

Krishnamurti Foundation India Bulletin

Volume 12, Issue 2, July to Dec. 2015

Rs 25/-

FROM THE EDITOR

‘Has knowledge any place at all in the transformation of man and society?’ This was a puzzling question J. Krishnamurti posed throughout his peripatetic life. Against the grain of history, Krishnamurti claimed that learning is not an edifice created out of rational ideas, rather its building blocks are infused with thought-feeling and profoundly influenced by the social environment. He argued that social expectations become embedded in students’ and teachers’ minds; these expectations turn learning into an instrumental activity designed to fit students into a ‘rotten society’.

It isn’t that he did not acknowledge the difference between knowledge that is ultimately linked to truth in the form of evidence, in other words, the difference between ‘The moon is 384,400 km from the earth’ and knowledge that is infused with subjectivity, such as, ‘My son has failed the examination’ or ‘I am a Hindu’. These latter, supposedly factual propositions, are accompanied by a penumbra of emotion; disappointment, regrets, anger, bitterness, even envy, are drawn to the first. As a statement of identity, the second is attended by feelings of pride or victimhood, depending on the individual and the context in which it is uttered.

Krishnamurti did not engage with knowledge of the factual sort, and often dismissed it as being practical, even technological. He was essentially interested in

propositions that are infused with emotion, and held that a silent investigation of emotional thought processes was liberating and ought to be an essential aspect of a life well lived. Contrary to mainstream thought, he explored with his audiences the role of silence and its associated aspects, such as, attention and awareness, in learning about life.

Krishnamurti took his stand on the mind's transformative capability. He held out the possibility that 'the mind is capable of action which is not related to ambition, to envy, or to any of the conflicts that we know. Such a mind, being indifferent in the sense that it is not seeking a result, is capable of living with compassion'.

R. H.

**THE SELF IS THE ACCUMULATION OF KNOWLEDGE:
THE UNDOING OF KNOWLEDGE IS THE
FUNDAMENTAL REVOLUTION
AND
ONLY THE INDIVIDUAL AND NOT THE COLLECTIVE
CAN BRING ABOUT A NEW WORLD**

J KRISHNAMURTI (JK): As life is so complicated, it seems to me that one must approach it with great simplicity. Life is a vast complex of struggle, of misery, of passing joys and, perhaps for some, the pleasurable continuity of a satisfaction they have known. Confronted with this extraordinarily intricate process which we call 'existence', surely we must approach it very simply because it is the simple mind that really understands the problem, and not the sophisticated mind, not the mind that is burdened with knowledge. If we want to understand something very complex, we must approach it very simply, and therein lies our difficulty because we always approach our problems with assertions, with assumptions or conclusions and, so, we are never free to approach them with the humility they demand.

And may I point out that this talk will be utterly futile if we listen to what is being said merely on the verbal or intellectual level because mere verbal or intellectual listening has no significance when we are confronted with immense problems. So let us try to listen, for the time being at least, not just on the verbal level, or with certain conclusions at which the mind may have arrived, but with a sense of humility

so that you and I can explore together this whole problem of knowledge.

The undoing of knowledge is the fundamental revolution; the undoing of knowledge is the beginning of humility. Only the mind that is humble can understand what is true and what is false and is, therefore, capable of eschewing the false and pursuing that which is true. But most of us approach life with knowledge – knowledge being what we have learned, what we have been taught, and what we have gathered in the incidents and accidents of life. This knowledge becomes our background, our conditioning; it shapes our thoughts, it makes us conform to the pattern of what has been. If we would understand anything, we must approach it with humility, and it is knowledge that makes us unhumble. I wonder if you have noticed that when you know, you have ceased to examine what-is. When you already know, you are not living at all. It is the mind that is undoing what it has gathered, that is, actually and not merely intellectually dissipating what it has known, it is only such a mind that is capable of understanding. And for most of us knowledge becomes the authority, the guide which keeps us within the sanctuary of society, within the frontiers of respectability. Knowledge is the centre from which we judge, evaluate; [the centre] from which we condemn, accept, or reject.

Now, is it possible for the mind to free itself from knowledge? Can that self-centre, which is essentially

the accumulation of knowledge, be dissolved so that the mind is really humble, innocent and, therefore, capable of perceiving what is truth?

After all, what is it that we know? We know only facts, or what we have been taught about facts. When I examine and ask myself, 'What is it that I really know?' I see that I actually know only what has been taught me, a technique, a profession, plus the information which I have acquired in the everyday relationship of challenge and response. Apart from that, what do I know, what do you know? What we know is obviously what we have been taught, or what we have gathered from books and from environmental influences. This accumulation of what we have acquired or have been taught reacts to the environment, thereby further strengthening the background of what we call knowledge.

So can the mind, which has been put together through knowledge, undo what it has gathered and thereby remove authority altogether? Because it is the authority of knowledge that gives us arrogance, vanity; and there is humility only when that authority is removed, not theoretically but actually, so that I can approach this whole complex process of existence with a mind that does not know. And is it possible for the mind to free itself from that which it has known?

We can see that there is a great deal of tyranny in the world, and that tyranny is spreading; there is compulsion, there is misery, both physically and

inwardly, and the constant threat of war, and with such a world there must obviously be some kind of radical change in our thinking. But most of us regard action as more important than thought; we want to know what to do about all these complex problems, and we are more concerned with right action than with the process of thinking which will produce right action.

Now, the process of thinking obviously cannot be made new as long as one starts thinking from any assumption, from any conclusion. So I must ask myself, as you must ask yourself, whether it is possible for the mind to undo the knowledge it has gathered – because knowledge becomes authority, which produces arrogance, and with that arrogance and vanity we consciously or unconsciously look at life and, therefore, we never approach anything with humility.

I know because I have learned, I have experienced, I have gathered, or I guide my thought and activity in terms of some ideology to which I conform. So gradually I build up this whole process of authority in myself – the authority of the experiencer, of the one who knows. And my problem is: Can I who have gathered so much knowledge, who have learned so much, who have had so many experiences, can I undo all that? – Because there is no possibility of a radical change without the undoing of knowledge. The very undoing of knowledge is the beginning of such a change, is it not?

