

- Paris -

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

- Amsterdam -

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

- London -

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 1ST PUBLIC TALK PARIS 16TH APRIL 1967

I THINK THERE are really two fundamental problems, violence and sorrow. Unless we solve these, and go beyond them, all our efforts, our constant battles, have very little meaning. We seem to spend most of our lives within the field of ideologies, formulas, concepts, and by means of these we try to solve these two essential problems, violence and sorrow.

Every form of conflict is violence, not only the psychological conflict, within the skin, but also outwardly, in our relationships with other human beings, with society. And sorrow, it seems to me, is one of the most complex and difficult problems; the very complexity of it needs to be approached very simply. Any complex problem - specially a human problem and we have many of them - must surely be approached very clearly, very simply, without any ideological background; otherwise we translate what we see according to the conditioning and the peculiar idiosyncrasies and intentions that we have.

To understand the two essentially deep-rooted problems of violence and sorrow, we must not approach them merely verbally or intellectually; the intellect doesn't solve any problem at all, it may explain problems - any clever person can explain problems, - but the explanation, however erudite, however subtle, is not the reality. It is no use explaining to a man who is very hungry what marvellous food there is, it has no value at all. But if we go into these questions, not intellectually, but actually, totally, come to grips with them, unravelling these two terrible problems that

destroy the mind, then perhaps we might go beyond. We, as human beings, have accepted violence and sorrow as a way of life, having accepted them, we try to make the best of them. We worship sorrow, idealize it, and abide with it, as in the Christian world. In the Eastern world it is translated in other ways, but again the solution is not found. And as we said, this violence we have inherited from the animal, this aggression, this domination, with the desire for power, position and the urge to fulfil. Our brain structure which we have inherited from the animal, is itself the product of evolution, its function is not only to be self-protective but also to be aggressive, to be violent, to be very dominating, thinking in terms of position, prestige, with all of which you are all quite familiar.

Sorrow, the self-pity which is part of that sorrow, the loneliness, the utter meaninglessness of life, the boredom, the routine, deprive life of all sense of purpose, so we invent purpose; the intellectuals put together ideological purpose according to which we try to live. And not being able to solve these problems we go back to something that has been, either in our youth, or to the culture of tradition, depending upon race, country, and so on. The more the problem becomes urgent, the more we escape to some form of ideological explanation from the past or to some ideological concept of the future, and we remain caught in this trap. And one observes, both in the East and in the West, the escapes into every form of entertainment, whether it is the entertainment of the Church, or the entertainment of football, or the cinema - and all the rest. The demand for entertainment, for distraction takes extraordinary forms, going to museums, talking endlessly about

music, about the latest books, or writing about something which is dead and gone and buried, which has no value at all.

Apparently there are very few who are really serious. I mean by that word `serious', the ability to go through a problem to the very end and resolve it; not resolving it according to one's personal inclination, or temperament, or according to the compulsion of environment, but putting all that aside, finding the truth of the matter, pursuing it to the very end. Such seriousness it seems is rather rare. And if one would solve these two fundamental issues, of violence and sorrow, one has to be serious and also one has to have a certain awareness, a certain attention, for nobody is going to solve these problems for us, obviously no old religions or carefully planned organizations, worked out by some authority or by the priest - nobody in that category is going to help us. It's very obvious that they have no meaning at all, - you can see throughout the world the so-called young people are throwing all those out of the window; they have no meaning - the Church, the Gods, the beliefs, the dogmas, the rituals. And such authorities have ceased to have meaning for any serious man; obviously, when the world is in such confusion and misery, merely to look to some kind of authority - especially such organized authority as religious planning with sanctions - has no meaning whatsoever.

One cannot rely on anybody, on saviours, masters, not on anybody, including the speaker. And when we have rejected totally all the books, philosophies, the saints and the anarchists, we are face to face with ourselves as we are. That is a frightening and rather a depressing thing: to see ourselves actually as we are. No amount of philosophy, no amount of literature, dogma, ritual is

ever going to solve this violence and sorrow. I think one has ultimately to come to this point and to resolve and go beyond. The more earnest one is, the more immediate the problem, the very urgency of it denies the authority one has so easily accepted.

Another problem is that of how to look into, and how to observe violence and sorrow as they exist in us. As we have said, human beings as individuals, are the product of society, of the culture in which we live, and that society and culture have been built by each one of us. Society is the product of human beings and we are of that product; and we are caught in this situation. We are caught in the trap of our individual inclinations, tendencies and pleasures and these are the structure of society. We are apt to regard the individual and society as two different things; and then it may be asked - What value has a human being who changes himself with regard to the whole structure of society? - which seems to me an absurd question.

We are dealing neither with an individual nor with a particular society, French, English, or whatever it is, but with the whole human problem. We are not dealing with the individual in relation to society or with the relationship of society, the collective, to the individual; we are trying to deal with the whole issue, not any separate issue.

We can only understand something when we see the totality of it, when we see its whole structure and the meaning of it. You cannot see the whole pattern of life, the whole movement of life, if you merely take one part of it and are tremendously concerned about that particular part. It is only when we see the whole map that we can see where we are and choose a particular road. So we

are not concerned with individual salvation or individual liberation, or whatever the individual is trying to seek but rather with the whole movement of life, the understanding of the whole current of existence; then perhaps the individual problems can be approached entirely differently. It becomes extremely difficult to see the whole issue, to understand it - it demands attention. One cannot understand anything intellectually - you may hear words, give explanations, find out the cause, but that is not understanding. Understanding - as one observes oneself - takes place only when the mind, including the brain, is totally attentive. And one is not attentive when one is interpreting and translating what one sees according to one's background. You must have noticed - obviously most of us have - that when the mind is completely quiet - not demanding, not fussing around, not tearing to pieces the problem, but I really facing the problem with complete quietness - then there is an understanding. That very understanding is the action, the liberating force or energy, which frees us from the problem. So we are using the word 'understand' in that sense, not intellectual or emotional understanding. And this understanding is rather a negation of the positive, the positive being understanding with the motive to do something about it. Most of us, when we have a problem, are inclined to worry about it, to tear it to pieces, to analyse it, to find a formula for dealing with it. And thought - as one may observe - is always the response of the old; thought is never new, yet the problem is always new. We translate the new, the problem, in terms of thought, and thought which is old is therefore positive, and active to do something about it.

Thought is the response of the past, it is memory, experience,

accumulated knowledge, it is old, and challenges are always new, if they are challenges. From that background of knowledge, experience, memory, arises the response as thought - thought is always of the past - and thought translates the challenge or the problem in terms of that past. And thought, if one observes it, makes a positive response with regard to the problem in terms of the past.

So thought is not the way out; and this doesn't mean that one becomes nebulous, vague, absent-minded or more neurotic. On the contrary, the more you give attention, complete attention, to anything, it doesn't matter what it is, then in that attention you observe that there is no thought, no thinking; there is then no centre which is in operation as thought. So, understanding takes place - understanding, or observing, which are all the same - without the response of the background of thought; understanding is immediate action.

Am I making it somewhat clear or is it too abstract? I hope you are not translating what is being said in terms of some oriental mystical nonsense! Look! - if I want to understand a child, I have to observe him, I have to watch him, I have to pay attention to him. I watch him playing, crying, misbehaving, doing everything - I just watch him - I don't correct him; I want to understand and therefore I have no prejudices, I have no patterns of thought - as to what he must or must not do - as to what is good and what is bad. I just watch, and in that watchful attention I begin to understand the whole nature of his activity. In the same way, to observe nature, a flower, is fairly simple; nature does not demand very much of us, just to watch an objective thing is very simple. But to watch what

is going on inwardly, to watch this violence, this sorrow, with that clarity of attention is not so simple. That watching, that observing, denies totally every form of personal inclination, tendency, or the compulsive demand of society, that very watching is like watching the movement of a whole river. If you sit on a bank and watch the river go by, you see everything. But you, watching from the bank, and the movement of the river, are two different things; you are the observer and the movement of the river is the thing observed. But when you are in the water - not sitting on the bank - then you are part of that movement, there is no observer at all. In the same way, watch this violence and sorrow, not as an observer observing the thing, but with this cessation of space between the observer and the observed. It is part of the whole enquiry which is meditation of life.

As we said earlier, we human beings are violent and this we inherit from the animal, and this we never really go into because we have the concept of non-violence; we are concerned with the concept and ideology of non-violence, of what should be, but not with the fact of what actually is. Please - if I may suggest - do not merely listen to a lot of words; words are words, they have not very much meaning. Semantically one can go into the meaning of words, but the word is not the thing, explanation is not the fact, that which is; and one is apt to be caught in the trap of words and one listens only to words, endlessly - words are ashes, they have no meaning. But if one listens beyond the word, observing oneself as one actually is, - not now, because you are sitting here, listening to a talk, but actuality, when you are outside, to watch yourselves - not egotistically, not introspectively, not analytically, but just observing what is actuality going on, then one can discover for

oneself not only the superficial violence, such as anger, the demand for position and so on, but also the deep-rooted violence. And when you discover that, the concept of non-violence has really no validity at all. What had validity is the fact, violence.

Observe the fact of violence in the Orient, in India they have been talking endlessly about non-violence, preaching practicing - all nonsense - the moment there is any for of challenge it disappears and they become violent. Here also they talk endlessly about peace, in all the churches, of love, goodness, loving your neighbour - yet you have had the most terrible wars, fifteen thousand of them, within the last five thousand years. And one has to observe how deep-rooted this violence is within oneself, in the demand for fulfilment, in competing and always comparing oneself with somebody else, in imitating, in obedience and in the following of somebody, conforming to a pattern - all that is a form of violence. To be free of that violence, demands extraordinary attention and care; otherwise I don't see how there can be peace in the world. There may be so-called peace, between two wars, between two conflicts, but that is not real peace, deep within, untouched by any ideology, or by any thought, not put together by some meaningless little philosophy. If one hasn't that peace, how can one have love, affection, care; or how, if there is no peace, can one create anything? One may draw pictures, write poems, write books about the past, and all the rest, but it all leads to conflict, to darkness. But to have this freedom from violence, - totally, not just partially, fragmentarily - one has to go into the problem very deeply.

One has to understand the nature of pleasure; violence and

pleasure are intimately related. Because again, as one observes oneself, one will see that our whole psychology is based on pleasure - apart from what the psychologists and the analysts talk about, one does not have to read a lot of books to see this - not only the sensory pleasures, as sex, but also the pleasure of achievement, the pleasure of success, of fulfilment, of achieving position, prestige, power. Again, all this exists in the animal. In a farmyard, where there are poultry, you see this same phenomenon taking place. There is pleasure, in the sense of taking delight, or of insulting. To achieve enjoyment, to achieve position, prestige, to be somebody famous, is a form of violence - you have to be aggressive. If one is not aggressive in this world, one is just downtrodden, pushed aside; so that one may well ask the question, 'Can I live without aggression, and yet live in this society?'

Probably not, why should one live in society? - in the psychological structure of society, I mean. One has to live in the outward structure of society - having a job, a few clothes, a house, and so on - but why should one live in its psychological structure? Why should one accept the norm of society which requires that one must become a successful writer, must be a famous man, must have...oh, you know, all the rest of it? All that is part of the pleasure principle which translates itself in violence. In church you say, love your neighbour - and in business you cut his throat; the norm of society has no meaning. The whole structure of the army, any structure based on the hierarchic principle, on authority, is again domination and pleasure, which is again part of violence, basic violence. To understand all this demands a great deal of observation - it is not a matter of capacity - you begin to

understand, the more you observe. The very seeing is the acting.

Pleasure is what we are seeking all the time. We want greater pleasure - the ultimate pleasure, of course, is to have God. In the pursuit of pleasure there is fear, and we are burdened all our life with this dark thing called fear. Fear, sorrow, thought, violence, aggression - they are all interrelated. Therefore, in understanding one thing clearly, you understand beyond it.

One can take time and analyse the whole of the emotional and the intellectual structure of one's being, analyzing, bit by bit - which the analysts do, hoping to bring about a certain normal relationship between the individual and society - but all that involves time. Or, one can see that one is violent and understand the cause of it directly; one knows the cause of it. But to see each and every form of violence involves time; to unravel it exhaustively in all its forms demands months, years of time. Such an approach, it seems to me, is absurd. It is like a man who is violent and is trying to be non-violent, in the meantime he is sowing the seed of violence all the time. So the question is whether you can see the whole thing immediately and resolve it immediately - that is really the issue - not bit by bit, taking day after day, month after month; that is a terrible, dreary, endless job, it involves a very careful, analytical mind, a mind that can dissect, see every aspect and not miss one detail - when a particular detail is missed the whole picture goes wrong. Not only does that involve time but in it there is also a concept which you have established of what it is to be free from violence. I don't know if you are following this? That concept, that thought which you use as a means of attempting to get rid of violence actually creates violence; violence is created by

thought. So the question is, is it possible to see the whole thing immediately? - not intellectually, if you put it as an intellectual problem it has no issue at all, then you'll just commit suicide as many intellectuals do, either actually commit suicide, or invent a theory, a belief, a dogma, a concept and become slaves to that - which is a form of suicide - or go back to the old religions, and become a Catholic, or a Protestant, or a Hindu, a follower of Zen, or whatever.

So the question is, is it possible to see the whole thing immediately, and with the very seeing of it, the ending of it?

You see wholly when the problem is sufficiently urgent, not only urgent for yourself but also for the world. There is war outwardly and war inwardly within each one of us, is it possible to end it immediately, psychologically turning your back on it? Nobody can answer that question except yourself except yourself when you answer it, not depending on any authority, on any intellectual or emotional concepts or formulas or ideologies. But as we said, this demands a great deal of inward seriousness, a great deal of earnest observation - observing when you are sitting in a bus the things about you, without choice, observing the thing within oneself that is moving, changing, observing without any motive, just everything as it is. What `is', is much more important than what `should' be. Out of this care and attention, perhaps, we will know what it is to love.

Questioner: Am I to understand we have to meditate, but our minds are prevented from meditating because they tick over automatically and so we are unable to observe what happens around us? Does this mean that we must therefore observe what

goes on inside our minds first?

Krishnamurti: 'To observe one needs to meditate' - I didn't say so. Observing is meditation, it is not that in order to observe you must meditate. To observe is one of the most, difficult things. To observe a tree, for example, is very difficult, and that is because you have ideas, images, about that tree, and these ideas - botanical knowledge - prevent you from looking at that tree. To observe your wife or your husband is even more difficult, again because you have an image about your wife and she has an image about you, and the relationship is between those two images. That is what is generally called relationship, which is two sets of memories, images, having a relationship. Just think of the absurdity of it - all relationship as we generally know it, is dead. To observe means actually to be aware of the interference of thought; to see how the image you have about the tree, about the person, about whatever it is, interferes with looking - observe that you forget what you are looking at, which is the tree, or the person; and see why thought interferes, why you have an image about that person. Why do you have an image about anybody? Here we are, you are looking at me, and I am looking at you - the speaker and you, the audience. You have an image about the speaker - unfortunately - but because I don't know you, I have no image and I can therefore look at you. But I cannot look at you if I say to myself, I'm going to use that audience to achieve power, position, to exploit it, become a famous man - you know all the rest of it - all that rubbish which human beings cultivate. So, to observe means to observe without the interference of one, background; but one is the background - you follow?-one's whole being which looks is one's background - as a

Christian, as a Frenchman, or as an intellectual. In observing one discovers this background and observing it without any choice, without any inclination, is tremendous discipline, - not the absurd discipline of conformity, imitation. Such observation makes the mind extraordinarily active, extraordinarily sensitive - and the whole of that is meditation. Not, `to observe you must meditate; but rather it is in observing that all these things take place, and all this is meditation - not just some kind of control of thought, which we will discuss another time. Questioner: Will you be precise and explain pleasure and fear - how they are related?

