideals that I have held.

**K:** Yes.

**P:** What has been told to you.

**K:** Yes; your experiences, your concepts — put it all together; you will see it in a minute — your beliefs, your judgements, your hurts, your desires, and so on, and so on. The nature of the image is — what?

**P:** The accumulation of all that.

**K:** Yes sir. Move; move a little more.

**P:** Sir, memory.

**K:** Memory! He said memory. Is the nature and the structure of the image memory?

**P:** Yes, sir, and thought which is based on memory.

**K:** Memory. The whole thing is based on memory. No?

**RADHIKA HERZBERGER(RH):** Then you will have to say a certain *kind* of memory, because you can have factual memories, you can have ...

**K:** For the moment we are saying that it is based on memory. Don't let's ...

**P:** It's remembrance.

**K:** Remembrance is memory. Remembrance of things past. So, what is it? If the nature of the image is memory, then what is memory?

**PNS:** The past.

**K:** What does that mean?

**P:** It is not actual.

**K:** Yes; it's something gone. Right?

**P:** Yes.

**K:** My brother is dead, but I have a memory of him. What does that mean? — *That is also dead.*

**PNS:** It is not alive.

**K:** So what does it mean? I am living on dead things. Right? The nature of my image is memory, the remembrance of things that have happened, and so on, and so on. On that I am living — right? — and she is living on that, and you are living on that. So ... What?

**PNS:** So, we are not really living.

**K:** Please, don't. What does it mean? Come on, sirs; look at it.

**ACHYUT PATWARDHAN(AP):** Sir, we are afraid to be completely new, afraid to be totally uncertain about ourselves, about others.

**K:** Achyutji, answer my question, sir, if you don't mind. I am living in the past — which is the accumulation of memory of a hundred years or fifty years or ten years — and she is living on that, too. I am asking: What is the quality, the nature, of this?

**RH:** Shadow boxing.

**K:** Shadow boxing! Yes. (*Laughter.*) Go on; tell me some more. See, you are not *with* it; it is all still ideas. You are not with the image which you have. You are not watching that image, and seeing the nature of that image, which is something that is over: a remembrance of it, which is memory. And memory is words, pictures, symbols — all dead things. I can give them vitality, but they are dead. Do you understand what I am saying?

**PNS:** It is like a machine working, going on.

**K:** No; machines have vitality. (*Laughs.*)

**PNS:** Memory also has ...

**K:** (*Interrupting.*) No. I said: I have a dead brother, and I remember him; but the fact is gone. I have certain recollections, remembrances — which are my memories, and I am living on that. See what I am doing.

**P:** I'm not really living.

**K:** What does that mean?

**P:** It means not seeing.

**P:** It means I am dead to the present.

**K:** I do not know what the present is. One of the most difficult things is to find out what the present is.

**PNS:** But I am living with these images, and I am being pulled, influenced by the memory.

**K:** You, sir, are that image. I don't think you realize this. You are not being pulled by the image.

**PNS:** Sir, I am being pulled by that image.

**K:** No, sir; *you are the image.* (Laughs.)

**PNS:** We have to be careful with words.

**K:** Exactly.

**HP:** Sir, you remember something which has happened in the past and when you are aware of that remembering in the present, then it is the present — isn't it? Then it is not the past.

**K:** Sir, I am taking one example. You stick to one example, too, and work it out, sir. My brother is dead — fifty years or sixty years ago. If I am living on the memory of that brother who dies, then what is the quality of that memory? What is the difficulty, sir?

**HP:** That quality will depend on whether you are forcing yourself to have that memory, or on whether that memory is spontaneous.

**K:** What? What are you talking about? I am talking about my brother — dead.

**HP:** Sir, memory just comes spontaneously...

**K:** No. There is no spontaneity in memory. Sir, please just listen. My brother is dead — which is a fact. And suppose I am living — which I am not — on the memory of his living: how we walked together, what we said together, the shirts we wore, and so on, and so on, and so on, what is my brain doing?