What do we mean by 'change'? Is change merely a movement from the knowledge I have accumulated to other fields of knowing, to new assumptions and ideologies projected from the past? This is generally what we mean by 'change', is it not? When I say, 'I must change', I think in terms of changing to something I already know. When I say, 'I must be good', I have an idea, a formulation, a concept of what it is to be good. But that is not the flowering of goodness. The flowering of goodness comes only when I understand the process and the accumulation of knowledge, and in the undoing of what I know. Then there is the possibility of a revolution, a radical change. But merely to move from the known to the known is no change at all.

I hope I am making myself clear because you and I do need to change radically, in a tremendous, revolutionary way. It is an obvious fact that we cannot go on as we are. The crisis and the appalling things that are taking place in the world demand that the individual approach all these problems from a totally different point of view, with a totally different heart and mind. That is why I must understand how to bring about in myself this radical change. And I see that I can change only when I am undoing what I have known. The disentangling of the mind from knowledge is in itself a radical change, because then the mind is humble; and that very humility brings about an action which is totally new. As long as the mind is acquiring, comparing, thinking in terms of the 'more', it is obviously incapable of action which is

new. And can I who am envious, acquisitive, change completely, so that my mind is no longer acquiring, comparing, competing? To put it differently, can my mind empty itself, and in that very process of emptying itself discover the action which is new?

So, is it possible to bring about a fundamental change which is not the outcome of an action of will, which is not merely the result of influence, pressure? Change based on influence, pressure, on an action of will, is no change at all. That is obvious if you go into it. And if I feel the necessity of a complete, radical change within myself, I must surely inquire into the process of knowledge, which forms the centre from which all experience takes place. Do you understand? There is a centre in each one of us which is the result of experience, of knowledge, of memory, and according to that centre we act, we 'change'; and the very undoing of that centre, the very dissolution of that 'me', of that self, of that process of accumulation, brings about a radical change. But that demands the hard work which is involved in self-knowledge.

I must know myself as I am, not as I think I should be; I must know myself as the centre from which I am acting, from which I am thinking, the centre which is made up of accumulated knowledge, of assumptions, of past experience, all of which is preventing an inward revolution, a radical transformation of myself. And as we have so many complexities in the world at the present time, with so many superficial changes

going on, it is necessary that there should be this radical change in the individual, for it is only the individual, and not the collective, that can bring about a new world.

Looking at all this, is it possible for you and me as two individuals to change, not superficially, but radically, so that there is the dissolution of that centre from which all vanity, all sense of authority springs, that centre which actively accumulates, that centre which is made up of knowledge, experience, memory?

This is a question that cannot be answered verbally. I put it only in order to awaken your thinking, your inquiry, so that you will start on the journey alone. Because you cannot start on this journey with the help of another; you cannot have a guru to tell you what to do, what to seek. If you are told, then you are no longer on this journey. But can you not start on this journey of inquiry alone, without the accumulation of knowledge which prevents further inquiry? In order to inquire, the mind must be free of knowledge. If there is any pressure behind the inquiry, then the inquiry is not straight, it becomes crooked, and that is why it is so essential to have a mind that is really humble, a mind that says, 'I do not know; I will inquire', and that never gathers in the process of inquiring. The moment you gather, you have a centre, and that centre always influences your inquiry.

So, can the mind inquire without accumulating, without gathering, without emphasizing the centre through the authority of knowledge? And if it can, then what is the state of such a mind? Do you understand? What is the state of the mind that is really inquiring? Surely, its state is that of emptiness.

I do not know if you have ever experienced what it is to be completely alone, without any pressure, without any motive or influence, without the idea of the past and the future. To be completely alone is entirely different from loneliness. There is loneliness when the centre of accumulation feels cut off in its relations with another. I am not talking of that feeling of loneliness. I am talking of the aloneness in which the mind is not contaminated because it has understood the process of contamination, which is accumulation. And when the mind is totally alone because through self-knowledge it has understood the centre of accumulation, then you will find that, being empty, uninfluenced, the mind is capable of action which is not related to ambition, to envy, or to any of the conflicts that we know. Such a mind, being indifferent in the sense that it is not seeking a result, is capable of living with compassion. But such a state of mind is not to be acquired, it is not to be developed. It comes into being through self-knowledge, through knowing yourself – not some enormous, greater self, but the little self that is envious, greedy, petty, angry, vicious. What is necessary is to know the whole of the mind which is your little self. To go very far, you must begin very

near, and the near is you, the 'you' that you must understand. And as you begin to understand, you will see that there is a dissolution of knowledge so that the mind becomes totally alert, aware, empty, without that center, and only such a mind is capable of receiving that which is truth.

QUESTIONER (Q): *To you, the observation of thought or feeling within consciousness seems to be a state of complete objectivity. How is this possible? Can you separate a thought or a feeling from the matrix of thought?*

JK: Let me explain the question as far as I understand it. Thought is part of consciousness; thinking, feeling, is part of the mind. What we think and feel – the contradictions, the tensions, the ambitions, the greed, the aspirations, the desire to be powerful, the fulfillment and frustration – is all within the field which we call 'consciousness'. Consciousness is like a single piece of cloth, and the questioner asks me, 'How can you separate one thought or one feeling from this complex field of consciousness and examine it objectively, go right to the end of it without any distortion? Is that possible?'

Now, you will find out whether it is possible or not by listening to what I am going to explain. The explanation is merely verbal, but we are going into the problem together, and this is meditation, real meditation, and therefore it is hard work. It requires enormous attention to separate one thought, or one

feeling, and pursue it until it is understood, dissolved, without letting any other thought or feeling, any other pressure interfere. And can we do it? It is like following a single thread in a large piece of cloth from the beginning right through to the end of it. Have you ever tried it? To follow that thread demands not only visual attention but the attention of your mind and heart, of your whole being; otherwise, you will lose it. And what we are now going to do is like that; it requires hard work, close attention – not the attention of narrowness, not the concentration which is exclusion, but an objectivity of following in which there is an awareness of everything. I do not know if you follow all this. No, I am afraid you don't.