Krishnamurti: Fear - have you ever come into direct contact with fear? Have you ever been directly in contact with anything, a tree, with a flower, with a human being - directly, not through the image? You know, when you look at a tree in the park, there is always the observer and the observed - there is you watching the tree - there is a space between the observer and the observed. And to be in direct contact - you can touch the tree but that is not contact, nor is identifying yourself with the tree, I don't mean that, that is another form of mental gymnastics - but to be in direct contact is quite a different thing, it is to have no space at all. This is what takes place when various forms of drugs are taken - L.S.D. and so on - space disappears; that is quite a different experience. But that space recurs again so they take more drugs and so on, deteriorating, getting more and more weary of the drugs, and less and less result. But when one can observe without the observer - that is, the background, the ideological concepts, the memory - then space disappears altogether between people, and perhaps in that state there is no fear, there is only something called - verbally

we can use that word - 'love', but it is not the thing that is usually called love. We shall have to discuss fear another time.

Questioner: It seems to me that even our being here is a sort of a paradox because it implies that we are dissatisfied. I mean, I am dissatisfied with life as I find it, there is violence, and wishing to understand that with which I am dissatisfied.

Krishnamurti: No Sir, there are not human beings separate from violence - human beings are violent. It is not 'I' different from 'violence'. When I am angry, it is not something or somebody else that is angry within me, I am angry. There is no 'me' separate from anger. To realize the actual fact of that statement, that 'I' am violence, not theoretically, not intellectually, but actually to realize the fact means this division between 'me' and the violence, the anger, ceases - but that requires tremendous attention, work.

Questioner: Would you make a difference between pleasure, hate and violence?

Krishnamurti: Sir, I think the question of pleasure isn't so easily understood, one has to go into the problem, not just deny. Don't you take pleasure when you eat food, go for a walk, or when you look at a tree, or a beautiful woman, or man, or whatever it is. One has to go into the question of pleasure totally. Life is complex, isn't it? Life is tremendously complex and pleasure is a complex thing. So-called monks and religious people have said you must have no pleasure, they take up the Bible, or the Gita, and keep everlastingly reading the book and never looking at life. But to understand pleasure, one has to understand desire, enjoyment, memory - the storing of experiences that have given pleasure - both at the conscious as well as at the so-called unconscious level.

As I said, life is a very complex problem and you can't forget the complexity of it by saying 'I won't look at it'. One has to approach it extraordinarily simply, and no formula must be there, no ideology, no choice - mere observation.

Probably this is the first time that some of you are listening to these talks and they may sound rather like Greek, or Chinese, but as we discuss these matters and go into them perhaps we shall begin to understand more of it.

One must ask questions - not only now, but all the time one must ask questions. One must doubt and not accept anything. To ask a question is very important - it is even more important to ask the right question. To ask the right question implies that one must be extraordinarily aware of the problems of life - not in terms of like or dislike, but the whole field of life. To ask that question means one must have great humility - not the humility of vanity, but the humility of a person who wants to know. When we ask ourselves the right question, which is the outcome of a great deal of intelligent enquiry, then being right, the question has its own reply; we don't have to ask anybody - the answer is there.

16th April 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 2ND PUBLIC TALK PARIS 20TH APRIL 1967

WE WERE SAYING the other day that there must be a radical revolution, not only in the outward structure of society but also psychologically; inwardly, there must be a total mutation, a revolution in the psychological being.

We see that society is in terrible disorder, and that it is based on greed, envy, power, position, and so on. And we, as human beings, of that society, we are also in disorder, inwardly. For the average human being, life - the daily routine, the daily grind of earning a livelihood, the fearful loneliness and boredom, the endless repetition - has very little meaning. To give meaning and significance to life, intellectuals throughout the world, in the west and in the east, have invented philosophies and religions; they have said `There is God, there is a certain state of mind which one must strive after, and there have been so many clever philosophers stating certain things totally unrelated to life. They have tried to give a significance, but in actuality - nonintellectually, non-ideationally - life, as it is, as we live it everyday, is really quite meaningless. And it has no meaning, not only because we as human beings are in a state of disorder, but also because our life is very repetitive. We spend years in an office - forty or fifty years - endlessly carrying out something that has very little meaning, and, as we see, inwardly, the disorder is growing. Outwardly they are trying to establish order through law, through various forms of dictatorship, by controlling the mind and behaviour of human beings; outwardly bringing about, politically, economically, a

semblance of order, but inwardly there is no order at all. Order implies - does it not? - a state of mind in which there is no conflict at all a state of mind that is clear, that is not caught in routine; a state of mind not conditioned by any personal inclination or tendency, or compelled by outward environmental influence. And it seems to me that this order must be born without any effort; it cannot be brought about by will, by conceptual or ideational striving; in one's confused mind, in one's misery, in this endless loneliness and conflict, such striving cannot possibly bring about order, it can only increase the confusion.

What is one to do? What is a human being to do who realizes he is confused, uncertain, that he is living a life of routine, imitating, conforming to a pattern set by society, of which he is himself part - yet he sees the necessity of there being order within himself? Unless there is order within - however much there may be order outwardly - the inward disorder will invariably overcome the outward semblance of order - I think that is fairly clear. So, how is one to bring about order within oneself?

Order means a state of mind in which there is no contradiction, and therefore no conflict - and that doesn't imply a state of stagnation or of decay.

Order which is according to a formula, according to an ideal or concept, is merely disorder. If a human being conforms to a pattern of thought - an ideal of something that he should be - then he is merely imitating, conforming, disciplining and forcing himself to fit into a mould. When he does that - which in society he has been coerced to do for centuries upon centuries, society trying to control him through various religious sanctions, through laws and so on -

then great disorder is always produced in him. And it seems to me that that is one of the basic reasons for the present revolt that is going on throughout the world. Younger generations are trying to throw off the ideas, the gods, the behaviour of the older generation; everything is being discarded; they are in revolt against society, against the established order. And yet the order they are trying to find is also slowly becoming conformist - and therefore creating disorder in themselves.

So the problem is - is it not - how is a radical change to be brought about? - that essential need is obvious. If there is a motive to change then you are tethered or bound to the past because all motives come from the background of one's conditioning.

I hope together we can work this out; if you are merely listening intellectually, emotionally or verbally then we are not working together, you are merely hearing a few sets of ideas and agreeing or disagreeing - this will have very little value. But if we could actually go through this problem together, actually work it out, actually live the thing through, each one of us, then I think we might come to something which will be realistic, in which there does take place a radical revolution, psychologically, in the very act of listening.

We all agree, even if only intellectually, that there must be change in the whole mind structure, in the whole being. And we have tried so many ways - through discipline, through conformity, through obeying, through following; or we have accepted life as it is and lived it to the full; and if one has had capacity, money, then as one comes to die one says to oneself that one has had a good life and that is the end of it. We may realize that to live we must have

order - because without order there is no peace - but order that is brought about by identifying oneself with a concept, with an idea, with a formula, only brings about an isolation. Though one may identify oneself with something like nationalism, or with an idea of god, it brings about separation and conflict. Therefore, identifying oneself with an idea, with a concept, does not bring about a radical change.

There are vast technological changes going on outwardly, but inward I'm the same as we've been for centuries, in conflict, in misery, in battle with myself and with others - my life is a battlefield. All my relationships are based on images, formed by thought. My life is a battlefield, I want to change it, I see that I cannot possibly live at peace within myself, or with society, or with another, unless there is complete order - which means complete freedom. Order can only come into being when there is freedom; and there is no freedom through slavery to an idea, or in acceptance of a certain theology, or in conforming to a certain pattern set by society or by myself. So what am I to do? I do not know if you have thought about it - if you have you will have seen that it is really an enormous problem. What am I as a human being conditioned through millions of years, with a brain that functions only in patterns of self-preservation, this self-preservation leading more and more to self-isolation, and therefore more and more conflict - to do? Seeing this whole battlefield in which as a human being I live, afraid, guilty, in despair, clinging to past memories, afraid to die, living in semi-darkness, though clever enough to invent all kinds of theories, giving myself work to do, writing books, explaining, doing all that ordinary human beings do - seeing

all that, not as an idea, not as something that is outside of myself but actually seeing that my life is that - what am I to do? How am I to change the whole psychological structure of my being? - otherwise I can't have peace and there is no such thing as freedom.

If it is your problem as well as the speaker's (it is not actually my problem, but we are exploring it together) what is one to do? Obviously there is no authority any more, no body is going to tell us what to do; no priest, no theologian, no guru, no book, no outside agency is going to tell us what to do. We have tried all those, and they have no meaning whatsoever now, and they never had. There being no authority I have to rely completely on myself - yet, 'myself' is a confused entity. The more I discard every form of outside agency which promised to bring about a change within oneself - all sanctions, all law which makes me do this and that - the more I discard them the more I am aware of the enormous problem of myself, who am confused, uncertain, not knowing. And when one becomes aware of that, there is more fear, more despair, and, as a reaction a reversion, and one joins various organizations, political or religious; if one was a Catholic, one becomes a Protestant, if one had been a Protestant one begins to follow Zen, or one finds some other form of distraction without fundamentally solving the problem at all.

So there it is. One has discarded totally all outside authority - if one has - and one finds that authority is one of the causes of disorder. One sees one has followed a so-called teacher, philosopher, or saviour, out of fear - not out of love. If one had love, one wouldn't follow anybody; love doesn't obey, love has no duty, no responsibility. One follows, accepts, obeys, essentially

because there is fear - fear of not arriving, of going wrong, and so on, a dozen forms of fear. Inwardly, to discard authority totally - the authority of another and also the authority of your own concepts, of your own experience of the past - is an extraordinarily difficult thing to do. It is fairly easy to deny the authority of society - the monks have done it in various ways, and the modern younger generation is doing it in a different way - but to discard the authority of one's own conditioning - of one's own experiences, the authority of the past in oneself, of which one is and which becomes the supreme authority - is much more difficult. And to discard that is much more important, much more essential, because that is what breeds outward authority, and also breeds fear, because one wants to be certain, sure, secure.

So, freedom from authority, which means freedom from fear, from psychological fear, surely is the first requirement for order? Is it possible to be free, totally, from fear - both at the conscious as well as the unconscious level? And is there such a thing as the unconscious at all? We have accepted the idea of the unconscious as part of us - that has been the fashion - but is there such a thing? Because, enquiring now into this question of whether it is possible to be completely free from fear, one obviously has to go into this question of the unconscious.

Is there such a thing as the unconscious? I do not know what you think about it, what you discover. If there is the unconscious, how is the conscious mind going to uncover it? (The speaker is not accepting the unconscious, but we are examining what is said about the unconscious.) As it is said, the unconscious is the past, the racial inheritance, the storehouse of all human endeavour and

so on; it is at a very deep level in each one of us. How is the conscious mind going to uncover that storehouse, all that hidden something which we have accepted? How are we going to examine with the conscious mind something which is unconscious? It is said that you examine it through analysis, going to an expert, an analyser that is, if you have the money and feel neurotic enough to go to him. Now, how are you as a human being going to examine something of which you know nothing, except verbally? Can the conscious mind look into the unconscious - or can it only discover through dreams, through intimations, an occasional glimpse of that thing called the unconscious? Can the observer, who is the analyser, who is part of and not separate from the structure, examine the other part of the structure? What it can examine is its own part and not the total structure. It can attempt to analyse the unconscious by watching every movement of thought, every motive, every dream. And to do that takes time. You can spend all your life analysing. And if in your analysis you are not extremely accurate, your next analysis will go wrong, will not be true. It takes time - and is time the instrument that will bring freedom, and therefore order? - I hope I am making myself clear - time being the distance between the analyser, and the analysed, and the object which is going to be gained at the end of the analysis. To cover that interval between the observer and the ultimate end when he will be totally free - that distance is time. That interval, the gradual process, is time - will time bring freedom and order? If the unconscious cannot be examined so critically, so closely, so deeply by the conscious mind, then what is one to do? You understand the problem? Or, is there a totally different approach to this? - there

must be. We have lived for thousands and thousands of years in this way and we have not escaped the trap. We get out of one trap, only to fall into another. One sees that as long as there is fear, at any level of consciousness, traps and authorities must invariably exist. And therefore the unconscious becomes immensely important - that is, when you say time is necessary to bring about change, then you have all these complicated problems, and therefore no ending to problems at all. But if you deny time - that is - no tomorrow at all, psychologically, which means really, no tomorrow as pleasure - there is no gradual unfolding of the conscious or the unconscious. If you deny time there is no acquiring of virtue, there is no achievement, there is no tomorrow. Which doesn't mean, if you say 'There is no tomorrow', that one is in despair. But if you really understand this whole issue, then, when the mind frees itself from time the question of fear becomes something entirely different. Then the mind is in direct contact with that thing which is called fear - there is no interval of space between the observer and the observed, fear. One says, 'I am afraid', afraid of my neighbour, afraid of death, afraid of not being a success - that is, I am different from that fear. And when there is a separation between the observer and the observed, then there is an action to do something about the observed. When I say, 'I am afraid', then I want to do something about that fear, I want to control it, I want to shape it, I want to get rid of it, I want to escape from it, which means I am different from that fear. But I am that fear, that fear and me are part of the whole structure of life.

So, when this interval of space, which is time, between the sayer, who says, 'I am afraid', and the fear disappears, then one is

directly in contact with the fact - there is only the fact, not you as the observer of the fact. There are several things that take place in this process: you eliminate conflict altogether when the observer is the observed - for the observer is fear itself - this means you have the energy, that energy which has the form of fear. Since there is no interval between yourself and the fact, since the energy is you and the fear, there is, as we said, no conflict at all - obviously - therefore there is no positive action with regard to fear. There is no positive action at all, but merely a state of observation, seeing the fact, seeing actually 'what is' - because you have removed the image - you understand Sirs?

Let's put it differently. All relationships between human beings are based on images. You have an image about your friend, or your wife or your husband, and he or she has an image about you, the relationship is between these two images - this is obvious. The images have been put together by thought, from various forms of insults, pleasures, pains, all the rest of it, between human beings. The relationship is only between the images. When there are no images at all, then there is real relationship - then you are directly in contact. And when there is no image about the tree, you are really observing what it actually is - which is quite a different state. In the same way if you have no image about another human being, the relationship is entirely different. Which means that there is the absence of thought, of the 'me', of the Memory, (which is actually of the past). Therefore you are facing something which is immediate - and because one has eliminated conflict, one has tremendous energy. When one discards, or puts an end to, or stops, time, then there is only the fact of fear - therefore there is no

escape from fear, there is no controlling, there is no sublimating - it is so. When that is a fact, then it undergoes a tremendous change. That is, when there is no longer the observer - the entity that says, 'I am afraid', 'I' being separate from the fear - then, is there fear at all?