**P:** It is trying to seek some form of pleasure.

**K:** (*Emphatic.*) No.

**P:** It is in the past.

**K:** Yes, but what does that mean? I am living in the past. Right?

**P:** Yes.

**K:** Now, what does that mean? To live in the past — on what? What is the past? For God's sake!

**P:** My experiences.

**K:** Please, don't ... My brother is dead. And if my brother is dead, and I am living on that memory, what does that mean?

**PNS:** I am living in ideas.

**K:** I am living in ideas. What does that mean?

**PNS:** Illusions; things that are not real, sir. Things that are not ...

**K:** Stick to that. I am living on something that is not real — right? — that is not actual. What does that mean? Why am I doing this? This is my image.

**HP:** But this act of memory which is happening in the present is actual — isn't it, sir?

**K:** Is it? ... It is actual in the sense that I am bringing something dead to the actual. What's the matter with all of you? What's the difficulty in this? Somebody help me, please. (*Laughs.*) Sir, I will go into it. My brother is dead — fifty-seven years ago.

**PNS:** You remember it very well.

**K:** I just calculated now. He died in '25; fifty-seven years ago. And if I have — which I haven't got — the picture of him, how he looked, what we talked about ...

**PNS:** You don't have the picture of him, sir?

**K:** No. Sir, don't bother about me. I haven't got one. Don't — look here old boy — go into that for the moment. He died of tuberculosis. And if I remember all the things that he said to me, and I said to him, the quarrels, etc., etc., I am living on something that is gone, only on something that is remembered. Right? That remembrance is memory. Memory is experience. The things we have talked about, and so on — all gone. I can revive them and say, 'This is very actual, very living'. But it is reviving a dead thing — right? And when I do that, what's happened to the brain? It's being clogged by things which are gone.

**PNS:** Which are unnecessary.

**K:** No, gone! Don't use that word. (*Laughs.*) Then they will begin to ask, 'What is necessary? What is not necessary?'

So the brain is living on past memories, on dead things which have an emotional impact if revived. If they don't revive, and it keeps on thinking about and looking at it, it just becomes a sloppy little machine. Right? Do you see the fact? Am I right in this? I am living on something which is dead and, therefore, my brain also dies. I wonder if you see this.

**P:** Sir, you said the emotional response is real. Therefore, maybe, I would like to recollect, recall that, if it is pleasurable.

**K:** Yes, which means what? I have, I have derived pleasure from a dead thing: memories. Memories are always dead. Right? And I am deriving, out of a dead body, pleasure! (*Laughs.*)

**SCOTT FORBES (SF):** Is that pleasure what gives it its force?

**K:** Its force, its vitality, its sense of loyalty. 'I must be loyal to my brother: he died so long ago; we liked each other' — you know all that.

**SF:** But it is the pleasure that keeps it going, you said.

**K:** Pleasure, and the constant repetition of it. I have a picture on my mantelpiece, and I look at it every day. You know, sir, all the things that go on with human beings. My image is all that. Right? So my brain is living on a dead carcass. I am purposely using the word 'carcass'. Right? So what's happened to my brain?

**PNS:** It is decaying.

**K:** Haven't you seen, sir, old ladies and old men who are living in the past?

**PNS:** We are also living in the past; we don't have to look to old ...

**K:** I'm being polite. (*Laughter.*) So the brain is never fresh. Now: My wife has a memory, an image of me, and she is living on that; and I am living on my image of her — so two dead things. And the relationship is between these two dead things, each giving it life. So: battle, conflict. So, the next question is: Is it possible to live without any image? Listen. Is it possible to live without a single image? Not *how* to control it, *how* not to do it, *how* to live but, first of all, put the question.