Sirs, I am going to approach it in another way. There is a feeling, and a feeling is a thought as well as a desire. Desire, feeling, and thought are not separate units, they are interrelated and, therefore, they are extraordinarily vital. They are a living thing, and my attention must be equally living, vital, to follow them.

So, can I look at a desire, at a thought, at a feeling, and go to the very end of it? Let us take the desire, the feeling, the thought which we term 'envy'. Envy is not merely the jealousy you feel because your neighbor is more beautiful than you are, or has a bigger house. That is only part of envy. Envy is the desire for the 'more', for more knowledge, more experience; it is the sense of comparison which says, 'I am this and I must become that'. Envy is the feeling of 'becoming': becoming virtuous, becoming

noble, becoming a saint, achieving enlightenment. All that is envy.

Now, we are going to follow envy as you would follow a thread in the cloth. Envy is in operation; it is a living thing, so I must pay complete attention, not only at the superficial, conscious level, but also at the unconscious level, because the unconscious, with all its traditional and racial inheritance, is based on envy. I have been taught to achieve, to fulfill, to become, and all that is part of envy. So, can I follow envy step by step in myself, objectively, and see what its relationship is to the whole? And can I also examine it by itself?

I hope this is not too difficult or abstract. It is not, really, because if the mind is to be free of envy, it has to go through all this. And the mind must be free of envy because if it is envious, there can be no understanding of truth. The understanding of truth requires humility, and as long as the mind is envious, as long as it wants to become a governor, an executive, a banker, a Master, or what you will, it is not humble.

So, can your mind, which is the matrix in which all thought-feeling is held, separate the one feeling of envy and pursue it? You know what it is to be envious. I have described it, and it is what you are. Though you may not acknowledge it, though you may find excuses for it, you are envious. That is obvious. And can you pursue that feeling of envy right to the

end? We are going to do it as I talk, so please follow this.

I am fully conversant with the fact that I am envious; there is no excuse. I do not justify or condemn it. There it is. It is as factual as this microphone and is observed as objectively. So my mind has separated that feeling, that desire which it has termed 'envy', and is capable of watching it in action. That is, my mind is aware of its envy when it sees a car, or a beautiful person, or a man who is erudite; therefore, it is able to observe the absurdity of becoming and follow all the implications of envy.

Now, can my mind be without comparison? Can it function without the thought of the 'more' and yet not vegetate? Most of us say, 'If I do not compete, learn, struggle to become something, I shall vegetate, I shall go to pieces, disintegrate'. But my question now is: Can my mind be without envy, without the struggle to become something, and yet be extraordinarily active, very alert?

I see how my mind has always operated on this thought, this feeling, this desire which it calls 'envy'. My mind invariably approaches it with condemnation or justification. But I now see that if I want to understand something, there must be no condemnation, no justification; so condemnation and justification have ceased. I also see that by naming the feeling, giving it the term 'envy', I am condemning it, because that very word 'envy' is condemnatory.

So, can my mind separate the word from the feeling? Is that possible? Because the moment the mind has a feeling, that feeling is immediately named. If you observe, you will see that the feeling and the naming are almost simultaneous. And the real part of meditation is for the mind to separate the word from the feeling – which is hard work, it demands close attention – so that the feeling remains without the verbalization.

You verbalize a feeling in order to recognize it, and for various other reasons. Naming it establishes the feeling in the mind, which is the process of recognition; therefore, by recognition, the new feeling has become the old feeling. A feeling is always new, but we verbalize it in order to establish it in the old, in order to recollect and communicate it. But we won't go into all that now.

So I now have the feeling, the desire, the thought which is called 'envy', separated from the matrix of all thoughts. I see the implications of envy, both inwardly and socially. Then I see how extraordinarily difficult it is for the mind to free the naming from the feeling because they are practically simultaneous. So, is it possible for the mind to separate the word from the feeling? And if it is, then what happens to the feeling when this is done? If the mind no longer identifies that feeling with a word, the feeling does not remain; then there is a totally different kind of movement in that feeling.

Most of us know a feeling only through the process of verbalization and recognition. By recognition we either put an end to that feeling, or we give it a continuity. If it is a pleasurable feeling we say, 'How nice; I want more of it', but if it is ugly, we condemn it. Whereas, if we do not name either the pleasurable feeling or the ugly feeling, then there is only the feeling – and that is essential because it is by pursuing the pleasurable and denying the ugly that the mind becomes insensitive, incapable of feeling. And it is this feeling, this impulse which is not related to verbalization, that is new.

I wonder if you have ever noticed that every feeling is new if you do not term it. It is the naming of the feeling that makes the feeling old, and then you have destroyed the impulse. The impulse is the new, but it is made old by recognizing, by naming.

Sirs, as I said, this is a very difficult thing to do. When you go home, experiment by taking a piece of cloth and seeing if you can follow one thread to the end; follow it not merely visually, but with all your attention. Try it and you will see how very difficult it is.

Similarly, it is extraordinarily hard work for the mind to follow one thought, one feeling, one desire right to the end without distortion, without any deviation because, as I was explaining earlier in the talk, it is knowledge as the word that destroys the new. The word, which is knowledge, is the old; and the moment

you recognize a feeling, you have already made it into the old because to recognize is to name it. You cannot recognize something unless you have already known it. When there is a feeling, the mind immediately labels it, and so makes that feeling into the old. But if you do not name it – and not to name a feeling is astonishingly difficult, it is really hard work and demands great attention, meditation, tremendous alertness – then you will see that the feeling is entirely new; it is not to be recognized, and a feeling which is new has its own movement, its own activity. So the mind is capable of separating one thought, one feeling, one desire from the matrix of consciousness.