So one has learned to observe without the whole process of mentation, without thinking being set into motion. For, as we said the other day, thought is the response of memory, of knowledge, of experience; from the past, thought takes shape. Thought is always old and it can never be new. There is only a new state of being when thought, having been completely understood, comes to an end - that is the fundamental change. Thought, always seeking from the past its own security, has created fear. Basically we are seeking security, (speaking psychologically) security related to the past - I have had pain, I don't want pain; I have been happy, I must be happy in the future; I have had tremendous pleasure, there must be more pleasure. Thought, being old, only functions in this search for security. And if one observes in oneself closely, one sees that all the discontent which one has is turned into some poisonous contentment, security.

It is thought that creates the time interval that brings about disorder. But if one sees something, really clearly, in the absence of thought, one does so immediately, there is no time interval - the seeing is the doing. To see very clearly, without any confusion, the mind must be completely silent. If I want to see you, or understand you, my mind must stop chattering, obviously. In the state of incessant soliloquy, mental talking, chattering, it is not possible to see anything clearly. It is only when the mind is quiet that you do

see clearly - but you cannot make the mind silent by enforcement, by discipline.

Quietness of the mind comes into being only when you see the whole implication of fear, of authority, of time and the separation between the observer and the observed when you see the whole structure. To see the whole structure, obviously your mind must be quiet; one has to learn how to look - not at the most complex things, but just to look at a tree or a flower, at a cloud - without any movement of thought - just to look.

I think that many of those people who take drugs, do so in order to destroy the separation between the observer and the observed; they experience this peculiar state, but it is artificially brought about and they are left as wretched as ever before. The drug has momentarily given them a heightened sensitivity; chemically it has brought about a change in the structure of the brain cells themselves - for the time being. In that state everything is experienced very clearly, very closely - there is no separation at all and this is due to the total absence of thought, as the 'me' with all its memories. The more that is experienced in this way the more they want drugs to keep themselves in that state.

When one sees outwardly and inwardly all this disorder - the confusion, misery, loneliness and the utter meaninglessness of life as it is lived - one may invent extraordinary ideas about it, but they are mere inventions, theories. But when you understand the whole nature of time and thought, and discard it, then there is no need to seek a significance to life. Then there is quite a different state - not brought about by thought - that obviously cannot be explained by words. The more you explain it by words, the less it is. But to

actuality come upon it because one has observed - that state of mind, surely, is the released mind; it has nothing to do with any organized belief and dogma.

Questioner: Is good and bad merely an idea?

Krishnamurti: Ah - is it just an idea? If you have a tooth ache, a pain, is it just an idea? Ah - is it? - (laughing) - or is it a natural response. Take another example - is it evil when you are violent - is it just an idea when you hit me, when you kill me? Is it an idea? You may kill me for an idea, which is called nationalism.

One has really to enquire into this question of what is evil and what is good, what is beauty and what is ugliness. When you get angry, violent, envious, greedy, jealous, would you call that evil? When you hurt another by a word, by a gesture, or by throwing a bomb, would you call that evil? But you are doing that all day. And what is it, to be good, to be kind, to be generous and not to create enmity? This dual thing exists in every human being - the good and the bad - the battle is there. That is our battlefield, we want to be peaceful and quiet, affectionate, yet there is the other in us, violent, wanting to hurt. Is it possible completely to be free of this duality? It is only possible to be free of this duality when you are completely in contact with the actual fact, with what actually is. That is to say, when you are violent, not to have its opposite as idea, as ideal, but to be completely aware of the total significance of violence. Then you will find, if you are totally aware of what actually is - whether you call it good or bad - then you will find that there is no duality at all. After all, if beauty is merely the opposite of ugliness, or if love is the opposite of hate, then there is neither beauty nor love. But, with us, love is the opposite of hate;

therefore we are always caught in love, jealousy and hate. But when you completely face the fact - be it jealousy, envy, anger, brutality - not creating the opposite as a means of escape from the fact, then you will transcend both the good and the bad and go beyond.

20th April 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 3RD PUBLIC TALK PARIS 23RD APRIL 1967

I FEEL THAT merely attending talks, reading books and discussing with one another, has very little meaning. Verbal exchange may be somewhat necessary and useful, but much more important is understanding, and that comes only in the doing. It is not that first you understand and then do, but rather that in the very doing, in the very acting, there is understanding; learning. It is not that you learn first, and then act - which action becomes automatic, mechanical - but rather in the doing, as one is acting, there, in that, is learning. Learning is acting, and acting is learning - the two things are not separate. When there is understanding in doing - learning in acting - there is great conservation of energy.

One needs energy to solve the many problems of one's life, one wastes energy in the conflict that there is between idea and action. When one has ideation - an ideal or a formula according to which one is acting, living - then there is an interval between the ideation and the act; in that interval there is conflict which wastes energy. One observes this process in oneself in the continual approximation to the ideal, which approximation and effort is a form of conflict and thus a waste of energy.

When there is no ideation at all, no ideal or example, no pattern or formula, then there is no contradiction or conflict, and therefore there is a gathering of energy. But one observes that most of us function, live and act, within the field of patterns, conceptual formulations, ideals and so on. One's life has become mechanical, imitative, and the breeding ground of contradiction between that

which is and what we think should be. In this there is conflict and waste of energy; yet one needs a great deal of energy if one is to solve one's problems completely. Look at the waste of energy that takes place when one talks incessantly about nothing, or incessantly amuses oneself in reading; and outwardly the waste of energy in the build up of armaments, in going to the moon, and all the rest of it.

One, as a human being, has enormous complex problems, which one alone must solve; for somebody else's solution is of no significance, has no value at all. One has to solve them, and one needs the energy which one dissipates in so many useless, vain, unprofitable activities; that energy is necessary to solve the problems of love, living and death.

It seems to me that unless we solve these three fundamental issues of life, love, living and death, we are not really human beings at all, not really civilized, cultured. We may have a great deal of knowledge about pictures and music, we may write about the past, explain this or that, but we have not solved the problems which are of greatest significance in our lives - love, what is living, and what it means to die. And, if I may, I would like to go into this matter this morning; but not as idea, not as explanation, but rather as an investigation, a process of enquiry, so as to discover for oneself. For most of us are secondhand people; we have lived on what we have been told, guided by our inclinations or tendencies, and we have been compelled, urged or forced by circumstance, by environment, to accept a conditioned way of life. There is nothing original, pristine, clear. Being the result of all kinds of influences there is nothing new in us, there is nothing that we have discovered

for ourselves. Discovery is a constant living process; you cannot discover, store up what you have discovered and then live according to that.

To understand these three fundamental issues - life, love and death one needs not only energy but also a very sharp mind; not a dull, mechanical mind, not a mind that is tremendously informed and knowledgeable - such a mind may be necessary at certain levels but not at the level of enquiry in this region.

I suggest, if I may, that we take a voyage into this enormous problem - what is living? - and see actually what it is now, see actually what it is, not what it should be. What should be, or what has been, have no importance whatever; how people, the prophets and the saints and the saviours, are said to have lived, that has no value at all; it is only a dull, stupid mind that talks about them. We have to investigate that which actually is, we have to look very closely, and to look in this way there must be no interpretation, no discarding, no antagonism, no choice - we must look at our life as it is. And our life is a battlefield from the moment we are born until we die; it is an agony, a despair, a sense of guilt, fear, everlasting competition, comparing ourselves with others, trying to become something more and more, trying to control, trying to free oneself, trying to attain, trying to conserve. Our daily life, our everyday routine of existence, is competition, brutality, agony, despair, loneliness; there is constant sorrow which is never solved, never put aside. That is the fact, that is what actually is, and we have never been able to go beyond that. We have a whole network of escapes, from the football field to the churches, from organized religion to museums and concerts, and of course, the intellectual

investigation which leads nowhere. That is our life, and that is not living at all - obviously. Living implies a state of mind in which there is no conflict whatsoever; being free from all this conflict - to live!

To be free from this battlefield, from this incessant boredom and loneliest, one must have the capacity and the energy to look and observe what actually takes place. One cannot observe if one is trapped in words. For us, words and symbols are extraordinarily important. A word like `God' or `Communist', like `Bible', `wife', `husband', `nationality', the name of a person, and so on, has this extraordinary importance. Words! - we are caught in the web of words. These words and the symbols which we have cultivated, prevent us from looking at the fact of that which actually is. Because we think in words it is very difficult to free the mind from words.

It is only when we actually look at what is going on within ourselves and at that which is going on outside - observing, giving complete attention, giving your whole mind, heart, nerves and everything that one has, to observe with complete and total attention - that here is energy that is no longer dissipated. With that energy we can look at our life, and when we do look at it with that attention, and with care and with a sense of affection, there is no despair - there is no despair when we look at despair.

I hope you are listening not merely to words but to the actual state of your own mind, to your own particular form of fear, despair, agony, loneliness, the lack of love, and so on, just giving your total and complete attention to it. In doing this you will discover for yourself how inattentive you are - this inattention is a

waste of energy. Know when you are inattentive and be inattentive; not, try to become attentive when you are inattentive, that is a waste of energy. Be conscious, aware, know that you are inattentive, and be inattentive. And when you are attentive, give your whole being to attention - it doesn't matter if it lasts two seconds. With that attention, look; you will see that the thing that we have called life becomes transformed. There is then no `observer' separate from the thing observed, and therefore there is no conflict. The thing observed without the `observer' undergoes a tremendous transformation.

Most of our life is based upon pleasure; that is the fundamental demand of our life; pleasure in every form, comfort, security, possession, prestige, power, domination, success, to be on the top of the heap, all that is included in that word pleasure. That pleasure invariably breeds pain; and we would rather have pleasure than pain, so we pursue pleasure. To understand pleasure we have to understand the whole question of desire. We are not trying to get rid of pleasure, that would be too absurd - one has to leave that to the monks, to those people who are trying to be extremely religious yet who are not religious at all. I don't think we know what pleasure really is; we have an idea of what pleasure is, but actually we do not know what it is. And to understand it we have to come into contact with it completely, without the intervention of thought, the image, the picture; then it is something entirely different from what we call pleasure.

We have to understand this principle of pleasure, which breeds agony and despair; we have to understand the way of desire yet not deny desire. You can't deny desire, you can't deny anything, you

have to see things as they are, and to see one has to be tremendously attentive, with care.

And what is desire? - again, a very complex problem which must be approached very simply, that is to say, with innocence. Our minds are so jaded, old, shoddy corrupt with so much knowledge, information and experience, that we cannot approach anything simply. Yet we can only understand the very complex problem of life when we look at it very simply, with innocent eyes - and we cannot have innocent eyes if we begin to choose, to like or dislike, accept or deny. Various religions throughout the world have said that you must be without desire, act without desire, or be desireless - which is all nonsense - it only leads to such oppression and to such smothering, control and the further increase of conflict. So we are not talking about the suppression of desire, but rather about the understanding of it. When you understand something it is no longer a problem, it is no longer a burden and a thing to be battled with.

One can see very simply how desire arises and how that desire is sustained, given vitality, given a continuity. Surely, desire begins with seeing, or feeling, or tasting, and the sensation from that contact; then thought comes in and says that is very pleasurable, or not pleasurable - it must continue, or it must not continue. So thought gives to sensation a continuity and strengthens desire. You can observe it very simply; it is not, I think, a very complex problem. There is a beautiful face, a car, a lovely mountain and a sunset, a sheet of water glistening in the sun, you look at it, and there is great pleasure, enjoyment; seeing - sensation. Then thought comes in and says I must keep it, I must treasure it, I must think

about it. That is what takes place in sex and in every other form of pleasure. So thought gives a continuity to pleasure, which is desire.

To look without the interference of thought is, in itself, a tremendous discipline; then life is not a battle. If you understand all this - and I hope that you are not merely listening to the explanation, which is of no value at all, it is like dead ash - if you are actually taking the journey so that it becomes your own, then there is no secondhand thing. I feel that there is no teacher and no pupil, there is no guru and disciple, there is only learning - learning which takes place all the time. It is not that you learn and then act from what you have gathered as - learning that again breeds antagonism, battle. But if you are listening, then in that very act of listening is learning and the doing. When one does that, then life has a totally different meaning; a meaning and significance which is not given by the intellect.

One has to understand this thing called death, of which most of us are so terribly frightened. I feel that a human being who does not understand what living, or dying, or that which we call love, is, is not really a human being at all, he is a frightened entity, like an animal. And the more outwardly we are sophisticated - going to the moon or living under the sea, having marvellous instruments of destruction, or construction - the more inwardly our lives become superficial. And that very superficiality leads to great misery, to greater conflict - perhaps not in the battlefield, but inwardly.

To find out what death is there must be freedom from fear; we are all going to die whether we like it or whether we don't like it; whether the doctors, the scientist can give you ten or fifty years longer, there is always that thing waiting; you can't escape from it;

no new hormones, new antibiotics or the various forms of genetics, geriatrics and so on, all that game one plays, will remove that fear - there it is - there is death. And we have separated living from dying. Living, which is our daily torture, daily insult, daily misery - which we call living - with perchance the occasional light, with the occasional opening of a window over enchanted seas, yet the rest of the time a misery, a sorrow, a confusion. That is what we call living; and we are afraid to die, which is to end this misery.

We rather cling to the known than face the unknown, the known being our loneliness, our sorrow, our embittered existence. And as we cannot face that thing called death, we invent all kinds of theories; in the East reincarnation, here resurrection, or whatever it is. If you believe in reincarnation - as millions and millions do in the Orient - implying that you will be born to a next life, the 'you' being a constant, a permanent entity (there is no such thing as permanence, but that doesn't matter) if you believe in reincarnation you must live an extraordinarily intense, clear, virtuous life now, because in the next life you are going to pay for it, the next life will be equally of torture, agony. If you believe this you must live the right kind of life now, not tomorrow; live peacefully, not creating antagonism in another, because the next life will be what you have made of this life. But as nobody wants to bring about such a tremendous revolution in their lives, then reincarnation, or resurrection, or any other form of belief, is just an afternoon virtue, which has no value whatsoever. If you are really serious, to find out the implications of death, then you have to come into contact with that fact of death, actually come into contact with it - not theoretically, not as something which you have got to face,

therefore let's face it, but rather by coming directly into contact with it, by dying. Dying - I mean by that word, coming to the end of all the things that you have known psychologically, your experiences, your pleasures, to die - every day. Otherwise, you will never know what death is; for it is only in the dying that there is something new, not in continuing the old. Most of us are so weighed down by the known, by the yesterday, by the memories, by the `me', the `self', which is but a bundle of memories accumulated yesterday, having no actual existence in itself. Die to those memories; actually die to a pleasure without any argument. If you know what it means to die to a pleasure, to something that you have taken great pleasure in - without argument, without postponement, without any sense of resentment, bitterness - that is what is going to happen when you do die. And to die every day, to everything that you have gathered psychologically, is to be totally reborn. If you do not die in that way, then you have the continual problem of this memory that you have accumulated as the `me' and the self-centred activity that we indulge in - the thought of `my' house, `my' family, `my' book, `my' fame, `my' loneliness - you know, that little entity that moves around incessantly within itself, with its own limited pattern of existence. Will that continue? - you understand? - that is the problem we have. Either one knows how to die every day, and dying actually, the mind is fresh, instant, eager, tremendously alive, or, there is this bundle of memories, of self-centred activity, with all its thoughts, searching for fulfilment, wanting to be somebody, imitating, copying. That whole network of thought - will that continue? - yet that is what we want to continue. We say, at the least, if I haven't fulfilled in this life,

perhaps I will in the next. All the desire to fulfil tomorrow, is the next life - I do not know if you understand that - thought centres round the `me' and it will obviously continue in some form or another; but that way of living is so stupid, it is like a machine that goes on endlessly, well-oiled, with little friction. And this continues to take place when - as we have done - we divide living from dying, for living is dying, (that is the fundamental fact of that word which we are using) you cannot live if you do not die every minute to every instance of psychological knowledge, information, gathering, pleasure - it is only then, perhaps, that we shall understand what love is. For us, as we are, love is something terrible, something which is an agony, hedged about by jealousy, envy and uncertainty in all relationships. All our intimate relationship is based on love as pleasure and desire; in this love we know possession, domination, fear, the agony of not being loved, of not knowing how to love - you know all that we go through. Never knowing what it means and we die. Love has no sorrow; sorrow and love cannot go together; but in the Christian world suffering is idealized, it is put on a cross and worshipped - implying that you can never escape from suffering except through one particular door, all of which is the central dogma of an exploiting religious society. What we know as love is only hate, jealousy, antagonism, brutality and war. And love is not the opposite of hate, any more than humility is the opposite of vanity. A vain person can never be humble - he can struggle and achieve a form of humility, but it is hypocrisy. Being rid of vanity in every form - psychologically, inwardly, deeply, without the searching for humility - then there is humility and there is love. You know, the

word `love' is so spoilt; every newspaper, every magazine and soap advertisement, talks about love - like the word `God' - and we are trying to use that same word yet give it an entirely different content.