**P:** Krishnaji, you were saying that we are *not* living; we are living in the past and, so, we are dead.

**K:** More or less dead. (*Laughs.*) Yes, I did; that's what I said.

**P:** Then the only way of living is to leave the past.

**K:** Now, sir, what was my question? — Is it possible to live daily life without a single image which causes conflict, which brings a division? Right? As long as I have an image about you and you have an image about me, those very images are a divisive process; they divide. Right? Now, the question is: Can you and I live without a single image?

**P:** Totally unattached.

**K:** (*Quickly interrupting.*) No. You see, you are ready to answer; please see what is implied in the question.

**PNS:** I'm not trying to find out an answer.

**K:** *I'm* not trying to find the answer; I have put the question to see the implication of the question: Can I live without the image? I have an image about India, and I belong to that species, that tribe. Can I live without the image of India, without the image of the flag? The idea that I am a Brahmin, non-Brahmin — they are all images. Can I live without that? Of course, those — not to belong to any country, and all that — are fairly easy. Then, is it possible to live without any conclusion, which is an image? Do you see the complications?

**PNS:** Yes, sir.

**K:** That is, can I live without any end, purpose, goal? As long as I have a purpose, a goal, and you have a purpose, we will be at loggerheads with each other. If you are a Communist and I am a Democrat, if you are a Marxist and I am a Capitalist — inevitable division, right? So, I see that as long as I have an image — an Arab and a Jew, British, and so on — there must be division and, therefore, there must be conflict. So, can I live without a single image? What do you say, sir? Don't answer; see what the content of the question is, first.

**P:** It is a challenge, sir.

**K:** The image is tradition. Right? That tradition may be yesterday's tradition or a thousand years' tradition. It is still a repetition from yesterday to today to tomorrow. Right? So,

ask yourself whether you can live without a single image. (*Long pause.*) If I say, in all humility, that I have no image about any damn thing — anything — you will say, ‘You are crazy’.

**PNS:** I won’t say that, sir.

**K:** Why not? Why not say, ‘You are living in an illusion’? I say: No. I see the nature of images, the destructive nature of images, the divisive nature of images which bring conflict. And a religious person has no conflict. That is not an ideal; I see that as a fact, so it’s finished; I have no images. No images — if you *see* the fact. But you say, ‘Why should I not have the images?’ We can discuss it, but do you see the fact — a simple fact — that where there is division, there must be conflict? That is, where there is a ‘Jew’ and an ‘Arab’, a ‘Muslim’ and a ‘Hindu’, a ‘Christian’ — you do *pujas*, I don’t do *pujas*; you go to Mass, I don’t go — you follow? — there is division and there must be conflict. The nature of division is the beginning of images — ideological images, historical images, and conclusions. From historical studies you come to a conclusion and hold on that conclusion and work everything round that conclusion. This is what the Communists, the Totalitarian people are doing — that is, creating a division — and the Democrats and the Capitalists are doing their stuff. Right?

**RAJESH DALAL (RD):** Krishnaji, are you saying that the very seeing of the nature of the division ends division?

**K:** Yes.

**SF:** Sir, then that implies that the seeing of this division has more vitality and more force than the ...

**K:** Obviously, obviously.

**SF:** If that is true, Krishnaji, why do we then maintain the division?

**K:** I will show you in a minute. I have explained this; K has explained very, very carefully the whole nature of division: separativeness through ideation, ideals, conclusions, definitions, and so on. And each one of us chooses one and clings to it ... I prefer the Marxian; you prefer the Capitalist, and so on. So, each one builds an image, and holds on to it. And the image is a dead thing. It's like shutting all the windows hoping, thereby, to find some kind of security in that. Right? And apparently there isn't. So: conflict arises where there is division. Full stop!

**RD:** One brain sees this and says that the very seeing ends it. And the other brain...

**K:** Doesn't see it.

**RD:** No. But the other brain *says* it. It says, 'I see that images are divisive', but that itself is one more image or one more conclusion.