Bombay
February 24, 1957

**A CIVILISATION THAT LIVES MERELY ON
KNOWLEDGE MUST INEVITABLY DECLINE
AND
A WAY OF LIVING WHICH IS NOT BASED ON
KNOWLEDGE IS REGENERATION**

J KRISHNAMURTI (JK): I wonder why you come to listen to me. Is it out of curiosity, or [is it that] you have nothing better to do? Or: Do you want to find out what the speaker has to say? If you want to find out what he has to say, you have to listen.

To listen is an art. The word 'art' means to put everything in its right place; that's the real meaning of the word 'art'. And if you are going to listen this evening to a discourse, you have to listen, if one may suggest, not with your own opinions, your prejudices, your conclusions and ideas but, rather, listen neither agreeing or disagreeing. To listen requires a certain form of communication between the speaker and yourself. Communication implies not only a verbal exchange but, also, to think together, actually think together, and to share together not ideas, not words but rather the thing that lies behind the word; [it is] to read between the lines, to have an insight which we both share. So listening is not only an art, but a responsibility.

And if you are at all serious – not merely intellectually amused, but serious in front of a declining and degenerating world, (and especially this

country) – then [it requires] a quality of mind that demands to investigate, to explore, to examine not merely the description, the verbal picture but to investigate why this country – [India] – is becoming daily more and more confused, more and more corrupt [with] a way of life that is becoming mechanical. (When we use the word ‘degeneracy’ we mean what the dictionary says: An inferior state of mind which is not excellent.)

And if you will, this evening, go into this problem – because it is very serious: Why a group of people living in this country, why, [in] the people, which is yourself, [there is this decay]? What is the central core of this terrible decay, of this degeneracy, of this mechanical way of life? This is happening all over the world; we are not comparing India with the rest of the other countries, but merely taking the country as it is, the people as they are.

We have not only personal problems but also we have peripheral issues, like inflation, over-population, economic chaos and so on and so on; they are all peripheral issues. And a serious mind demands and must find an answer why there is this decline. [Decline] religiously: that’s the first degeneration. There is no religion in this country at all. (We are going to talk about it; don’t be shocked.) There is a sense of total unrelated[ness] to world events; each one is concerned with his own little problem, with his own survival, with his own security, with his own personal salvation. [And] all this

indicates a mind, a heart that is becoming more and more incapable of dealing with the problem as a whole. And we have to find an answer because there is so much suffering, incalculable misery, a despair of which one may not be aware, or conscious – but it is there. We are not exaggerating nor being pessimistic, but merely stating what is going on. Technologically there is extraordinary improvement, things are going so fast but human beings are not keeping up with that rapid growth in technology.

So, seeing all this – wars, violence, corruption, a social structure that is totally immoral, division, conflict, suffering, and the brutal violence that is spreading throughout the world – seeing all this, one wants to find out [the cause]. If one is at all really serious – not [just] playing with words, playing with ideas or speculating about the problem – if one really earnest, [one] enquires into it – which we are going to do. That enquiry demands on your part an observation which is not prejudged, which is not prejudiced, which is not parochial, which is not Hindu or any other particular race or caste.

To investigate there must be freedom, [for] otherwise [one] cannot investigate. That's obvious. If I want to find out something, my mind must be free to enquire, [it] must not be caught in its own prejudices, in its own beliefs and conclusions. That's the first requirement of any enquiry, of any examination. And I hope, together, being free – if that's at all possible – that is, not being a Hindu with all its ugly tradition,

superstitions, and all the rest of it – [we're] free to look, to observe, to find out. And I hope we can do this together.

What is the reason of this decay? – not [look for] peripheral reasons, reasons which are superficial, [and] which any economist, socialist or philosopher invents or describes but, rather, together, face this question: Why in India, in this country ([we are] not comparing India to Europe and America or Russia) why has this happened? You know, this is a question one asks after fifty years of coming to this country every winter, and seeing the decline every year. What is the reason, what has happened to you living in this country – India? [What has happened to] the mind?

As we said: Please neither agree nor disagree, but examine – examine not the words, the ideas, the speculative inferences but *why* this has happened. And where do you enquire? Do you enquire after some philosophical assertion, or do you enquire [according to] an idealistic formula, or do you enquire [into] what you are, what you have become? That's where the enquiry has to begin, [for] otherwise it has no value, otherwise it becomes merely an amusing, entertaining enquiry without any result. So, to enquire you have to enquire within yourself – [enquire] why human beings living in this country have allowed themselves to be what they are, and what they have become: non-religious (though they may do *puja* three times a day, go to temples, follow innumerable gurus, [and] read the *Gita*, the

Upanishads – [which] are all extraneous events, what other people have said. And by reading those books you think you are religious. By going to some guru and worshipping his nonsense, his systems, his meditation, you think you have become suddenly extraordinarily religious. Or somebody who does some miracle – you think by attending those tricks, you suddenly have found religion!

If you observe yourself very seriously: Are you religious? The word ‘religion’ [is used] according to the dictionary meaning, [and] not [as] what you think religion should be. Your opinion of what you think religions should be may be just your own hope, your own wish, your own longing, your own prejudice and, therefore, it has no validity. Religion means ‘gathering all your energy’, physical, intellectual, psychological – all your energy – so that [you] are totally aware of all [one’s] activities; it is not fragmented but whole: a holistic activity. That’s what religion means. Are you so religious?

And the next is: thought plays an extraordinary part [in our lives]. Thought has done [the] most extraordinary things technologically – it has constructed the aeroplane. Everything in the whole scientific field of knowledge, the whole world of medicine, and so on, and so on thought has created. Thought, also, has created wars, divided people. (Please observe it for yourself; don’t agree with me: the speaker has no value at all; he is not doing propaganda.) Thought has divided people, thought

has separated religions, thought has created the gods which you worship, the saviours, the gurus, the masters; that whole field is the projection of thought. Your Ramas, Sitas, and gurus – you know, the whole world of that – [is thought]. So you have created your gods whom you worship. So you are worshipping yourself in a round about way.