Love cannot possibly be cultivated; it cannot be put together by thought. Thought is always old and love can never be old. All our relationship is based on thought; thought has created images which come between people, and it is these images that have relationships; so love doesn't exist. Love is always new - yet neither new nor old, something entirely different.

So, again, there are all the major problems of life, and they are complex - one must come to them very simply, not demanding a thing. Then one discovers for oneself a state of mind that is not touched by thought, a totally different dimension that man is always seeking. It is only when one stops seeking, and faces the fact of what actually is and goes beyond, that one will discover it for oneself.

Do you want to discuss any of this?

Questioner: There are parts of our unconscious which are active, because new; must we not get into contact with those parts of our unconscious?

Krishnamurti: Is not all consciousness limited? - just listen, don't accept or deny, we will go into it together. All consciousness is limited because there is always the centre and a circumference. Where there is a centre - and all consciousness must have a centre - there must be a frontier, a border, therefore limitation. That is to say, when you look at the stars of an evening there is the space between you, the observer who sees, and the stars - there is that

immense space - the space created by the centre in relation to the object. As long as there is this centre, this observer, the space, no matter how vast, must be limited. This hall has space enclosed by four walls, and outside there is space because of the hall. This hall is the centre in space in which this hall exists. This microphone creates space round itself, and exists in space. Space is that which exists when there is a centre, as the microphone, or as the 'me', the observer. Consciousness may be expanded but as long as there is an observer, a centre, it is always limited, conditioned. This expansion of consciousness can be achieved in various ways - taking drugs, for example, but we are not concerned with that - yet however much it may be expanded, it is always conditioned, it is always limited. Now, in this consciousness, there is the unconscious and the conscious. The unconscious is not outside the centre which creates the space, and therefore not outside the limitation. In that conditioning, in that limitation, there is the division of the unconscious and the conscious. And, in the unconscious - the questioner says - there are certain activities which are beyond thought, with which one must come into contact. Is there anything in the unconscious which is new? - obviously not. Look at the problem very simply, in another way; if you recognize a 'new' experience, that very recognition is born from the old, that 'new' experience is not new at all. (I do not know if you are following all this). I recognize you because I met you, yesterday; I met you, and the memory remains, from that I recognize you today. And when I recognize, what I call a 'new' experience, it is really the old, set in a different frame, under different circumstances. Therefore, as long as there is a process of recognition, there is no

experience which is new. This is a tremendous thing to discover; a mind that has discovered this does not depend on experience at all;- a different matter altogether.

23rd April 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 4TH PUBLIC TALK PARIS 27TH APRIL 1967

DURING THE LAST three meetings that we have had here, we have touched in some detail upon several human problems, such as fear, anxiety, violence and sorrow. And I would like, if I may, this evening, to talk about something that may demand a certain quality of attention.

Most of us are crippled by the environment in which we live, by the family, by society, and by our own defensive measures and our incapacity to face the enormous problem of life. At the end of it all, after having lived a rather sorrowful, meaningless existence, there is always death. And in life - the life we generally have and lead - there is very little space, very little solitude. Whenever we are alone, our minds are crowded by so much knowledge, by all the experiences that we have had, by so many influences, and all our anxiety, misery and conflict. Our minds become more and more dull, insensitive - functioning in a monotonous routine. And it seems to me that one of our greatest difficulties is to have space; even outwardly that becomes more and more difficult, because we live in boxes, called flats; our life is very crowded and we have very little space either outwardly or inwardly.

Space is very important because it implies freedom - freedom to be, to function, to flower. After all, goodness can only flower if there is space; virtue can only flower when there is freedom. We have hardly any freedom - we may have political freedom (fortunately there are very few tyrannies left) - but inwardly we are not free and therefore there is no space. I do not know if you have

ever thought about it, of how important it is to have this vast space within one; not a space brought about by will, not formed imaginatively, speculatively. Without this inward space, virtue, or any quality that is worthwhile, cannot function, grow or come into being. And beauty - not in the picture, in the music, in the building - beauty is only possible when there is silence.

Space and silence are necessary, because it is only when the mind is alone, uninfluenced, untrained, not caught by thousands of experiences, no longer functioning in the very limited and petty field of its monotonous daily existence, it is only when the mind is free of all this, alone and silent, that it can discover, or come upon, something totally new. I would like to talk about this, this evening. But to talk about something is not the fact; the word, the symbol, is not the actuality. The word `tree' is not the tree - and for most of us the symbol, the word, is more important. We are very easily held fast by the word. But really it is of greatest importance that we should come upon something which is not merely the word, and all the implications of the word, but come upon the fact, the actual state of the mind that - though it has lived as thousand experiences - is alone, untouched by civilization, by the constant battles of life. It seems to me that it is only in that state that anything new - a new flow, a new wave of living, a new creative movement - can take place.

Is it possible for one's mind, which is so heavily conditioned, to free itself and be alone, untouched? - to free itself not only of the modern technological conditioning, but also of the racial and the cultural background in which it has been so obviously conditioned, of two or three millions of years of the deep conditioning that

mankind has lived? We are the result of so much influence, so many experiences, so many fears, anxieties - and we ask: can the mind so heavily burdened, free itself and be alone, untouched? I do not know if this is a problem to anyone, if one has ever asked even such a question? What most of us want is to solve our immediate problems, achieve our immediate fulfilments, vanities, or pleasures; but when we go beyond these, we must inevitably, it seems to me, ask this question: can the mind ever renew itself totally, and be untouched? There are those who say it can never be, that it must always be conditioned - like the Communists, the religious people, Catholics or whoever you will. And as we have been brought up, conditioned, probably we never ask such a question; and when we do, we are not capable of finding the answer - ideologically we may, but actually, not. It seems to me that it is important to actually find out and not live on theories, formulas, in the hope of eventually finding it - but to actually find out, truly.

The whole of the Orient is mesmerized by the word meditation, and in the Occident, the word prayer is of tremendous importance. It is essential to find out whether the mind - which is so very complex, and then caught in a system of what is called meditation, or in a repetition of words, however ancient, however meaningful as prayer - whether the mind can actually know what meditation is, or what lies beyond the word prayer, and discover an actual state that is really silent.

It is only when the mind is silent that we can understand anything. If I want to understand somebody, my mind must be quiet, not chattering, not prejudiced, not having innumerable

opinions and experiences, for they prevent the observation and the understanding.

One can see directly that it is only when the mind is very quiet that there is a possibility of clarity; and the whole purpose of meditation in the East is to bring about such a state of mind. That purpose is the controlling of thought - which is the same purpose in constantly repeating a prayer - so that in that quiet state one may hope to understand one's problems. One has to understand these problems, one has to be free of the anxieties and fears which they entail, otherwise one cannot really be a human being, one is a tortured entity, and the tortured entity obviously cannot see anything serious very clearly.

Unless one lays the foundation - which is to be free from fear, free from sorrow, anxiety, and all the traps that consciously or unconsciously one lays for oneself - I do not see how it is possible for a mind to be actually quiet. This is one of the most difficult things to communicate, or even to talk about. Communication implies, does it not, that we must not only understand the words that we use in telling something, but also that we must both - the speaker and the listener - be intense at the same level and at the same time, capable of meeting each other, not a moment later, or a moment after. Otherwise, communication is not possible. And such communion is not possible when you are interpreting what is being said according to your opinions, to your knowledge, according to your pleasure; or making a tremendous effort in trying to comprehend. One of the greatest difficulties lies in this constant struggle to reach, to understand, to acquire; for we are trained from childhood to acquire, to achieve (the very brain cells themselves

have set in this pattern in order to have physical security - but psychological security is not within their field). The mind wants to be completely certain - but there is no certainty. We may demand security in all our relationships, our attitudes, our activities - but actually there is no such thing as being secure; and when we try to communicate with each other, we may be thinking in terms of this urge to be psychologically secure (and most of us are) and that dominates all our attitudes, all our activities, all our thinking, and hence that becomes a block. So before we can begin to understand something much more fundamental, we have to be clear about this matter of security. Psychologically, is there such a thing as 'to be secure'? When one puts this question, it does not mean that one has to live in a state of uncertainty, and thereby bring about certain forms of neurosis. It is a question one must ask of oneself in order to find out whether there is actually any form of psychological inward certainty.

When one is young, active, there is great discontent and the asking of questions, but this discontent, unfortunately, disappears as one grows older, settling down to a job, to a family, to responsibility, to the environmental conditioning; gradually this discontent, this curiosity to find out, this questioning disappears. One accepts, and so discontent disappears, and one is no longer concerned to find out for oneself, actually, if there is any form of security. In all relationship - because life is relationship, to live is to be related - we demand security, and hence we make life into a battle. field. But if we realize that there is no such thing as security, psychologically - and there is not, however much we may demand it, there is nothing permanent - if we realize that, not as a

definition, an idea, but actually realize the fact that there is no such thing as being psychologically secure, then there is a totally different approach to life.

As we said, space and silence are necessary. It is only in silence that there is beauty. As we are we only know beauty in the object - in a poem, music, a picture, and so on - but is there beauty without the object? - for if there is no beauty without the object then there is not beauty at all. And to find this quality of beauty, is really to find - if I may use that word - love. This quality of beauty can only exist in silence.

How can the mind, which is so endlessly active, active in its self-interest, active in its own self-centred pursuits, how can such a mind be quiet? Do you understand? It must be quiet because it is only when your mind is very quiet that you discover something new. Now a true scientist (one who is not paid to work for the Government, in producing weapons of destruction) who is investigating in order to find, certain truth, must of necessity be alone and quiet, or he cannot discover. In the same way, silence is absolutely necessary to discover, to understand, to go beyond, our psychological limitations; how is this possible with a mind which is so actively self-centred? - this is a problem that man has faced, everlastingly. We all know that to understand anything we must be very quiet; to look at the sunset, at the flowers, the trees in spring, to look you must be quiet; one must be extraordinarily sensitive to look. And how can the mind, which is endlessly chattering, be quiet? That is the question. Now let us find out the truth of this matter.

One can attempt to make the mind quiet by disciplining it,

controlling or shaping it; but such torture does not make it quiet; on the contrary, it makes the mind more dull. So obviously, control, the pursuit of an ideal of having a quiet mind, has no value at all, because the more one controls the mind, forces it, the more narrow, the more stagnant, the more dull it becomes - which is so obvious that we don't have to go into the psychological process. Control, like suppression in any form, only produces conflict. So control is not the way - nor has an undisciplined life any value.

One has to understand discipline, for most of our lives are disciplined; outwardly, by pressure, by influence, by the demands of society, by the family; inwardly by one's suffering, by one's own experiences, in the conforming to certain patterns, ideological or factual - conforming, suppressing, imitating - and these all become the pattern of discipline, which again is the most deadening thing. But there must be discipline without control, without suppression, without any form of fear. So how is this discipline to come about? It is not that one first disciplines and then finds freedom; but rather that freedom is at the very beginning - it is not a result, at the end. To understand that freedom - which is the freedom from the discipline of conformity - is discipline itself. After all, that word discipline, the root meaning of that word, is to learn; not to follow, not to imitate, not to suppress, but to learn. The very act of learning is discipline; in the very act, learning becomes clarity, That is, to understand, for example, the nature of control, suppression, or indulgence, to understand it and study it, to investigate very closely the whole structure and nature of this imitative process, demands attention, doesn't it? I don't have to impose a discipline on myself in order to study it - the very act of studying brings about its own

discipline and in that is no suppression. To learn there must be freedom and in the very act of caring is the very act of discipline. I think that it is most important to actuality realize this fact. So true negation, the negation of what has been considered worthwhile, like imposed discipline, like the following of an authority, is an act that is positive, which is itself discipline.

To deny authority - we are talking of psychological authority - to deny the authority of ideation, the authority we have inwardly vested in the church, in experience, in tradition, and so on, one has to feel its structure and see how one obeys because of fear, fear of going wrong, of not being a success. One has to study it without any condemnation, justification, or giving an opinion, or accepting it - actually study it. To study it, there must be freedom. Now I cannot accept authority and yet study it - that is impossible. To study the whole psychological structure of authority within oneself there must be freedom. And when we are studying, looking in that way, we are negating the whole structure; that very negation is the light of the mind that is free from authority. So the actual negation of that, of inward authority, is an action that becomes the positive - I am only taking authority as an example - the negation of that which was the positive, in the studying of it and understanding of it in complete freedom - not merely as a revolt - is the positive action of freedom. So, we are negating all those things that we considered as important to bring about quietness of the mind.

One needs to be quiet; it is part of life to be quiet, part of life to be alone - which is not to be isolated - and one is not alone when there are these incessant pressures. One sees the importance of a very quiet mind and one does not know how to bring it about; one

hopes to gain it by discipline, by control of thought, by suppression, by withdrawal, like the monks do throughout the world, they retire behind a wall, or behind a wall which they have built for themselves, inwardly; but that does not lead to quietness, on the contrary, it leads to disintegration. So it is not control, nor the repetition of words day after day, that make the mind a quiet mind - they make it a dead mind. Nor is it a quiet mind when it has an object that is so absorbing, that it gets lost in that object - like a child, give him an interesting toy, and he becomes very quiet, he is not naughty any more; but remove that toy and he returns to his mischief-making. We have our own ideational toys which absorb us and we think we are very quiet. If a man is dedicated to a certain form of activity - political, literary, whatever it is - it is as a toy that absorbs him - but his mind is not quiet at all.