**K:** Of course, that's just it. Now, that means — what? Just listen. That is, the speaker — K — is speaking *seeing* the fact, and holding on to the fact, the reality of it. You hear it — verbal communication takes place — and you draw a picture of it, an idea of it, and you hold on to that idea, but do not see the fact.

**RD:** Right. Now, K points that out, and this man says, 'Yes'.

**K:** (*Emphatic.*) No, you don't ... No. Either you see it or you don't see it. Don't say, 'I see it'.

**GN:** I think he is trying to say, 'I can say to myself that I am seeing but, actually, I am not seeing'.

**K:** Of course; I mean that's simple enough.

**GN:** Sir, the question: Is it possible to be without images? is a question of far-reaching depth. How does one give depth and vitality to something which is real? — because the image-making mechanism seeps in very quickly.

**K:** Look, Narayan: Once you see that something is dangerous, it is over. You don't go each time to the precipice and say, 'I must run away from it'. You see the danger of it; it's not that you see one moment and not see the next moment. When you see danger, when you see poison, when you see something terrible, it is finished; you don't go near it. But we don't want to listen. Right?

**SF:** Why, sir?

**K:** Because it is too damned disturbing.

**SF:** It interrupts the pleasure of ...

**K:** (*Interrupting.*) Too disturbing. I have found security in my image, and you come along and say this. I hear you, but I don't — you know.

**SF:** But the fact is, Krishnaji, it really does not give security, it gives only the impression ...

**K:** You *say* that.

**SF:** But it is a fact.

**K:** Sir, Britain, France, Germany, Russia; each one knows that isolation is the most dangerous thing.

**SF:** But they maintain it.

**K:** But they maintain it. Why? It is simple. The politicians, the voters: 'Being British, British, British, British' ...

**SF:** But then, at an individual level, Krishnaji ...

**K:** It is the same process.

**SF:** But I can see that it breeds tremendous insecurity and, yet, ...

**GN:** We continue with it.

**P:** Yes, we continue it.

**K:** Which means — what?

**GN:** Is there a dilemma in that?

**K:** You are a damn fool! (*Laughter.*)

**PARTICIPANT (P):** Yes.

**RH:** Krishnaji, can't one say that the question 'Can one live without an image?' *you* pose for us; we don't pose it to ourselves?

**K:** That's what I am telling you. If you put that question to yourself, what would be your answer?

**PNS:** I should be as serious as ...

**K:** (*Interrupting.*) No, no, no. What would be your answer? Have you put that question to yourself?

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** Then, what takes place?

**PNS:** I would very much like everyone else to live that way; I can't say anything about myself. (*Laughter.*)

**K:** Yes. 'Let them all stop war first, then I will stop war.' I know all the good old stuff.

**HP:** Sir, my response to that question would be: I would be watching images as they come. I would be in touch with what is happening.

**K:** Then you will take all your years, sir.

**HP:** No, it is not so, sir. It is while living just watching whatever comes. It is not seeking freedom from images, but to be in touch with them.

**K:** Sir, why do you complicate these questions? I am just asking a very simple question. I have lived with images. Then you come along and put that question to me. Then I say, 'Am I putting this question to myself, or am I just repeating the question?' Do you understand, sir? Have *you* put that question to *yourself*? I am asking you, sir.

**HP:** Yes, sir, and I answer: Without putting that question to yourself, you can watch what is happening.

**K:** Jesus! Sir, after coming to a certain point through all this morning's dialogue, you have put that question to me. This chap puts that question to me, and I say to myself: Is it *his* question, or *my* question? If it is my question, if I have put it, what's my answer to it?

**RD:** Sir, you asked that question...

**K:** (*Interrupting.*) I haven't asked it; you have asked it of yourself.

**RD:** No, sir. In today's dialogue, you asked that question; you put that question verbally. And I noticed people giving answers to the question. At some moments I noticed answers coming from me, and I brushed my answers aside. Then I realized how difficult it was for me to even put the question. I was noticing — all the time — that my mind was not putting the question.