Are you observing all this? Are you aware that what the speaker is saying is a fact or non-fact? Thought, your thought, your daily thought – not your idealistic thought which is still part of thought – has accumulated tremendous knowledge, and that knowledge is operating in the technological world and, also, that thought as knowledge is destroying human beings. (I'll explain as we go along.)

Have you ever observed yourself – [observed] that you are functioning, thinking, acting according to knowledge? Knowledge means experience, accumulated memory, and you are acting, functioning, according to that memory, which has become mechanical. Right? You are following this? And as thought is fragmentary – thought is never whole – all action becomes fragmentary. Knowledge in one field, in one area is absolutely necessary, [but] when [the] mind merely functions on knowledge – as most do – then it becomes mechanical, and the decline begins.

Right? Am I talking Greek? Do you understand?

Knowledge, to which you give such tremendous importance, is always in the past; and part of that knowledge is tradition. And when you are acting, living in that area – as you do – then the mind must become mechanical. Right? That is, memory is experience and knowledge stored up in the brain, and that knowledge is reacting all the time. You can observe it in yourself. And we say that one of the basic reasons for the decline of people in this country is that they are living in an area of mechanical knowledge. And when you are living according to the knowledge of others – the *Gita*, the *Upanishads*, you know, all the books that you read – the mind must decline, the mind must degenerate. You are living on the knowledge, or the experience, or the say-so of other people and, therefore, your life is second-hand. Right? Aren't you surprised, or you just sit there listening to all this? Do you understand what I am saying? I am not insulting you; I am just pointing out: You are second-hand or third-hand people. Discover that, not because the speaker tells you, but discover it for yourself, [discover] the truth of it, the fact of it, that you are living on knowledge, on tradition, which is a continuity of knowledge. And a civilisation, a culture, a people that live merely on knowledge must inevitably decline.

And to find out a way of living which is non-mechanical, which is not based on knowledge, is the regeneration. That is, in one area knowledge is essential, otherwise you can't go home, otherwise you can't understand English, otherwise you can't

recognise your wife or husband. Knowledge in that area is necessary. But when the mind merely lives nourished by memory, by [the] knowledge of others – especially, then the inevitable decline takes place. So is it possible – please do listen to this for two minutes, if you will – is it possible to live a life where knowledge is sustained [to] one area, and not to act in relationship? – because life is relationship between you and another. [Is it possible] in that relationship [to have] no continuity of knowledge from day to day? Do you understand my question? Because, you see, I am using the word ‘knowledge’ in the sense [of] accumulated experience in human relationship which becomes memory stored up in the brain and according to that memory responds. It’s excellent in the field of technology, but in the field of relationship between human beings then it becomes a destructive and a mechanical thing, which prevents what one can call ‘love’. Right?

I wonder if you are following all this? Are we communicating with each other or not? I think, I’m afraid, you are used to going to meetings – aren’t you? – [and] being lectured to, talked at. And here one is saying things which apparently you don’t catch. Apparently you haven’t even thought about all this, you haven’t even enquired [into it]. Do you understand my question? I am asking, very seriously: Why you, as a human being living in this country, are declining, degenerating, why your minds are not fresh, why there is no love at all? And that may be this mechanical activity of the brain, of the mind, of

ideas, and the utter lack of what one can call deep affection, compassion. These two factors may be – right through[out] the world – the essence of this decline. You understand?

Haven't you got a problem of this kind? Isn't it your problem? Or are you merely concerned with over-population, inflation, and how to get on with your wife or your husband, [how to] get a better job, corruption – you know, all the superficial things which dominate most people? And if you are enquiring, you must go very much deeper – not merely find superficial answers to superficial issues. Aren't you concerned? You understand my questions, my problem? It is not mine; it is *your* problem; I am putting it to you for you to face and answer. How can human beings live on tradition, which is a mechanical process, on mere knowledge? It makes the mind mechanical; therefore it has no energy.

Let's leave that for the moment, and look at something else

Have you ever gone into the question of what love is, or you don't even think about it? Have you gone to find out that extraordinary thing which one calls 'love', 'compassion'? Is compassion knowledge? Is compassion the cultivation of thought? Is love a mere remembrance of certain incidents, knowledge? You understand my question? You have to answer this. So one asks: Is there love in this country? Please, I am not saying it does exist or doesn't exist [even] in

Europe or America or Russia. I am asking – non-comparatively – [this question] to you who live in this country. Have you reduced love to sex, pleasure, or has it become duty, responsibility, a thing which is the outcome of a comfortable life, or something which you call ‘devotion’? You understand all my questions? Because it may be this factor – [that] you are living entirely within the field of knowledge – that in your heart there is no love.

Let’s go into it a little more. You see, one observes what is going on in the world: the political division; the wars and the threat of war; the Arabs and the Jews, the Russians and the Chinese and the Americans; the constant strain and struggle and brutality; starvation – all that. When you consider all that [and] not just your little problem – your problem is involved in all this – you have to take the whole thing [and] not just one fragment of it. Now when you look non-personally, objectively at all that – the chaos, the immense suffering (not only personal but the collective suffering of man) – what is your answer to this? For God’s sake, what do you say? – Retreat into some philosophical jargon and slogans? If you are at all serious, you have to find out whether human beings, that is you and I, whether we can bring about a total revolution in ourselves psychologically – because when you change fundamentally, you affect the whole consciousness of the world.

You understand, sirs, do you understand this?