So, by becoming aware of all these factors in life - aware, that is just to be aware, without any choice, just to be aware of the fact, of the colour, of the face in front of you, aware of the relationship with another, aware without any judgment, without any opinion, aware - one begins to see things one has never seen before. Then, when the mind is so aware, you will find, that out of this awareness (it is not a system that you follow) which has come naturally, that you are capable of attending. I do not know if you have noticed that when you give your whole attention to anything, complete attention, when you give your heart, your mind, your nerves, your ears, your everything to attend, to look, then there is no centre at all, there is no observer, there is no entity, who is attending, who is paying attention. If you are listening now, for example, with a complete attention, in which there is no opinion, agreement or

disagreement, but attending completely with all your mind, heart, with an attention in which there is no division - then in that state, there is no listener and hence no contradiction, no conflict. In that state of attention, there is silence. In that state of attention there is clarity.

Attention is not possible when you are seeking experience. It is one of the most extraordinary things that we all want more and more experience; because the everyday experiences are stale, dull and rather monotonous, trivial - we want greater experiences; and if we are aging, with waning appetites and sexual demands, we want wider, deeper experiences. And to have these wider, deeper experiences, man tries to achieve various things by will - expanding his consciousness, which is quite an art, a very difficult business. And also he tries various forms of drugs. This is an old trick which has existed from time immemorial - from chewing a piece of leaf, to the latest forms of drugs, LSD and so on - to extend one's consciousness, to have greater experiences. And this demand for greater experiences shows the inward poverty of man; he thinks that through these experiences he can escape from himself; yet always these experiences are conditioned by what he is. If the mind is petty, jealous, anxious, the latest drug will cause it to see its own little creation projected from its own little mind as any vision, image, or whatever it is.

Any form of experience is to be doubted, because in that process of experiencing there is always the factor of recognition. You only recognize an experience because you have already had it. All recognition is based on the past, on past memories. Therefore, when you recognize an experience it is already an old experience;

it is nothing new.

One begins to discover that in the state of attention, complete attention, there is not the observer, with its old conditioning as the conscious as well as the unconscious. In that state of attention, the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet. The brain cells, though they may react, no longer function psychologically, within a pattern; they become extraordinarily quiet psychologically.

So, to come upon this freedom, this silence and space, one must negate the whole psychological structure of society in which one is; that is extraordinarily interesting and important, for otherwise one functions merely mechanically. And to deny the whole psychological structure of society, which we have made and of which we are a part, requires this attention; observing ourselves, as we are, everyday, in this total awareness is the realization of that which actuality is and in that there is freedom.

By asking questions, can we go over this in a different way?

Questioner: Je crois que vous avez touche le probleme de la solitude, et ce probleme est capital, parce que nous sommes seuls dans le sens total du mot. Je crois que, en montrant l'importance capitale de ce fait, nous pourrions voir le probleme que vous avez expose et pour certains plus clairement. (I believe you touched on the problem of solitude, and this problem is a fundamental one, because we are alone in the fullest sense of the word. It seems to me, that by showing the tremendous importance of this fact, some of us might see the problem which you spoke of, more clearly.)

Krishnamurti: Are we ever alone? When you are walking by yourself in a street or in a wood, are you alone? Or are you not carrying with you all the burdens of yesterday, all the memories? -

therefore, never really alone? There is rather a nice story of the two monks who were walking from one village to another on a clear sunny morning, with deep shadows. And they came on a young girl, on the banks of a river, crying. And one of the monks went up to her, and said, `Sister, what are you crying about?' She said, `You see that house across the river? I came over early this morning and waded the river without trouble. But now the river has swollen, and I can't get across; there is no boat'. `Oh, said one monk, `that is no problem at all'. So he picked her up, carried her across the river, and left her on the other side; and the two monks went on. After a couple of hours the other monk said, `Brother, we have taken a vow never to touch a woman. What you have done is a terrible sin. Didn't you have a pleasure, a great sensation in touching a woman?, And the other monk said, `I left her behind two hours ago - you are still carrying her aren't you?

That is what we do. We are carrying all our burdens all the time, we never die to them, we never leave them behind. To do that means giving complete attention to any problem as it arises and solving it immediately - never carrying it over for the next day, for the next minute - so that the mind is fresh all the time. It is only then there is real solitude; even if you live in a crowded house, or are travelling in a bus. And that solitude is necessary, it indicates a fresh mind, an innocent mind.

Questioner: Would you go a little more into what you mean when you say that we should doubt our experience?

Krishnamurti: What is an experience, Sir? When you are responding to a challenge - any challenge, whether it is small or great - if the response is not adequate, complete, then there is

conflict. This conflict, whether it is pleasurable or painful, is part of the experience. When you experience anything, be it a response to a political speech or whatever it is, it is either partial or total - and if total the response is comparable to the challenge. Every challenge is new - or it is not a challenge - and if you respond according to your background then the experience is in terms of the old, there is no experience at all.

For most of us, experience is the stimulus that keeps us awake. If we had no challenges at all we would be fast asleep - we would become very dull. There are vast technological changes in the world, and to these our psychological response is inadequate - hence the conflict.

Experience, as we have it, is a process of recognition of what has been. You cannot recognize a new experience - it is impossible. You only recognize something which you have already known; therefore when you say I have a new experience, it is not new at all.

One has to understand this process of recognition, which is the memory, which is the past - the past is responding all the time. We are the past, we are the bundle of memories, and it is that that is responding all the time - demanding more and more experience. And, as I said, if we did not have challenges, we would go to sleep; on these we depend to keep us awake. The more intelligent one becomes, the more one tends to reject the challenge; then one creates one's own challenge, asking, doubting, questioning, denying, but in that there is still the process of recognition, hence conflict.

Can the mind keep awake without the stimulus of experience? -

implying a great sensitivity, both physically and psychologically, a great capacity and vulnerability. Such a mind does not demand experience, it is not seeking experience. It is its own light; it does not need a challenge, or know a challenge; it does not say, I am asleep or not asleep; it is completely what it is. It is only the frustrated, narrow, shallow mind, the conditioned mind, that is always seeking the more. Is it possible to live a life in this world without the more - without this everlasting comparison? - surely it is. That, one has to find out for oneself. Questioner: What is the difference between a child of two or three who poses any question to himself, and the adult; between any questions that a child puts, and the questions of an adult?

Krishnamurti: Oh, a vast difference, surely. The child, an intelligent child, puts a question in order to find out, - if he is not a frightened child and he wants to learn. But the adult puts questions in order to acquire knowledge, from which he will act. To him, learning in itself is not important; what is important to him is to learn in order to act; he learns first, and acts afterwards. The child is innocent - if I may use that word. It is only a fresh mind which can learn. The older people have stopped learning long ago; they have learned, they have acquired knowledge as ideas, and according to these ideas, they act, and they do this in order to protect themselves, to be secure. I think there is a vast difference between the two.

27th April 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 5TH PUBLIC TALK PARIS 30TH APRIL 1967

THE RELIGIOUS MIND is entirely different from the mind that believes in religion. The religious mind is psychologically free from the culture of society; it is also free from any form of belief, any form of demand for experience or self-expression. And man - it seems to me - throughout the ages has created through belief, a concept, which is called God. To man, the belief in the concept called God has been necessary because he finds life a sorrowful affair, an affair of constant battles, conflict, misery - with an occasional spark of light, beauty, and joy.

Belief in a concept, in a formula, in an idea, has become necessary, because life has very little significance. The everyday routine, going to the office, the family, sex, the loneliness, the burden, the conflict of self-expression - all these have very little meaning; and there is always death at the end of it all; so man has to believe, as an imperative necessity.

According to the climate, to the intellectual capacity of the inventors of these ideas and formulas, the concept of the God, the Saviour, the Master, took shape, and man has always been trying to reach thereby a state of bliss, of truth, the reality of a state of mind that must never be disturbed. So he has posited an end and worked towards it. The authors of these ideas and concepts have laid down either a system or a path that must be followed in order to achieve that ultimate reality. And man has tortured his mind - through discipline, through control, through self-denial, through abstinence, austerity - inventing different ways of approach to that reality. In

Asia, there are many ways leading to that reality (at least they are said to) depending on temperament and circumstances, and those paths are followed to that reality that cannot be measured by man, by thought. In the Occident, there is only one Saviour; through Him alone is to be found that ultimate something. All the systems of the East and of the West imply constant control, constant twisting of the mind to conform to a pattern laid down by the priest, by the sacred books, by all those unfortunate things which are of the very essence of violence. Their violence is not in the denying of the flesh but also in the denial of every form of desire, every form of beauty; in controlling and conforming to a certain pattern laid down.

They have had some kind of miracles - but miracles are of the easiest things to achieve, whether in the West or in the East. And they that achieve these miracles are anointed as saints; they have broken the record in that they have so completely conformed to the pattern, which is expressed in their daily life. They have very little humility, for humility cannot be shown outwardly - the putting on of a loincloth or a robe is not an indication of humility at all. Like any virtue, humility is from moment to moment, it cannot be calculated, established, and laid down as a pattern to be followed.

But man, throughout the ages, has done this; the originator, the original person who experienced something called reality, has laid down a system, a method, a way - and the rest of the world has followed. His disciples, through cunning propaganda, through cunning ways of capturing the mind of man, have established a search and dogmas, rituals. And man is caught in that. Any man - any man who wishes to find that which mind is always seeking -

must go through some kind of twisting, some kind of suppression, some kind of torture, to come upon that ultimate beauty. And so, intellectually, one sees the absurdity of all this; intellectually, verbally, one sees the absurdity of having any belief at all; one sees the idiocy of any ideology. Intellectually, the mind may say it is nonsense, and discard it, but inwardly there is always, deep down, the seeking, beyond the rituals, beyond the dogmas, the beliefs, beyond the saviours, beyond all the systems which are so obviously the invention of man. One sees that his Saviour, his Gods, are inventions, and one can discard these comparatively easily - and modern man is doing so. (I don't know why one uses the word `modern' - man has existed much as he is now for generations upon generations. But the present day climate is such that he is denying totally the authority of priest, belief and dogma, at the very root concept; to him, God is dead, and he died very young.) And as there is neither God nor belief, there is no concept other than of the actual physical enjoyment, and physical satisfaction, and a developed society; man lives for the present, denying the whole of religious conception.

One begins by denying the outward gods, with their priests, of any organized religion - one must completely deny these because they have no value at all, they have bred wars, have separated men, whether the Jewish religion, the Hindu religion, or the Christian religion, or Islam - they have destroyed man, they have separated man, they have been one of the major causes of war, of violence; and seeing all this, one denies it, one puts it aside as something childish and immature. Intellectually one can do this very easily - living in this world, observing the exploiting methods of the

churches, temples - who can but deny? But it is much more difficult to be free of belief and of seeking at the psychological level. We all want to find something that is untouched by man, untouched by cunning thought; something which is not contaminated by any social, intellectual or cultural society; something that cannot be destroyed by reason. We all seek it, deeply, for this life is a travail, a battle, a misery, a routine. One may have the capacity to express oneself verbally, or in painting, in sculpture, in music, but even that becomes rather empty. Life, as it is now, is very empty and we try to fill it with music and literature, with amusement, with entertainment, with ideas, with knowledge; but when one goes into it a very little more deeply and widely, one discovers how empty one is, how shallow the whole of existence is - though one may have titles, possessions, capacities.

Life is empty, and realizing that, we want to fill it, we are seeking - seeking ways and means, not only to fill this emptiness but also to find something that is not to be measured by man. Some may take drugs, LSD, or another of the diverse forms of psychedelic drugs that give expansion of consciousness; and in that state one acquires or experiences certain states, because a certain sensitivity has been given to the brain. But these are chemical results. They are the results of extraneous outside agents. One takes drugs hopefully, then inwardly one has these experiences; as one has certain beliefs, so one experiences according to those beliefs; the processes are similar. Both produce an experience, yet man again gets lost in belief - in the drug of belief itself, or in the belief in the chemical drug. He is inevitably caught in his thoughts. And one sees through all that and discards it - that is, one is completely

free of any belief. That does not mean that one becomes agnostic, that one becomes cynical or bitter. On the contrary, you see the nature of belief and why belief becomes so extraordinarily important; it is because we are afraid - basically that is the reason. Fear - not only in life, the daily grind, the fear of not becoming, of not achieving psychically, not becoming, not having power, position, prestige, fame - all this causes a great deal of fear, and one puts up with that fear - but also because of this inward fear, belief has become so important. Faced with the complete emptiness of life one still holds on to belief - though one may discard the outward authority of belief, the belief in, vended by the priest throughout the world - one creates for oneself one's own belief, in order to find and to come upon that extraordinary thing for which man has been searching, searching, searching.

And so one seeks. The nature, the structure of search, is very clear. Why does one seek at all? It is essentially self-interest - enlightened self-interest, but it is still self-interest. For one says: 'Life is so tawdry, empty, dull, stupid, there must be something more, I will go to that temple, to that church, to that...' And then one discards all that, and one begins to seek deeply. But seeking, in any form, becomes, psychologically, a hindrance. I think that must be understood very simply and clearly. One may objectively discard the authority of any outward agency that claims to lead to the ultimate truth, and that one does. But to discard because one understands the nature of searching, to discard all seekings, is necessary - because, one asks - what is one seeking? If you examine what it is we are groping after, what it is that we want, is there not the implication of seeking something that you already

know, that you have already lost, and you are trying to get at it? That is one of the implications of seeking. In seeking, there is involved the process of recognition - that is to say, when you find it, whatever it is, you must be able to recognize it - otherwise seeking has no meaning. Do, please, follow this. One seeks something, hoping to find and on finding it, to recognize it; but recognition is the action of memory; therefore there is the implication that you have already known it, that you have already had a glimpse; or as you are so heavily conditioned by the intense propaganda of all the organized religions, you mesmerize yourself into that state. So when you are seeking, you already have a concept, an idea of what you are seeking; and when you find it, it means that you already know it, otherwise you can't recognize it; for this reason it is not true at all. Therefore one needs to find that state of mind that is really free from all search, from all belief - without becoming cynical, without stagnating. For we tend to think that if we do not seek, strive, struggle, grope after - endlessly - we shall wither away. And I don't know why we should not wither away - as though we are not withering away now. One does wither away, as one dies, as one grows older, the physical organism comes to an end. One's life is the process of withering, because in it, in daily life, we imitate, copy, follow, obey, conform, which are forms of withering. So a mind that is no longer caught in any form of belief, not caught in self-created belief, not seeking, not seeking anything - though it may be a little more arduous - is tremendously alive. Truth is something which is only from moment to moment, like virtue, like beauty, it is something which has no continuity. That which has continuity is the product of time, and time is

thought; and time being sorrow, time...

Seeing what man has done to himself, how he has tortured himself, brutalized himself - becoming nationalistic, getting lost in some form of entertainment, whether it is literature, or this or that - seeing all this pattern of his life, one asks oneself, must one go through all this? Do you understand the question? Must a human being go through all this process, step by step - discarding belief, (if you are at all alert) discarding any form of search, discarding the torturing of the mind, discarding indulgence - seeing what man has done to himself in order to find what he calls reality, one asks (please ask yourself and not me) one asks, is there a way, or is there a state of explosion, that discards it all at one breath - because time is not the way.