**K:** All right. Now, after saying all this, put that question.

**RD:** I put it, sir. I'm saying that suddenly it happened; I became more serious. I put the question, but there was no answer. The mind was silent. There was no answer in the mind.

**K:** What do you mean 'There was no answer'? Why not? Or, you are refusing to answer; you don't want to answer.

**RD:** But I am asking the question of myself.

**K:** You can ask it, but unconsciously, deeply you say, 'For God's sake I'll keep quiet'. When you say, 'I have put the question', put it — not as just something casual but because you want to know.

I want to know if it is possible to live without one image. What does that mean? Suppose I have no image, but my wife has an image — what is my relationship to her? If I said to her, 'Sorry, old girl, I have no image about you', she will say, 'What the Hell are you talking about? Does it mean you have no relationship with me?' 'No darling, that is not the question.' And we begin to argue. (*Laughs slightly.*)

See what happens, sir. I have no image — about India, about Europe, about myself, about my wife. I have no image *and* I am related to my wife — what is my action? She says, 'If you have no image, are you detached from me? Are you not attached to me?' If I say, 'No, darling, I am not', what would she say? She will pick up the nearest handy thing and throw it at me — if she has got guts! Why don't you face all this? Go on, sir; put that question to yourself, and see what the response is. That is real freedom — do you understand, sir? — not to have a single image about anything.

Could we put the question differently? I am asking this question, sir: Could I — we — put the question differently? Is affection, love put together by images? Is love — a much-abused word — is it related to images? If I have an image about you, can I love you? Oh Lord, this is too ...

**AK:** Then I will be loving only the image.

**K:** Sir, the image is the product of thought. Right? The image has been put together by thought. Are you clear on this?

**PNS:** Yes.

**K:** Are you sure?

**PNS:** Yes, sir; sure.

**K:** Thought is memory; thought is knowledge; thought is experience. Experience, knowledge, memory — thought has built this image. Therefore, is thought affection; is thought love?

**PNS:** What is affection, sir?

**K:** Wait a minute; I am asking you: Thinking about my wife — is that love?

**PNS:** It is thought.

**K:** I am asking you: Is that love?

**PNS:** I don't know what love is, so how I can ...

**K:** All right. Is thinking love? For God's sake!

**PNS:** I don't think so. It is not, sir.

**K:** Why do you say that it is not?

**PNS:** It — thinking — is a very limited thing. If thinking is love, then it is a very limited thing.

**K:** But when I think of her, when I write a postcard from Goa to my wife — 'Darling, I am thinking about you' — she feels flattered; *she* calls that love. Right? What are you all smiling at? (*Laughs.*) So thinking about her — is that love?

**PNS:** No.

**K:** Sir, do you know what you are saying? We are reversing the whole process of human relationship! I have a picture of my wife on the mantelpiece. Right? And I call that love!

**PNS:** It's not love, sir.

**K:** No, don't say, 'It is not love'. I call it love, because I am thinking about her; I am lonely, I am miserable, I am depressed without her. And all this I call, 'Love for her'. No? You are married ladies, what do you say? Or, unmarried people, what do you all say to this? (*Laughs.*) Sir, do you realize that when we say, 'Love has no relationship to thought', we have upset the whole apple-cart of human relationship. I wonder if you get this ... (*Pause.*)

So: I am coming back. Does a religious mind have conflict? Or, a group of us working together — which we are, and I hope with our hearts and minds, and not just as a business affair — if we are all working together, if there is a dissension, a disagreement, why do we have a conflict about it? Do you understand? Could we dissolve the disagreement immediately, and not carry it over?

**AP:** Sir, in our consciousness there is a certain weightage to the past. As I see it, we give a certain weightage to the past.