Look: Lenin, whether you agree with him or [do] not agree with him, has affected the consciousness of the world. Right? Stalin has; Hitler has. And the priests have affected the consciousness of the world by their belief, by their saviours, and all the rest of it. Every human being – please look at it for yourself; it's the truth, it's a fact – every human being, when there is a fundamental change in himself, affects the consciousness of the world because you are the world, the world is you. You are India, geographically as well as psychologically. And when you change not at the superficial level but fundamentally, radically, [and] because you are the world [and] the world is you, you affect the consciousness [of the world]. That's a fact, isn't it? (We don't seem to be communicating with each other at all!) Haven't the inventors of Rama and Krishna affected your consciousness [with their] everlasting songs about them? Of course it has affected your consciousness! And so if you as a human being transform yourself, you affect the consciousness of the rest of the world. It seems so obvious.

And can knowledge transform man? Do you understand my question? You have knowledge about so many things: you have read so much, you have philosophies galore. Philosophy means the love of truth in daily life; [it is] not theories, not speculative concepts; it is the love of truth in living, in daily life – which means tremendous honesty – and the love of being honest. So can the human mind, your mind, transform itself through knowledge, or [does]

knowledge have no place in the regeneration of man? Knowledge is mechanical. You can add and take away from knowledge. And when you live in that area – in memory, experience, knowledge – as most people do, when you live in that area, the mind must inevitably become mechanical. That is, in your relationship, in [your] daily relationship between man and woman you function on knowledge – don't you? No? Don't you have an image of her and she have an image of [you]? – which is, essentially, the image is knowledge, and you live in a relationship based on knowledge and, therefore, there is no freedom. (Are we meeting at all?) So, I am asking you: What place has knowledge in the transformation of man and society? We are saying [that] knowledge has *no* place because knowledge is mechanical, (which I have explained). Then what is the element, what is the core, the root, which is not the product of thought and, therefore, a factor which is not knowledge?

Do you understand my question? Please do.

Look, sir: I want to transform myself because I see what I am: miserable, confused, ugly, brutal, avaricious, hateful, jealous, ambitious, cunning, deceitful; [I] say one thing and do another, double talk; [I'm] an idealist and [my] ideal has nothing to do with my daily life. I see all that; [I see] this contradiction, this conflict, this struggle from the moment I am born until I die. And I say to myself, 'How can I change all this?' That requires not slackness, laziness. I must find out, not according to

some philosopher, not according to the *Gita* – that doesn't interest me at all because that's rather a bore! I want to find out: what am I to do? Now put yourself in that position; please put yourself in that position and see; ask yourself, seriously: What are you to do? That is: Can the knowledge that you have acquired either through self-knowing, understanding yourself, or the knowledge that you have acquired from others, the knowledge that you have gained through experience, whether this knowledge is going to transform you? You understand? Or is a different energy, a different factor necessary to bring about a transformation?

[If] we have put this question unconsciously perhaps, then we say, 'Yes, [but] I cannot do it by myself. Therefore I need a guru'. And the guru is of my choice, [is one] who must please me. I don't go to a guru who tells me, 'Get to work'. And I escape into ideas, ideals and so on, and never face this. Now, since you are here, [since] you are good enough to come this evening to listen, look at it: Can your knowledge that you have acquired transform your envy? Take that one factor: [envy]. Can you totally be free of it? That is, can your knowledge of what it is to be envious and the results of envy, and the cause of envy – you know all that because your minds are very good at analysing (most minds are, if they are given certain opportunity); you have [all] that knowledge – can that knowledge transform your envy? Please, look at it, go into it. What will end envy? You know what envy has done in the world;

you know the cause of envy, which is pleasure, and so on. (We won't go into the cause of it now for the time being.) And all that knowledge is time – and the mind that seeks the cause of envy is caught in time. So I am asking: Will time solve it? You follow? I am putting the question differently.

And if you are serious, [you] want to find out how to end [envy] totally, so that this problem of envy never comes back again – because our whole social and religious structure is based on envy. The hierarchical outlook, the one who knows, the one who doesn't know – all that is based essentially on envy, with all its competition, with all its ruthlessness, and so on. Now after examining all that, not only verbally, descriptively, and you know that you are envious, can you end that envy through the information you have all about it? (Do you understand my question? For God's sake say, 'Yes', or 'No'!) Then what will end it? Determination? Now when you determine to end envy there is a conflict – isn't there? So you may suppress it, you may overcome it, you may escape from it, but it is still there. So knowledge will *not* open the door so that you are free of envy.

Then the problem is: What will? Please ask yourself. Because envy, with jealousy, is hatred in a different form. And a world that lives on hate, a human being that is nourished by hate cannot bring about a different world, a different culture, a different existence. So it is absolutely necessary – I am taking that as an example – to end envy. How is this done?

Now: How do you look at envy? Please watch yourself. You know you are envious – don't you? – and how do you observe that envy? How do you see it? How do you know it? This is really a very important question. When you say, 'am envious' is you who says, 'I am envious', different from envy? Is the feeling of 'envy' different from the observer of that feeling? You understand my question? If the observer is different from the feeling, then there is a division; therefore there is a conflict. There is conflict wherever there is a division: Arab-Jew, Hindu-Muslim, Buddhist-non Buddhist, Christian-non Christian. Wherever there is a division – politically, inwardly, psychologically – there must be conflict. That's a law; that's the truth. So when you observe envy, is the observer different from the observed, or they are both the same: the observer is the observed? Do you understand? So when the observer is the observed, conflict ceases – doesn't it? And what happens? When conflict ceases between the observer and the observed – because the observer is the observed, the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experience and so on, when the observer is the observed, when the observer is the envy [and], therefore, there is no division and therefore there is no conflict – what has taken place?

Do you want me to tell you? Are you again becoming second-hand? Of course you are! Do you understand my question?

We live in conflict. We are nourished in conflict, and

the conflict comes about when there is division. And I took the feeling which is called 'envy', and one sees the result, the effect and the cause of that envy, the effect in the world, the effect in oneself, the anger, the jealousy, the hatred that is born out of envy, the bitterness. And will knowledge resolve that envy? You may rationalise it and say, 'Yes, we need envy to live in this world; otherwise I am destroyed'. You know all the reasons; you give false reasons to enjoy your own envy. Now, you ask: Is the observer different from the observed? If he is different, there must be conflict, suppression, rationalisation, overcoming it, and the battle begins – all that. But the fact is the observer is the observed, the observer is envy itself. Now when you realise that, what has taken place? What has taken place when you have dissipated your energy in conflict, in suppression, in rationalisation, in overcoming? [And] what has happened to that energy when you are not doing that? You have all that energy collected – haven't you? And when you have that energy, complete energy which is not dissipated, then what takes place?