Search implies time, the eventual finding - taking perhaps ten years - more; or the eventual finding through reincarnation, as the whole of Asia believes. All this implies time - the gradual throwing away of these conflicts, these problems, becoming more wise, more cunning, getting to know slowly - slowly, gradually unconditioning the mind. Time implies that. Obviously time is not the way, nor belief, nor the artificial disciplines imposed by a system, by a guru, by a teacher, by a philosopher, by a priest - all that is so childish. So, is it possible not to go through all this at all and yet come upon that extraordinary thing? - because that thing cannot be invited. Please do understand this very simple fact; it cannot be invited, it cannot be sought after; because the mind is too stupid, too small, our emotions are too shoddy, our ways of life are too confused for that enormity, for that immense something to be invited into that little house, into a petty though tidy room. One

cannot invite it - to invite it, you must know it, and you cannot know it (it does not matter who says it) because the moment you say 'I know', you don't know. The moment you say you have found it, you have not found it. If you say you have experienced it, you have never experienced it. Those are all cunning ways of exploiting another man - the other man, your friend or your enemy.

Seeing all this - not formally, but in daily life, in your daily activities, when you pick up the pen, when you talk, when you go out for a drive or when you are walking alone in the woods - seeing all this at one glance - you don't have to read volumes to find it out - seeing all this with one breath, with one look, you can understand the whole thing. And you can only really understand this as a whole when you know yourself; know yourself as you are, very simply, as the result of the whole of mankind, whether you are a Hindu, a Muslim, a Christian, or whatever you are. There it is, when you know yourself as you are, then you understand the whole structure of man's endeavour, his deceptions, his hypocrisies, his brutality, his search.

And, one asks, is it possible to come upon this thing without inviting, without waiting, without seeking, exploring? - for that just to be, just for it to happen, like a cool breeze that comes when you leave the window open - you cannot invite that breeze, but you must leave the window open. This does not mean that we are in a state of waiting - that is another form of deception - it does not mean that one must open oneself to receive - that again is another way of thought.

But if one has asked oneself without seeking, without believing, then, in that very asking is the finding. But we do not ask. We want

to be told, we want to have everything corroborated, affirmed; fundamentally, deep down, we are never free from every form of outward or inward authority. That is one of the most curious things in the structure of our psyche; we all want to be told; we are the result of what we have been told. What we have been told is the propaganda of thousands of years. There is the authority of the ancient book, of the present leader, or of the speaker. But if really deep down one denies all authority, it means one has no fears. To have no fear is to look at fear, for as with pleasure, we never come directly into contact with fear - we never actually come into contact with fear as you come in contact when touching a door, a hand, a face, a tree; we only come into contact with fear through the image of fear which we have created for ourselves. We only know pleasure through half-pleasures. We are never directly in contact with anything I do not know if you have observed when you touch a tree - as you do when you are walking in the woods - if you are really touching the tree? Or is there a screen between you and the tree, although you are touching it? In the same way, in order to come directly into contact with fear there must be no image, which means actually having no memory of yesterday's fear. Then only do you come into actual contact with the actual fear of today. Then, if there is no memory of the fear of yesterday, you have the energy to meet the immediate fear; and you have to have a tremendous energy to meet the present. We dissipate this vital energy - which all of us have - through this image, through this formula through this authority; and it is the same in the seeking pleasure. The pursuit of pleasure is to us very important the greatest pleasure of all is God - supposed to be - and that may be

the most frightening thing you could ever know - but we have imagined it, the ultimate, so we never come upon it. Again, it is as when you have already recognized a pleasure as a pleasure of yesterday, you are really never in contact with actual experience, with an actual state. It is always the memory of yesterday that covers and screens the present.

So, seeing all this, is it possible not to do a thing, not strive, not seek - to be totally negative, totally empty, without any action? - because all action is the result of ideation. If you had observed yourself acting, you will have seen that it takes place because of a previous idea, a previous concept, a previous memory. There is a division between the idea and the action - an interval however small, however minute - because of that division there is conflict. Can the mind be so completely quiet, neither thinking, nor afraid and therefore extraordinarily alive, intense?

You know the word `passion; that word so often signifies suffering; the Christians have used that word to symbolize certain forms of suffering. We are not using that word `passion' in that sense at all. In this complete state of negation is the highest form of passion; that passion implies total self-abandonment. For such complete self-abandonment there must be tremendous austerity; austerity that is not the harshness of the priest agonizing people, of saints who have tortured themselves, who have become austere because they have brutalized their mind. Austerity is really an extraordinary simplicity; not in clothes, not in food - but inwardly. This austerity, this passion, is the highest form of total negation. And then perhaps if you are lucky - (if you are lucky!) - there is no luck there - the thing comes uninvited. Then the mind is no longer

capable of striving. Then you do what you will, because then there will be love.

Without this religious mind a true society cannot be created. We must create a new society in which this terrible activity of self-interest has very little place. It is only with such a religious mind that there can be peace, outwardly as well as inwardly.

Is there anything to talk over, as this is the last talk, at least for this year?

Questioner: Experiencing and expressing....(remainder inaudible)

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by expression, and what are we expressing? I know there is an idea that one must express oneself; and self-expression has become extraordinarily important. But what are we expressing, some capacities? If you are a painter you express yourself on a canvas, and the owner of the gallery exploits you. Or if you have certain capacity with a pen, you write a book. What are we expressing? - the same old patterns of yesterday: that is all we have; routine in different ways - so what is the need to express? I am not saying one should not, or one should - but what is implied in self-expression; what is implied when one uses the word `self-expression,?

The self is always the past, it is nothing new; you may express it very cleverly in a new way, using new words, a new technique, a new jargon - but it is essentially the same thing. So that is one side. Then, when you say, `I must give expression to myself', what is the thing you are expressing? - what is the self which is constantly demanding to be expressed, sexually or in books? Obviously the `self' is a bundle of memories - unfortunately it is nothing other

then that. And in self expression, there is pleasure, so that when we talk about self expression we mean the pleasure of the self, which is the memory, which is a dead thing. But is there an expression which is not self seeking, which is not of the self at all? - the self being (we know what it is) memories, accumulated experience, pleasure - then expression may be entirely different.

Questioner:.. without motive?

Krishnamurti: `Expression without a motive' - most people pretend that expression is without motive, and are at the same time cunning enough to realize that expression without motive is a rather questionable thing. But we are asking something entirely different. Is there an expression without the self-activity which expresses itself And what is there to be expressed? When you love, you don't talk of self-expression. But if love is tinged with desire, pleasure, then you want it expressed, sexually or in books; it needs to be expressed. But if there is no self-centred activity in expression then it may not express at all - you will live and living itself is expression.

30th April 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 1ST PUBLIC TALK AMSTERDAM 20TH MAY 1967

TO COMMUNICATE ABOUT facts, information, is comparatively easy. To communicate about theories, ideas, dogmas and theological concepts is perhaps a little more difficult. But to communicate at a deeper level, at a depth not of ideas and words, but of our human problems - at the centre of our human complexities, our miseries, our agonies, and all the confusion that man is heir to - there to communicate requires attention and care; also a certain quality of listening.

Most of us hardly listen; we hear a great many words, we hear and translate what we hear into our own opinions, opposing and accepting. But I mean, really to listen without translation, without interpretation, without opinion; actually to listen without any sense of condemnation - which doesn't necessarily mean acceptance. On the contrary, when we so listen attentively, and with care, it is really with a sense of affection and love - because without attention and care it is not possible to listen to anything. If you listen to music or to anything you believe in, you must give attention, and also you must care, care enormously, to actually listen to the breeze among the leaves. In the same way, to listen to what the speaker is going to say needs a great deal of attention; and there is no possibility of attention when the mind is occupied with judgment, opinion, comparison, condemnation or justification. But to actually listen! Condemnation or comparison merely act as distractions, and therefore there is no listening. First one has to understand the words. What is said in words is not the fact; the

word is never the fact; the thing. We must go beyond the word in order to understand, in order to communicate; and that is going to be our problem (amongst many others: not only how to listen, but also to go beyond the word. To go beyond the word is necessary because we have so many problems in life, not only physical, but also the deeper psychological problems. We have enormous problems, not only the individual problem but the collective, social problem. The individual is part of the social structure, and this structure has been created by individuals throughout the world. The social structure outwardly is the inward, psychological structure of our human relationships.

To understand these problems one must have a very alert mind; not a sloppy mind, not a complex, erudite learned mind, but rather a mind that is willing to see clearly, willing to examine, explore - not in terms of its own idiosyncrasies, nor inclination, nor temperament, but rather to examine things as they are; and to examine things as they are one has to have attention, care.

We have to enquire deeply within, most profoundly - because there must be a revolution, a psychological revolution; we are not talking about communist, social or economic revolutions - these have not fundamentally changed man. There have been many revolutions, wars, and they have had a superficial, secondary effect. But basically, fundamentally, deep down, we human beings are the same as we have been for millions of years. There has been progress technologically, from the bullock cart to the jet-engine; but psychologically, inwardly, we have not changed at all - hardly, a little bit, here and there. But fundamentally, radically, we are what we have been - greedy, envious, full of antagonism, anxieties,

despairs, with an occasional flash of joy and affection. It is there, it seems to me, that one has to change - and change infinitely. And that is what we are going to talk over together during these five talks.

We are human beings, whether we live in India, in the extreme Orient, in America, or in Russia we are human beings with our human problems, miseries, conflicts, despairs. Each part of the world has invented a philosophy, a theory, which has nothing to do with actual daily living, and it is only in that daily, intolerable living, the everyday loneliness, everyday boredom, everyday routine, going to the office, the ugliness or beauty of sex, the constant conflict within - it is there that we have to change.

One observes throughout the world there are two fundamental issues, violence and sorrow. That violence and sorrow is not limited to the Orient nor the Occident, to the West nor the East; it is part of the human psychological structure. Violence we have accepted as a way of life - in wars, in our business, in our outward social structure; competition and all the things we know of - how we dislike, hate, get angry, violent. We are familiar with that and have accepted it as a way of life. That is, though we talk endlessly about love and loving our neighbour, when we are actually in the office, in business, we cut his throat. There is war going on - there have been thousands of wars and we have accepted war, conflict, violence, as a way of life. We have also accepted sorrow; the sorrow of everyday life, everyday misery, everyday quarrels, conflict, unfulfillment; the sorrow of loneliness, despair, the sorrow of not having loved, the sorrow of death, and the endless complexities of our psyche. And having accepted that, not knowing

how to resolve it totally, we worship sorrow as the Christians do: put a cross and figure on it; and we think by worshipping it we have solved it. In the Orient they think differently. They say, well perhaps the next life will be better.

So we are concerned with human beings not being able to find a way out of this violence, out of this misery, out of this endless sorrow. From the moment we are born until we die, we know nothing except violence and sorrow, with an occasional ray of light, an occasional flash of joy and ecstasy, which again becomes memory and therefore loses its significance. So what we are concerned with is, whether it is at all possible to find a way out for a human being living in this rotten society, in this society built by man through his greed and envy, through his violence, his despair; this society in which religion is merely an idea, a belief, dogma with authority and acceptance - which is not religion at all. Organized religion in any form ceases to be religion; when there is a priest, it is no longer a religion. When you have to go to a church to worship God, then it means there is no God in the church. Because in our hearts, in our minds, we are a violent, sick people. And a tortured mind, a brutal mind, a sorrowful mind, can never find that which man has been seeking, trying to understand through millennia.

So it seems to me that what is important is whether it is possible to change the whole psychological structure of ourselves, totally, completely. That is, to bring about a fundamental revolution in the psyche, which means, in the mind, in the heart, in the very structure of our being. So that there is no possibility of ever being violent, nor ever entering the field of sorrow. It is a fundamental

question, not a question that is casually asked and passed by. It is a question that must be asked, but unfortunately when we do ask we are satisfied merely by explanations, as are the psychoanalysts with their peculiar theories. The analysts seek and find a cause for one's disarrangement, for neurotic states and so forth. But that process of analysis obviously does not fundamentally change the human mind; it helps him perhaps to be free from certain neurotic states, but such analysis does not fundamentally change the human mind. So that is our problem, it seems to me, our basic fundamental problem: whether the human mind, which is the result of many millions of years, which has evolved from the animal - we are still part of the animal, with its fears, with its antagonisms, with its instinct to hoard and so on - whether such a mind which has invented gods, saviours, theories, that endlessly talks about unrealities, inventing philosophies - whether such a mind, however complex, can actually bring about a revolution, a mutation.

That is the issue. Can one investigate through oneself what one is, the animal, the highly sophisticated, educated, technological mind, with all the background of its conditioning, as a Christian, a Hindu, a Muslim, a Buddhist, or the latest form of Communism - whether such a mind, so heavily conditioned, can be changed by analysis, taking endless years examining, exploring layer after layer of consciousness? All that implies time, and not only time; but also any error in examination distorts every other fact. Yet all the religions throughout the world have claimed that to be free from human bondage, from human sorrow, you must control, practise, meditate, deny, be harsh to yourself; give up this, give up that, follow this, follow that, accept authority, obey, take vows. But

that is to create habits, other forms of conditioning: to add to the already existing conditioning some more conditioning.

This is what we have accepted as the norm of life - to follow, to obey, to accept the authority either of the priest, or of the analyst, or the theologian. As has been done in the Orient as well as the Occident, to accept the priest as the final authority between God and yourself which is obviously absurd. So we know this, that is we know a way of gradually peeling off, gradually exploring till we hope to come upon something that will give us total freedom, total freedom from all anxiety, despair, sorrow and misery, confusion. And that is the way we live; we think that gradually through time there will be freedom from war, from national disasters. You know, it is one of the most peculiar things that it has taken centuries to bring about a Common Market and yet there are people who are preventing this happening. And it shows how extraordinarily dull our minds are although we can live peace. Fully - that means living peacefully daily, in our daily life, not in some heaven, but in every moment of our daily life; which means no nationality, no wars, no competition. And we have taken centuries to come to this most obvious thing, to break down national barriers, economic barriers, because we really don't want to break down these barriers. We take great pleasure in our national spirit, in our uniforms, our queens, our generals, in our theoretical religious ideas. And this has been going on for centuries and centuries. And is it possible, one asks, to bring about a change radically, a total revolution in the psyche itself, not through time.

The question of time is very important to understand. Is there actually tomorrow? I know chronologically, by the watch, there is

tomorrow - tomorrow happens to be a Sunday, a holiday. But psychologically, is there tomorrow at all, or is it an invention of the mind? Today is a miserable day, unhappy, unfulfilled; tomorrow perhaps it will be better, there will be better opportunities, a better way of looking at the tree, at the field, at the bird. But actually is there a tomorrow at all psychologically? Or is there only today - not in the Existentialist sense, because they also have their theories, invented by people who are very clever, who are utterly in despair, and to them today, the now, matters enormously because there is nothing - no meaning to life at all. Therefore they say: live as well as you can for today and tomorrow doesn't matter. But to live completely today means that one has to understand the totality of the past; because we are the past, with all our memories, the scars of memory, the longings; the whole structure of ourselves is of the past.

We are revolted with the present system, the established order doesn't bring freedom, revolt is never freedom, revolt is merely a reaction, and reaction creates other sets of reactions and patterns. That is what is actually happening throughout the world, among the younger generation. They are in revolt, long-haired, dirty and all the rest of it - taking drugs! But they are also setting their own pattern of life, which becomes the norm, in which they are caught - and therefore there is no freedom in reaction at all.

So is it possible to be free? Not economically free, I don't mean that. I mean free from violence, free from sorrow, so that a mind that is free is never again touched by violence, never again knows what sorrow is. Is it possible having lived a million, or two million, or three million years, is it at all possible to be free? And what do

we mean by freedom? Most of us want to be free, we want to be free from despair, from the agony, from the aching loneliness, the boredom and viciousness of life. One wants to be free. And is it possible?