**K:** Yes, weight.

**AP:** We carry it with us as a convenient piece of luggage, like we carry our clothes, etc.

**K:** Yes.

**AP:** We can't conceive of being without that because we would feel very bereft if ...

**K:** Yes, sir, we said all that.

**AP:** Now, what I want to say is that you have very graphically — almost out of time — placed us in a totally new context, and still you say, 'Go and live your old life; go and teach Mathematics; go and do this; go and do that'. I wonder if you see...

**K:** How extraordinarily difficult it is!

**AP:** No, the kind of situation we get into.

**K:** I think any situation, sir, if there is this quality of intelligence, it is solved. After all, if I have affection for you — in *my* sense — I would see that a disagreement never arose between us. It is my job, my responsibility to see that there is no dissension. Because I won't take a stand about anything — but I am willing to examine (which does not mean that I am yielding) — I don't start from a posit and, then, move from that. I say, 'I have no ground on which to stand — in the psychological sense — and so I am willing to move.' And if there is a disagreement between him and me, I would say, 'Look, let's talk about it now — not wait till day after tomorrow'. I would say, 'Let's meet this afternoon; let's talk about it so that there is no wall between us'. This way I have functioned, and I'll function. But if you refuse to do that, well, it is up to you; I can't force you.

So, could we have a religious mind, a religious group which has no belief — God, future — on which most people thrive,

no faith (belief, faith: they go together), no ideals, conclusions, definitions?

**GN:** No concepts and no conflict.

**K:** No concepts. 'I know', and I hold on to a concept because I have studied Marx, studied history. I agree with Marx's conclusion, and stick to that conclusion. That is a stupid thing to do. And they are all very clever people. Suslov. Do you know Suslov?

**GN:** He died some years ago.

**K:** He was my great brother. (*Laughs.*) Suslov was the theoretical communist at the politburo, at the top level. He was the theoretician translating what Marx meant or Lenin meant. I think I have met him. He was the priest. They don't call him the priest; they call him a 'theorist' but, actually, he was the priest, and they were all caught on to him! (*Laughs.*) It is all so silly.

So: no belief, no ideals, and *no* conflict! (*Pause.*) Can we live that way? — not as an ideal, because then we will go back to something else. Then, next, all this implies co-operation. Right? Can we co-operate to build — together — a religious centre here? — Not an *asrama* in the old sense, which is an abomination. A religious group, *because* they are religious have a new kind of vitality; they are free. If you have no belief, you are an extraordinarily free person already. Right? No ideals, no conflict. My God! You understand? That is, we co-operate without a person — not round a person, not round a belief, not round an ideal — but we have, there is the spirit of co-operation, which is totally different from co-operating for something or about something. Have we that? Have you got that? What does that mean?

**P:** It means that I want to learn. So I don't have anything that I know.

**K:** Yes, then you have this spirit of co-operation. Suppose you have it: It means no authority; you are not co-operating because of something, or about something, or for something. No cause, no person, no ideal, therefore you have the feeling of wanting to work together, but I don't want to. How will you deal with me? — because it's going to happen. How will you deal with me? This is a problem in this school, isn't it? A few people — a few of you — have got this feeling of really wanting to co-operate; I haven't. How will you deal with me? You want to help me to break down my ideas, and all the rest of it. How will you help me? Have you got that feeling, sir, of co-operation? It doesn't exist in India — you understand? Right? They all want to co-operate with Mrs Gandhi, of course, or round a guru, or round a business motive for personal gain. And nobody says, 'Let's co-operate without a purpose'. They wouldn't even know what the thing meant. If you understand it, and if you have got that spirit and I haven't got it, what will you do with me? You have got me here in this place — what will you do? What is your responsibility to me?

**PNS:** I will give my life and explain to you.

**K:** Yes, sir, but find out: What will you do with me? This is happening, sir, now.

**T:** Yes, it is happening.

**K:** (*Pause.*) What will you do, Rajesh, if you have got that spirit? Have you got that spirit? Don't say, 'Sometimes'; that's an awful word. (*Laughs.*) Have you? Don't take long, sir; I am gone.