You are still waiting [with] the second-hand mind! Good God! What takes place? Don't theorise, don't say, 'Love'. What actually takes place in you? Do you understand? Before you said, 'I am aware that I am envy', you said, 'How terrible! I must control it; I must suppress it', [and] 'One must have envy, otherwise one can't live in this world' – which is rationalisation, and you have done that all your life! And when you realise that the observer is not

different from the observed, that the observer *is* the envy – what has happened?

AUDIENCE (A): Transformation.

JK: Oh, come off it, sir; you are just talking! Has it disappeared in you? God, you people! Second-hand mind in operation! *You* don't do it! And this has what has happened to this country: [you] talk and invent ideas or repeat somebody else; [you] never go into it to find out. You observe yourself and you will find the answer; it is very simple. When you are not dissipating energy through suppression, overcoming and all the rest of it, you have that tremendous energy to deal with the fact. The fact is envy. You are that envy; envy is not separate from you. Your consciousness is its content. (I won't go into that now.) Your consciousness is made up of its content. You are envy. And you say, 'All right, I am envy' and your whole mind – if you are serious – is giving all its energy to this question of envy. So what takes place?

Sirs, look [at] what you are doing: you are going to repeat it after me, discuss it, reject it or accept it, or say, 'Yes, somebody else has said the same thing', and you [will] think you have understood. This is the tragedy of this country: you have never gone into yourselves, you have never found yourselves in that reality of knowing what is actually going on.

I'll show it to you. The observer is the observed, that is, the envy is the observer, the 'me' who says, 'I am envious'; that 'me' is envy. That's a fact. Not knowing what to do, we invent an outside agency: 'God will resolve this', 'An analyst will resolve this', 'Somebody else will do all the trip for me'. That means you are accepting authority. In spiritual matters there is no authority, including your gurus, your *Bhagavad Gita*, your *Upanishads*; [there's] nothing. If you rely on [all] that, that makes you second-hand human beings – which you are. Now what takes place? I feel envy; that's a fact. How do I know that it is envy? Please follow this a little bit. How do I know that it is envy? Because I have [a] previous memory of that feeling. So instinctively the previous experience recognises 'envy', and that recognition strengthens the envy. Right? Do you understand what I am saying? That is, your previous knowledge, your knowledge of envy recognises the present envy; therefore it says, 'Yes, I know all about it' and, then, it accepts it and goes on. Look, you see what the mind has done! When it recognises that envy, it is memory that is operating, which is knowledge. It – [the mind] – cannot deal with the present feeling with a past memory; it only strengthens that feeling.

So the problem, then, is: Can the mind [observe], can that feeling be observed, without any recognition? Do you follow? This means not bringing your previous knowledge into it. The previous knowledge is the

observer and, so, you create a division. Now when there is no division, when you see all this, you have abundance of energy. Then that fact of envy can be dealt with instantly; it's gone. It is only the lazy, inattentive mind that knows the cause, the effect *and* goes on. But [for] the attentive mind, the mind that has seen the whole nature and the structure of envy and, therefore, has gathered that energy and can deal with that fact – the fact being the observer is the observed, the observer is envy – there is no movement at all.

Have you learnt it by heart?!

And when you realise this, then the question arises: Is there a way of living – please listen – is there a way of living daily life without a single conflict? To find out for yourself – not as an idea, not as a slogan, not [as] something you repeat, and so on – a way of living in which there isn't a shadow of struggle (except in the technological field which you carry over into the psychological world!). So: In the realisation that the observer is the observed (that is, the 'me' that says, 'I am envious', that 'me' is envy itself), there is no movement away from it. Because you can't move away from it – you *are* it – you have all that energy, [and] that energy dissipates the fact of envy. Have you understood? Have [you] an insight into *it* – not my explanation of it?

So: Is conflict part of affection, part of love? We – you as a human being, individually as well as

collectively – have to find an answer to this. You are [the] collective, you are not [an] individual; ‘individuality’ means ‘a non-fragmented human being’. Now you have to find an answer [to]: How to live a life without a single conflict? And you will find it – [the answer] – when you understand this whole problem of the observer and the observed, the experiencer and the experience, because the experience is the experiencer. Do you understand this? Because, after all, you are seeking experience, aren’t you? When you go to your guru, aren’t you seeking experience? You want ‘experience’, [but] how do you know that experience unless you recognise it? Therefore the experiencer is the experience. So the mind finds then [that] there is no questing after experience.

A mind that lives mechanically in the field of knowledge, technologically, such a mind does not necessarily deteriorate; but a mind that lives in the field of psychological knowledge, the knowledge of experience – either your own or of another – [a mind that lives with] tradition – accumulated tradition or the tradition of a day – such a mind, living in the field of its own particular knowledge, brings about its own decay. [And this] is what is happening all through the world, and especially in this country because you have never gone into yourself, and said, ‘Look, I have to find an answer to all these problems – not through books, through teachers, through others’. And this requires energy. You have[an] abundance of energy when you want to do something. You have plenty of

energy to earn money, to go to the office day after day. [And] if you applied that same energy, that same intensity to go into yourself and find out how to live a life without a single shadow of conflict, then you will affect the whole consciousness of the world.

Right, sirs.