Is freedom a thing to be achieved through a gradual process of time, through discipline, control, suppression? Or is freedom at the beginning, not at the end? That is, to examine there must be freedom. To actuality look at this microphone, or look at your neighbour, to look at a tree, or a bird, or the light on a canal, to actually see them, there must be freedom. And this freedom doesn't lie at the end of one's miserable life, but it lies at the beginning. And there is freedom when you realize for yourself that to see, to examine, to explore this whole sociological structure, to question the psyche is to understand by that very questioning that there must be freedom. When one demands it the urgency is there because one wants to understand immediately. Then with that urgency comes attention, care, and therefore that attention and care are beauty and love, and that is freedom, it is not a concept.

One of the peculiar states of our existence is that we live according to concepts, formulas, ideas, theories. If you examine your own mind, if you look at yourself without too much prejudice, you will see how your mind works in theories, in ideas. So the first and last freedom is really when the mind is totally free from concepts and from the mechanical process of building a concept, a formula. To look at a tree, at the sunset, or a cloud full of light and glory, to merely look there must be freedom; freedom from your ideas, your memories - freedom to look! Very few can so look because they have images about the thing at which they are

looking; so these images, symbols, knowledge, prevent the actual act of looking. I think it is fairly simple when you observe what actually takes place in human relationships.

You know, what we are talking about is not theoretical, nor some Oriental mystification, but actual facts, and when you look at a fact you can't have opinions. When you examine something, examination ceases if you look with a particular opinion, judgment, valuation, condemnation, and so on. So what we are saying is, look at your relationship and you will soon understand how extraordinary it is. The relationship you have between yourself and your wife, your neighbour, or your queens or kings - this relationship is based on images - the image you have about your wife and the wife has about you. And the relationship is between these two images, which is no relationship at all. That is, we have concepts. Please do observe this in your own mind, not merely listen to a lot of words and then agree or disagree, but actually examine as you are listening; look at your own mind. You will soon find out how burdened we are with concepts, ideas, with formulas, the good, the bad, "this is right", "this is wrong", "this is evil", "this is sin". With this background we look. And obviously when we do look we look at nothing; we look at our own projections.

So look at yourself, and one must, because self-knowledge, the knowing of oneself, is the beginning of wisdom. Knowing oneself, as one actually is, is the ending of sorrow. And you cannot look at yourself if you have formulas, concepts - those are the images, the symbols, the background that looks.

So we are talking of freedom. Obviously to live in this world

completely, totally, there must be freedom. As we said, freedom is entirely different from revolt; freedom demands great maturity, great sensitivity and intelligence. When we use the word 'intelligence' we want a definition of that word. What do you mean by intelligence? We think we are very intelligent if we can define and accept that word - that is, accept the definition. The very explanation of what intelligence is, and the definition of intelligence, ceases to be intelligent. But one has to find out for oneself what is intelligence, because freedom demands intelligence, as peace demands that you live peacefully every day, every minute, otherwise you contribute to war, contribute to violence. And is it possible for human beings, with their structure of violence and sorrow, not only at the conscious level but at the unconscious level, totally to be free from violence? And who is the entity who is setting up the mechanism that is going to operate, which will free him?

Do you understand? I want to be free from sorrow, from violence. That is an obvious demand, an obvious necessity, because we have had so many wars; there have been two appalling wars in these countries. And one asks after being tortured - everything that is implied in war - one asks, is it possible to be free from violence, right through? To enquire into the possibility there must be freedom; merely to enquire - not to say, it is not possible or it is possible, which becomes merely sentimental and has no value at all. But actually to examine; that is to go into the psychological structure of our whole being; because we have produced wars, each one of us, through our national, economic divisions, our divisions as the family, as the country, as my God

and your God. And as we are totally responsible for these wars, to find out whether it is possible to be free from this violence, one must actually be free now to examine. And I think that becomes one of the most difficult things. To actually be free to look; that is, to look implies freedom from concepts. It is the concept that has built the psychological structure of society; my concept as a Hindu, or a Buddhist, or as a Christian; my concept that I'm much more important than somebody else - my ambition, my greed, my envy, my brutality, is a concept. And to actually enquire into that concept I must be free to examine it. But, you see, freedom implies danger, insecurity. Because you don't know by examining what is going to come. So one is frightened. And we don't want freedom to examine, to change, to radically uproot the whole psychological structure of our being. Because we don't know then what will happen to our very existence. So there is fear.

Now is it possible, living in this world, in a society which is corrupt, which is based on acquisitiveness, is it possible for a human being to be free totally from fear? Because when one is not free from fear, one lives in darkness. One may have marvellous theories - may invent gods by the hundreds, one saviour or ten saviours, but as long as there is fear in any form there must be confusion; which means a state of mind is necessary which realizes that when it is free from fear it is no longer seeking security in any form psychologically. Obviously outwardly there must be security, to have food, clothes and shelter; but psychologically, inwardly, 'inside the skin', to be free from fear means clarity, and when there is clarity, there is no problem. For that which is light, there is no darkness. And there is darkness when there is fear: hence the

problem. So is it possible to be free from fear? Not in some future day, but actually to be free from fear every day? This is a question that demands, like every other human problem which is of great complexity, that we approach it very simply. Our human problems are very complex, and anything that is complex we have to learn about; and to learn about it we must be very simple. We must come to it very simply, not with complex ideas that we must be free, that this is wrong - you have just to look.

We are talking about fear. What do we mean by that word? Please, as we said just now, don't merely listen to words, because that will have no meaning, but through the word, examine yourself. Look at yourself and see what you are afraid of, actually what you are afraid of - darkness, you wife, your husband, your neighbour, or your debts, or no having success, not being loved. Whatever it is: fear of authority, fear of brutality, fear of being dominated. We are afraid and do you know what that means? Have you ever been in contact with fear? Or are you in contact with the image you have about fear? The two things are different, aren't they? I have an image about you, and you have an image about me and our contact is between these two images, and therefore there is no contact at all; there is no relationship at all, there is merely relationship of ideas, memories.

So when one looks at fear, if you have ever done it, several things are involved in that looking at fear. Your mind may not only be very quiet to look, but full of attention. It must have a tremendous care to look, because otherwise you can't see the infinite details. It must be actually in contact with fear - fear being danger, as one is afraid of a precipice, of a snake, of a policeman.

Has one actually come into direct contact with fear? Or is it only the word fear, the word itself with all its associations, that blocks your coming into contact? If you have no concept, no image of fear, then you are directly in contact with it, aren't you? Does the word create fear? Do please listen - go into this with me, if you will because we are enquiring whether it is at all possible, radically, right through our being, to be free of this enormous burden of fear. And to enquire, as we said, there must be freedom to look, and you cannot look if you have an image about fear. That means that the word itself projects fear with all its associations, as one is afraid of the word death. We have pictures, symbols, ideas of something unknown, and there is fear of that - as for example, the fear of falling ill or, being ill, the fear of never being able to become healthy, again. So is it, is the fear that exists in each one, is it fear created by the word, by the symbol, the concept, by an image? Or can the mind directly come into contact with that fact? This is very important to realise - how you look at a fact. How do you look at a tree? There is the objective tree outside of you. How do you look at it? Do you look at it with memories, with knowledge, with symbols, with botanical knowledge of that tree? That is, does the background look at that tree; or without the background do you look at that tree? The look with the background, with thought, is entirely different from looking at the tree without thought. Then, when you look you are directly in contact; that means there is no space between you and the tree; when you look, look without a single concept, without a single memory.

So can you look at fear? Please follow this closely, otherwise it will mean nothing. Can you look without concepts about that fear?

There is fear and the observer, isn't there? Please follow this step by step. There is what we call the fear of something: fear doesn't exist by itself, it is because of something. There is fear, and you say I am afraid. You are the observer of that fear, right? You are the observer, and the thing observed is fear. So there is a space between you and the thing observed, as when you look at a tree you have the space, the observer: "I am looking at that tree". And that space is created by thought, thought being the whole response of memory; memory is always old, and therefore thought is always old; there is no freedom in thought, you can think what you like but it is still from the past.

So to look without a concept is to be aware of the observer and the thing observed. And is the observer different from the thing observed? That is, when I say "I am afraid", there is fear outside of me, and I am the observer of that fear. Is that a fact? Or is the observer the fear? Please, this is not intellectual or high-falutin stuff. We are just examining what actually is. With most of us there is always the observer, the centre from which we look. And that centre is memory, thought, our conditioning, our experience, our knowledge. So when we are confronted with fear, that fear has its own associations, which are memory, and with these memories we look at that fact which we call fear, and therefore we are never directly in contact. You can only be directly in contact with anything, with your neighbour, with your wife, with your husband, with a tree, with a cloud, when the observer is not; the observer being thought, with all the ramifications of thought. You can try this for yourself when you look at a tree - then it is very simple, because a tree is objective. It does not want a thing from you; all

that it wants is that you leave it alone. And if you can look at that tree, can look at it without any concept, without any thoughts - which doesn't mean your mind is blank, vacant, empty - then on the contrary it is really free to look, and therefore there is tremendous attention.

And in the same way, look at fear without the observer. It is only then that there is the ending of fear; not escaping from fear, not suppression of fear, through drink, sex, amusements, through gods, through going to churches and all that idiotic, infantile business.

So it is an art to look. It is much more important than any art in the world, than any painting, any music, any book: to look totally and completely, whether it be at your wife or your husband, or the tree, or the cloud, or your own miserable conditioning. Then, being directly in contact with it, is the ending of fear.

Perhaps now we can ask questions and discuss what we have talked about. You know, Sirs, to ask a question is one of the most difficult things - which doesn't mean I am preventing you from asking. To ask a right question is still more difficult, because most of us ask such superficial questions, and when we do ask we are waiting for somebody to tell us, some authority who will explain, some technician who has reached heaven, or whatever it is: he is going to tell you about it. So when we ask we are waiting for somebody to tell us. But when we ask the right question, the fundamental question - to ask that right question demands a great deal of intelligence, because it means you have thought about it, you have gone into it, searched out, enquired into the urgency of it. Like a man who sees his house on fire. He acts, he doesn't discuss

the ways and means of putting that fire out, or who set the house on fire. So to ask the right question is not only important but necessary, which means you are doubting, questioning. We must question, we must doubt everything; from the gods that man has invented and the priests who have sustained those gods; question our whole psychological structure, never accepting anybody's authority (including the authority of the speaker). And this is one of the most difficult things to do, because there is no authority, except the authority of the policeman, the government and the law. So, if you are willing, if I have not stopped you from asking, perhaps we can discuss easily without the intervention of time and space.

Questioner: If one has cancer, how can one be free from the fear of death?

Krishnamurti: The questioner wants to know, if one has cancer, how can one be free from it and also from the fear of dying, with all the pain, all the anxiety, all that one goes through. Right, is that the question, Sir? May I say something here? In understanding one question - it doesn't matter who puts it, we will understand a great deal, but if you are occupied with your own question then you won't even listen to the first question. And most of us are occupied with our own problems and therefore we never see the vastness of problems.

If I have cancer, what do I do? I go to a doctor and if it is rather hopeless, then what am I to do? Accept it - the pain, the agony. That is a fact; you accept it, you have to. But something else steps in. There is fear; fear not only of pain, the anxious nights, the endless days - you know what it all is; also the fear of death, of

coming to an end. So, if it is incurable, you put up with it. But to put up with it requires a great deal of intelligence, because that pain, that anxiety, distorts the mind. It can't see anything clearly, it makes the mind bitter, or sentimental, or afraid. But to accept healthily something which is unhealthy is intelligence, part of intelligence. Then there is the question of fear, the question of dying. That is one of the most important, fundamental questions, why one is afraid of death.

Questioner: Sir, this question of being in contact with fear - a strong emotion of fear arises, and that happens at once...either to attack or to run. How can you be in contact with that fear?

Krishnamurti: You are from California, Sir, aren't you? (Laughter). And you have seen wild animals there, haven't you? And what do you do? You don't go and hunt them, you move away from them? Now either you move out of fear or you move out of intelligence. Follow this, Sir. If you move out of fear, run away from fear, there is a danger of that animal attacking you, because animals smell fear - right? Fear brings about certain activity of the glands, perspiration and so on - and perhaps the animal will attack you. But if you look at it, and are not afraid, but walk away, as the speaker has done with several animals, it is very simple. It does not attack you because you are not afraid, and if it does attack you will protect yourself, right? But there are other forms of fear which you are talking about - that is, psychological forms of fear, and it is this psychological fear which is far more significant, far more important to understand than physical fear. Psychological fear is the everlasting demand to be secure, psychologically. One must be physically secure, have enough money, clothes, food, shelter -

that's an obvious human necessity. But the psychological demand is to be secure in all relationships, with your wife, your husband - the urgency to be secure - yet we never question whether there is such a thing as security psychologically. And there is no such thing, ever: to have psychological security. There can only be security psychologically between two dead things, not two living, moving things. What we demand is the security of dead things, because we ourselves are dead in our search for security.

Questioner: We feel fear, but how to be in contact with fear?

Krishnamurti: I explained just now, Sir, how to be in contact with that fear. An immediate fear arises about some, thing: that you'll insult me, that you'll be angry with me... fear! Now when that arises, look at it; without all the mechanism of memories, associations intervening - which demands a great deal in itself, a discipline. We'll discuss this another time. I think we have talked enough for this morning, haven't we?

Questioner: May I ask just one question? This fear seems to be a chemical reaction. Isn't it possible through the attention you talk about, to change that chemical reaction?

Krishnamurti: If you take certain chemicals like LSD you have no fear, as in cases in America where people have taken drugs like LSD and they think they can fly and so jump out of the window and drop; or they feel tremendously vital and all powerful; and they stand in front of a rushing bus and try to stop it. Of course chemically, physiologically, chemistry does act; it's an obvious fact: you take some pills, you become extraordinarily brave, physically. Or you take rum on the battlefield and you go and kill. But the chemical reaction of a physical state not only reacts on the

psychological state, but the psychological state reacts on the physical. It is an interrelationship, it is a psychosomatic thing, it isn't just physical. Fear, which reacts on the psychological fear, or the psychological fear reacting on the physical... it is a constant interrelationship. Life is interrelationship. To be is to be related, and to divide these physical fears and psychological fears becomes impossible, because they are so closely related. But when we examine the psychological fears, then we will begin to understand the physical fears, and therefore establish a right relationship between the two. But without understanding the psychological fears, merely concentrating on the chemical fears of the body, leads nowhere.

20th May 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 2ND PUBLIC TALK AMSTERDAM 21ST MAY 1967

WE WILL CONTINUE with what we were talking about yesterday. Understanding is an act of instantaneous perception: immediate comprehension and therefore immediate action. It is not that one first understands and then acts, but it is, rather, that when there is total comprehension, which is understanding, there is total action, which is immediate. When we give complete attention to something which we want to understand, and we do this when there is a great crisis in our lives, then there is an instant comprehension, an instant understanding, an instant decision, and therefore action. When the crisis is very great then the understanding and action are simultaneous. It is not that one understands first and then acts later, but the action, which is the doing, is synonymous with understanding.