**RD:** I cannot answer you, sir.

**K:** Why not? Do you understand what it means, sir? It is so simple.

**RD:** Sir, don't say, 'It is so simple'.

**K:** It is terribly simple.

**RD:** Then why do we feel so hesitant, sir?

**K:** I don't know; I am asking *you*.

**RD:** Are we making it complicated, sir?

**K:** You are making it all so complicated.

**RD:** Yes. With the result that we are not able to say, 'Yes, we mean that'.

**K:** Yes.

**RD:** What is it that prevents us?

**K:** I will show you. First, put the question: Have you this spirit of co-operation which is not for a purpose, not round a person, not round an ideal: 'Let's all build an *asrama*'? We all want to build a new house. Right? We all want to build it. Do you?

**RD:** Yes.

**K:** That's all. If you really want to build a new house, you employ the architect, and you and I agree: so many

windows, so many doors, the size of the rooms, the kind of roof it should have, the right kind of insulation — this and that. Right? That means that though we want to build a house together, before that we have the urge to build, the feeling that we must create a new thing. Surely you have got it — any thinking person must have this — or you are dead to all this!

**RD:** No, sir; we are not dead to this.

**K:** So, you have it. Make it, keep it simple; it becomes very complex later. But you see the complexity, and you are stuck ...

**RD:** No, sir, if I start with simplicity, you suddenly bring up something so complex.

**K:** I will, I will; but begin simply.

**RD:** Yes.

**K:** Sir, have you ever noticed how a tree grows? It is so simple — the beginning. It puts out a little thing, and gradually moves, moves; it becomes a gigantic tree. But you start with the gigantic, I start with the lowest thing. Right?

Now, I say: How can you have this feeling of co-operation? A motive is always personal, or a person identifies with something greater — these are all limiting processes of co-operation. We are wiping all that out and, therefore, there is this extraordinary feeling of co-operating, working together: no belief, no ideals, no conflict, *and* this sense of deep co-operation. You've got it, sir — haven't you? If you

have, all that implies affection, care, love. What do you say? You are all quiet. So, are we becoming, is Rishi Valley becoming a religious centre?

**AP:** Sir, we have seen all this, this morning, through your eyes.

**K:** No, no; I am throwing it back ... All right.

**AP:** I feel that it is necessary for us to see this on our own.

**K:** Of course.

**AP:** Because unless we see — each one for himself — in this journey alone...

**K:** Yes, sir.

**AP:** Unless each one is working on this, and sees all this for himself ...

**K:** Sir, if you don't see it for yourself, and if I die tomorrow — I'll probably die sometime — you won't have this.

**AP:** No, I think we have seen something, but we must see that we have seen it through your eyes today. It is necessary to see it through our own eyes.

**K:** That's why I say: Put the question to yourself. I can see the yoga-teacher showing me the lessons, but I have to do it myself. Right? I can't live on him.