Madras
December 7, 1974

KFI ANNUAL PUBLIC GATHERING, 2014

One thing is fairly obvious, and that is, we must totally change the way we are living. There must be a deep radical revolution in our lives, a revolution not merely superficial, economic or social, an upsetting of the establishment to put in its place a new one, but we have to be concerned with how the human mind which is so conditioned can undergo a radical transformation, how it can live, act and function at a totally different dimension? Can there be a mutation in the very brain cells themselves? That is one problem and I think that is the major problem, because we are responding to every challenge with the old brain, the old brain which is traditional, habitual, mechanical, which has been conditioned for millennia. (*Krishnamurti in India 1970-71*, 24 December, 1970)

The Annual Public Gathering of the Krishnamurti Foundation India will be held at the Rajghat Education Centre, Varanasi from the 18th of November, 2015 to the 21st of November, 2015. The theme of the Gathering is *The Transformation of Consciousness*. The intention of the Gathering to create an ambiance that will enable the participants to enter into a spirit of serious inquiry. The talks, study, group dialogues, video-screenings of J. Krishnamurti's talks, will all be intended to unfold and explore deeply the different aspects of the central theme. The programme will be designed in such a way that there will be space to be quiet, to be with nature, to gather the energy necessary to observe, reflect on the theme and share observations.

The Gathering will commence at 10:00 am on the 18th of November, 2015 and conclude on the 21st of November, 2015 at 1:00 pm. Participants are expected to arrive by the evening of the 17th of November and depart on the 21st of November after lunch. Those wishing to stay longer before or after the Gathering, on extra payment, may contact the Rajghat Study Centre in advance and get confirmation.

As accommodation is limited, registration will be done on first-come, first-served basis. The total Gathering-Fee per person (which includes the registration fee of INR 500/- per person and which should be paid in advance) for those working in India is as follows: (1) Rs. 3000/- for Dormitory Type accommodation; Rs. 3500/- per person in a room with double occupancy. Bedding will be provided. (2) Day-participants Rs. 1200/- for the entire gathering and will include study material, lunch and tea. (3) For those working abroad the fee is \$125 (or equivalent in Rupees) per person for a room with double occupancy and \$150 for a room with single occupancy. Bedding will be provided.

The Gathering-fee covers lodging, boarding, and study material/ facilities for the entire period of the Gathering. The amount should be paid on arrival at the Reception counter. Students and participants who cannot afford the full fee may avail of concessions on prior request. All meals will be vegetarian and consumption of alcoholic beverages, drugs, meat or smoking is strictly forbidden on campus. The weather in Varanasi is cool and pleasant in November. The temperature ranges between 20-30C. Please bring light woolen clothing.

For reservations participants from India should send a non-refundable Registration-fee of Rs. 500 per person by D.D./

Multi City Cheque/M.O. drawn in favour of '**KFI STUDY CENTRE**', payable at any bank in Varanasi. This amount will be adjusted against the total Gathering-fee on arrival. The payment can also be done through direct deposit/ transfer into the Centre's Axis Bank Account. The Account Name is: KFI STUDY CENTRE, and the Savings account number is: 287010100094027. IFSC code is UTIB0000287

Please intimate – by email /post – the Rajghat Study Centre after the amount has been transferred.

For registration please contact:

The Krishnamurti Centre

Krishnamurti Foundation India

Rajghat Fort

Varanasi 221 001

Email: kcentrevns@gmail.com Phone: 0542-2441289

Varanasi is situated 800 kms southeast of New Delhi, about half-way between Delhi and Kolkata. Rajghat is accessible from Cantt Railway Station/Varanasi Junction which is 8 km away (auto charges about Rs. 125/-) or Mughal Sarai Station which is 11 km away (auto charge about Rs. 150). The Varanasi Airport is 30 km away (taxi charges about Rs. 800 at the pre-paid booth). Please ask the taxi or auto-rickshaw driver to take you to "*Vasanta College, Rajghat*", which is part of Krishnamurti Foundation campus. Most drivers know Rajghat Education Centre, KFI, by that name.

For more details about the place and its location please the website:

www.j-krishnamurti.org

* * * * *

QUESTION: *Listening to you, one feels that you have read a great deal, and are also directly aware of reality. If this is so, then why do you condemn the acquisition of knowledge?*

J KRISHNAMURTI: I will tell you why. It is a journey that must be taken alone, and there can be no journeying alone if your companion is knowledge. If you have read the *Gita*, the *Upanishads*, and modern psychology; if you have gathered information about yourself from the experts, and about what they say you should strive after – such knowledge is an impediment. The treasure is not in books, but buried in your own mind, and the mind alone can discover this treasure. To have self-knowledge is to know the ways of your mind, to be aware of its subtleties, with all their implications; and for that you don't have to read a single book. (*Bombay, 25th March, 1956*)

In our search for knowledge, in our acquisitive desires, we are losing love, we are blunting the feeling for beauty, the sensitivity to cruelty; we are becoming more and more specialized and less and less integrated. Wisdom cannot be replaced by knowledge, and no amount of explanation, no accumulation of facts will free man from suffering. Knowledge is necessary, science has its place; but if the mind and heart are suffocated by knowledge, and if the cause of suffering is explained away, life becomes vain and meaningless. And is this not what is happening to most of us? Our education is making us more and more shallow; it is not helping us to uncover the deeper layers of our being, and our lives are increasingly disharmonious and empty. Information, the knowledge of facts, though ever increasing, is by its very nature limited. Wisdom is infinite, it includes knowledge and the way of action; but we take hold of a branch and think it is the whole tree. Through the knowledge of the part, we can never realize the joy of the whole. Intellect can never lead to the whole, for it is only a segment, a part. (*Education And The Significance Of Life, p 66*)



BULLETIN KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

Please note that the editorial matter in this *Bulletin* does not reflect any official position of Krishnamurti Foundation India. The Editor is responsible for selecting materials to be printed in the *Bulletin* and for any editorial comments on these selections.

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

From the year 2013, the KFI has begun to publish the *Bulletin* only twice a year instead of thrice, as has been the norm in the past years.

Krishnamurti Foundation India
124, 126 (Old 64-65) Greenways Road, Chennai 600 028, India

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

Registered with The Registrar of Newspapers for India
Under No:TNENG/2003/12845

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