— Rishi Valley  
December 16th, 1982

## KRISHNAMURTI SCHOOLS

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| RAJGHAT BESANT SCHOOL (KFI)<br>Rajghat Fort<br>Varanasi - 221 001<br>Uttar Pradesh                            | Boarding School<br>Ages 7 to 19                             |
| VASANTA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN<br>Rajghat Fort<br>Varanasi - 221 001<br>Uttar Pradesh                              | B.A. & B.ED.<br>(Humanities only)                           |
| RISHI VALLEY SCHOOL (KFI)<br>Rishi Valley - 517 352<br>Chittoor District<br>Andhra Pradesh                    | Boarding School<br>Ages 8 to 17                             |
| THE SCHOOL (KFI)<br>'Damodar Gardens'<br>Besant Avenue<br>Madras - 600 020                                    | Day-Boarding School<br>Ages 3½ to 17                        |
| THE VALLEY SCHOOL (KFI)<br>'Haridvanam'<br>17th K.M. Kanakapura Road<br>Thatguni Post<br>Bangalore - 560 062  | Day-Boarding School<br>Ages 6 to 17                         |
| SAHYADRI SCHOOL<br>Tiwai Hills, Rajgurunagar Taluk<br>Pune District<br>410 513                                | Boarding School<br>Ages 10 to 15                            |
| BAL-ANAND<br>'Akash Deep'<br>28, Dongersi Road<br>Bombay - 400 006  | An After-School Centre<br>for young children                |
| NACHIKET<br>Uttar Kashi Education centre<br>P.O. Ranadi (Via Dunda)<br>Uttar Kashi - 249 151<br>Uttar Pradesh | Elementary School<br>for local students                     |
| BROCKWOOD PARK<br>Bramdean, Hampshire<br>SO 24 OLQ, UK  | Education Centre and<br>Boarding School<br>14 years upwards |
| THE OAK GROVE SCHOOL<br>P.O. Box 1560<br>Ojai, California 93023, USA  | Day/Boarding School<br>Ages 3½ to 17                        |

**KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA**  
**BULLETIN**

Due to rising costs, the KFI has to, unfortunately, increase the price of the Bulletins. Hereafter, the Annual Subscription (India) will be seventy-five (Rs 75.00) rupees, and a five-year subscription will be three-hundred-and-seventy-five (Rs 375.00). New Life Subscriptions (India) are no longer available. Those who have already paid for a Life Subscription will, however, continue to get copies of the *Bulletin*. Foreign subscribers will have to pay US \$ 5.00 per annum (that is, for three issues).

Also, due to certain technicalities, the numbering of the Bulletins have changed. Therefore, though the *KFI Bulletin* has been available to inquirers for many years, the third issue of the 2003 *Bulletin* is considered the first issue (Volume 1, Issue 1), and this issue is Volume 3, Issue 1.

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  
124, 126 (old 64-65) Greenways Road, Chennai 600 028, India.

**KFI BULLETIN, ENGLISH  
SUBSCRIPTION FORM**

Annual Subscription (India) Rs 75.00  
Annual Subscription (Foreign) US \$ 5.00  
Five-year Subscription (India) Rs 375.00  
(DD or MO, in favour of KFI Publications payable at  
Chennai, to the address below)

-----

KFI Publications  
Krishnamurti Foundation India  
'Vasanta Vihar'  
124, 126, Greenways Road  
CHENNAI 600 028.

Dear Sir,

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

Name (in block letters) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

PAYMENT ENCLOSED (Rs 75/Rs 375/US\$5)

BY D.D. No \_\_\_\_\_

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

## KFI BULLETIN, HINDI SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Annual Subscription (India)	Rs 100.00
Annual Subscription (Foreign)	US \$ 5.00
Five-year Subscription (India)	Rs 250.00
Five-year Subscription (Foreign)	US \$ 25.00
Life Subscription (India)	Rs 1000.00
Life Subscription (Foreign)	US \$ 75.00

Please send DD or MO in favour of KFI Study Centre payable at Varanasi, to the address below:

J. Krishnamurti Prajna Parisad  
Krishnamurti Foundation India  
Rajghat Fort  
VARANASI 221 001

Dear Sir,

Please enrol me as an annual subscriber/five-yearly subscriber/ life subscriber for the *Parisamvad*

Name (in block letters) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

PAYMENT ENCLOSED (Rs 100/Rs 250/Rs 1000/US \$ 5/US \$ 25/US \$ 75)

BY D.D. No \_\_\_\_\_

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

Registered with  
the Registrar of Newspapers for India  
under no. : TNENG/2003/12845

---

Published by G. Rajeev on behalf of the Krishnamurti Foundation India,  
124, 126 (old 64-65) Greenways Road, Chennai – 600 028.  
Printed by N. Subramanian at M/s Sudarsan Graphics Offset Press, 27, Neelakanta  
Mehta Street, T. Nagar, Chennai – 600 017. Editor: Dr Radhika Herzberger.