Now how does this understanding take place? What is the nature, the structure of this understanding? When do we actually understand? You know what the dictionary meaning is: to comprehend, to investigate, to use one's mind. But when we observe in ourselves the state of understanding, that is, when you say 'I have understood', is it an intellectual comprehension, or an emotional reaction, or is it nothing to do with the emotions or the intellect? When things are very serious in our lives, a deep crisis which demands immediate action, then how does action come about in which there is no friction at all? Action in which there is no afterthought, no thinking it over and coming to a decision, but action which is immediate - how does it come about? One must

have noticed in one's life this peculiar phenomenon of understanding. Understanding does not come merely through a conclusion, nor through a series of introspective, intellectual examinations, nor through ideation, through ideas.

Please, this is important to understand because what we are going into presently, what we are going to discuss, is fear and all the things implied in relation to that. So unless we understand this word, its structure and its nature, and also what is action, which is involved in this understanding, we cannot enquire, as we are going to, into fear - which most of us have in varying degrees. It seems to me, then, that it is very important to understand the nature of understanding.

Life is action; our very living is a movement in action. There is no living without action. Living is relationship, not only with a particular individual, but also with the whole social structure, outwardly and inwardly, which includes the psychological structure. This whole movement of living, which is relationship, is a movement in action. There is no state of mind in which there is not action, even when one totally isolates oneself from the world. Living is a process of relationship, a movement in action. So life is action, and to separate life and action as an idea, and act from that idea, brings about friction. Please, it is important, if I may say so, to understand this. It is not very difficult, only one has to give it attention. So we are enquiring, first, what is the state of mind that really understands. Even in the most complex technological problems, what is involved in this technological comprehension when the mind says 'I have understood it'? There, you have accumulated a great deal of information, knowledge, and

relatively, so far as that knowledge goes, you say you have understood the technological problem. But a technological problem is entirely different from a human problem and we are here discussing human problems and not how to put a motor together or how to work computers. Though a great part of us is the mechanical, we are trying to understand the phenomenon of 'understanding'. So, how does this understanding come about?

When there is a crisis - and life is a crisis if one is tremendously alert, watchful, sensitive - then you see that every moment is a crisis. A crisis is not something which happens only occasionally; it is happening all the time - the crisis being the challenge which needs immediate response. When there is a crisis, what takes place? One responds according to one's background, according to one's conditioning, tendencies, inclinations. Please just observe it in yourselves as the speaker is going along; do not merely listen to the words, but observe through the words your own minds, your own actual life, your daily living. So, when there is a challenge, a crisis, generally one responds according to one's temperament, conditioning, inclination - which are all contained in the word 'memory', one's background. And the background translates the challenge in terms of its own conditioning. Is that not so? If one is a nationalist one responds according to that conditioning, whereas the challenge demands a totally un-nationalistic action. Therefore there is a response which is not equal to the challenge and therefore there is conflict. This is a very ordinary psychological problem. It is what actually takes place. And in that state when the response to the challenge is not adequate, is not complete, then in that state there is no understanding. So, when one says 'What is this

understanding, and how does this understanding come about?' - then one means the understanding which is not separate, not divided from action. When you are confronted with great danger - real, imminent, immediate danger - there is a complete response. There is no thinking, nor acting according to a formula. There is immediate action. The understanding of the danger and the immediate action are simultaneous.

So, we are equating as to what is the state of the mind which understands? We said it is not that understanding takes place when one acts according to a formula, according to an idea; because when there is action which is derived from an idea there is an interval of time and that action is then made to conform to the formula, the pattern, the idea. Therefore there is a division and therefore there is a conflict. So, when does this understanding which is immediate action take place? We have said that it is not intellectual, it is not an emotional response, nor any response from the background, so what is the state of the mind which says 'I understand' and therefore acts immediately?

Unless one understands this, what we are going to discuss presently will have very little meaning - because we are going to go into the question of fear. We are going into fear, which is not only at the conscious level but also at the very deep-rooted layers of the total consciousness. Surely, understanding takes place only when the mind is completely quiet. It takes place when there is no effort, when there is no interference of ideas, when there is no response of the background. Then you can say 'I have understood it!' - and there is immediate action. You can see this in your own life. If you want to understand your child - and I hope you do - then

you observe that child without any sense of consideration, without any sense of comparison with the brother, the other children. You watch him at play, when he is crying, when he is being naughty; you are merely watching - in which there is no valuation whatsoever. Therefore the mind is extremely quiet, quiet in the very action of watching. This really means that the mind, being silent, is in a state of great affection. I do not know if you have observed that love does not chatter. Love is not pleasure, nor desire. Love is silent; it has nothing to do with the interference of ideation. So, understanding is only possible when the mind is completely quiet - not blank, not in a state of abstraction nor in a state of identification, but a silence that is completely active. It is only then that you can say. 'I have understood' and it is only then that there is complete action. Hence, there is no conflict involved.

If this is somewhat clear, not merely verbally but actually, then we can begin to enquire whether it is at all possible to be completely free of fear - not only at the conscious level but at the deeper layers of consciousness also - what is called 'the unconscious'. Now, I wonder if there is such a state as the unconscious at all? Is there 'unconsciousness'? I know it is the fashion of the Freudian and the Jungian analysts to say that they have established the unconscious as being the deeper layers of the conscious mind. We are now questioning whether there is such a state at all. I know most of you will say there is, but in examining one has to question everything, never accepting anything. After all, we are dealing with a very complex problem - with the human being who has lived a million years and more in pain, in torture, in misery, in violence, in sorrow. We are dealing with a human being

who is enquiring into the possibilities of a total revolution; and such a human being has to enquire, has to find the right answers, which means one has to be very serious.

First, one has to understand what is action, and what is an action which is derived from an idea. Most of us have an idea first, a formula, a pattern and from that we act. For instance the actual fact is that we are violent by nature. Our heritage is from the animal and there is in us a great deal of violence. That is the fact. The non-fact is the idea that we should be non-violent. It is a non-fact and hence what takes place? We are always trying to be non-violent when we are really violent. So our action is always derived from what should be and not from what is. You must know of this peculiar ideology of non-violence, which is being used politically in America with regard to the White and Negro problem, and this idea of non-violence has existed for many centuries. The idea is the ideal of not being violent, the what should be. All ideologies, however noble sounding, are idiotic because they have no validity. What has validity is what is. The what is is that we are all human beings throughout the world and whatever our particular culture is, we are violent. When you have an ideal of non-violence, which is only an idea, if you are acting according to that ideology then you are evading the central issue, which is violence. You can understand violence only when you give your total comprehension to violence - not when your mind is divided by the ideal of non-violence. Please follow this. Understanding is only possible when all ideologies have totally come to an end. Then you can face the fact that you are violent, because then you can give your total attention to it. Attention is not then divided into what is and what

should be. So ideologists are mischief makers because they are dealing with un-realities. You know, religions have done this, organized religions. They have said that you must love your neighbour. Throughout the world they have said this; it is not just a Christian doctrine. But society is so constructed that you destroy your neighbour. The fact is that you are destroying the neighbour by your greed, your envy, your acquisitiveness, by your desire for position, power and prestige. Instead of tackling that central problem of violence, we escape into ideations.

In our life ideas predominate, ideas being organized thoughts, which are conclusions, symbols, images. All these predominate; and according to those ideas we act hence there is, as I have pointed out, a division between action and idea. I wonder why we should have ideas at all about action? If you understand something immediately you do not need any idea, do you? So ideas, ideologies prevent you from giving your total attention to the problem, and therefore there is no understanding. So, is there an action without the idea, the formula first and then the action? We are asking if there is an action without the idea, and there is when life is in a crisis; then every movement of everyday action, then every activity of our life is immediate. So one finds out that there is an action which is not dependent on ideas at all. Bearing that in mind, then one can begin to enquire into this question of fear, at the conscious as well as at the unconscious level.

As we said yesterday, fear is always in relation to something; it does not exist by itself. It is not an isolated phenomenon; in life there is no isolated phenomenon at all, everything is interrelated. Fear we know at the conscious level. We know the fear of losing

the job, not having enough food to eat, not fulfilling, not achieving, not becoming a success, and so on. The outward fear we can fairly intelligently spot without too much analysis. And perhaps we can deal with these outward phenomena of fear fairly intelligently - if the mind is not totally self-centred in its activities. But we are going to enquire into fear at the deeper levels of consciousness - because there it has its roots; there we find the fear of death, the fear of not being, the fear of not having love, the fear of not fulfilling, the many, many fears that human beings have. And before we begin to enquire into the unconscious, which we have so easily accepted, we are questioning whether there is an unconscious at all. What is consciousness? I hope this is not all too serious, is it? If it is, I am sorry, because one has to be serious. Only to the serious life is, not to the fanciful, not to the man who is seeking amusement, not to the man who lives in books. It is only the earnest that know what life is; and one has to be serious. The world demands it, not only the world outwardly but the world inwardly, it demands that man be serious - not according to a particular pattern of belief, or in a particular technological way, but serious totally. Only to such a man is there life - the depth and the fullness and the beauty of it. So, we are asking: what is the unconscious, and is there such a thing as the unconscious?

What is consciousness? When are you conscious? We are enquiring into this question of consciousness not according to any philosopher, not according to any analyst or psychologist, We are enquiring simply as a human being, as we are. I want to know and you want to know what is this extraordinary thing called consciousness. How does it come into being? Are there divisions in

it and is there a deeper level which is called 'the unconscious'? So, what is consciousness, and when are you aware that you are conscious? When do you say 'I am conscious, I am aware, I am attentive'? You become conscious only, do you not, when there is either pain or pleasure. When the pain is intense you are fully conscious - pain being effort, conflict, the drive of ambition, the drive of sex, violence and all the rest of it. Then you are conscious. Otherwise most of the time we are half asleep. We are drugged by religions, we are drugged by society, by literature, by propaganda, by the radio, and all the rest of it. Most of us are half-asleep and we only wake up when there is a tremendous crisis - as pain, when there is danger or a great demand for pleasure. Do please observe this in yourself and please do not accept what the speaker is saying. We are communicating with each other; we are taking the journey into ourselves, and therefore there is no guide; we are walking together. There we discover that we act only from these two principles and only when either of these two principles is in full demand do we become at all conscious. Otherwise we are more or less asleep. In this sleepy condition there are several activities going on; we are not actually asleep. So, we become conscious only when these two principles are in full movement. So, what matters for us are these two things, pleasure, and the avoidance of pain, which is danger and so on. The avoidance of danger is fear. What we want, fundamentally, is the continuance of pleasure - whether it is going to church, whether it is worshipping God, reading books, or having sex or whatever it is, that is the drive, pleasure, and fear comes in when that pleasure is denied, which is the avoidance of pain, the avoidance of sudden danger. Please

observe this in yourself and you will see it. We are not describing something extraordinary. This principle of pleasure and pain operates right through us because, as human beings we are the result of the past. You are the result of the past two thousand years of Christianity - with all the ideologies, with all the propaganda which the Church has given you for two thousand years. They have told you that you are this or that, a dozen things. You are the result of two thousand years of a particular propaganda - all the racial accumulated inheritance. That is the background. As in India they are the result of ten thousand years or more of their own propaganda. So in this consciousness there is the residue of ten thousand years of propaganda, tradition, racial inheritance, memories, motives, pursuits - hidden as well as obvious. The whole of that is consciousness - and that is what we are. We are the total content of man. Whether we live in the Far East, or here, or in America, we are the total content of man's endeavour, man's existence. Therefore there is no collective apart from the individual. Do go into this and you will see the extraordinary thing that will take place. We are the collective and we are the individual; there is no division. And the one who gives emphasis to the collective or emphasis to the individual is unbalanced. So, in this total consciousness, in which the principle of pleasure is always functioning, in that there is fear, and in that total consciousness there has been a division as the conscious and the unconscious. The unconscious, as far as most of us are concerned, plays a part in our daily life; our motives, how we have been brought up, whether we have been spanked as a child. Now, is there actually a division? Is there a division between the conscious

and the unconscious or is it not that there is a total movement all the time operating; a total movement, not a divided movement - right? When do you see something totally?

Obviously, when there is no division. When the mind is divided in itself as the intellect, the emotions, the physical and the neurological responses and so on, you do not see totally. You see totally only when the mind is not divided in itself. You see the total man, humanity, the human being when you are not divided, when you are not national, not a Christian, not a Hindu. You see man throughout the world struggling in misery, sorrow, pain, though he worships his own silly gods invented by his memories and fears. And when do you see the totality of man, which is yourself? Please follow this. When do you see yourself totally? When there is not the observer and the observed. That is, when there is no centre as the 'me', the observer, with all its background, with its conditioning, which divides; then only do you see the total content of man, the total content of yourself. So when there is no division as the conscious and the unconscious, when there is no division as the West and the East, of various cultures, when these things do not divide, then there is a total comprehension of man, which is of yourself. It is only then that you can look at yourself.

I do not know if you have ever tried - as we were hinting yesterday - to look at a tree. Holland is full of lovely trees, lovely meadows, and there is a marvellous light because here the sky is very low to the earth and the light is entirely different. And if you have ever noticed it, if you have ever observed it, when you look at a tree do you really look at or at the image which you have of that tree? When you look at your wife or your husband, do you look at

him or her through the image?

Obviously you do; because that is all we have. All we have is the images which have been put together by fear, by demands, by memories of pain and pleasure; and through these images we look at each other. And it is only these images which have relationship, not you and I; we do not have relationship. It is only the images - we try to establish relationship between the images, and therefore all relationship becomes painful. Do follow this up and you will see how extraordinarily simple it all becomes. See whether you can live without any images, without an image about the tree, or the cloud, or the image about your wife or your husband. When the images die then you are really in direct relationship, and that relationship is quite a different fact from the relationship of images. In that relationship which is without the image there is no conflict. So, it is only possible to see the totality of this consciousness when one can observe this whole process - not from a centre, as an observer, as a Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, American - but actually look at it without any division. Then you will find that there is no such thing as the unconscious at all. Then you will see it as a total movement - and that is a marvellous understanding.

So, we were saying that in this consciousness there is pleasure and pain; and the avoidance of pain and the pursuit of pleasure at different levels, with different demands, brings about not only sorrow but also fear. A mind that is all the time seeking pleasure in different forms - bodily, sensually, sexually, the pleasure of fulfilment, the pleasure of being a success, the pleasure of finding something secure and holding on to it, such a mind, which pursues pleasure, must inevitably invite its opposite, which is pain. The two

go together, they cannot be separated. They are only separate when we do not see the totality of pleasure. This process goes on in our life, the pursuit of pleasure under all circumstances - the pleasure to be completely secure: that is what we are seeking in all relationships. This demand to be secure, to be safe in relationship, inevitably brings pain, because there is no such thing as psychological security. We have said that there must be the security of food and shelter, but psychologically there is no security. You know that is an extraordinary thing to understand. It does not mean that life is insecure; but psychologically we are seeking security and therefore inviting insecurity. We realize there is insecurity and when it becomes more and more intense we end up in psychotic states, in asylums. But when one realizes that where there is pleasure there is the shadow of pain, and when you see the thing totally - as we said when you see the tree totally without the image - then you will find that psychological fear comes to an end.

But you cannot see it totally when you are making an effort. We are brought up from childhood to make an effort, to struggle, to beat ourselves and others; to struggle, struggle, struggle until we die - in school, in college, in life, at the office, at home, in the family. There is everlasting struggle, and we accept struggle, conflict and confusion as the way of life. A mind that is in conflict is not a religious mind at all. When the priests throughout the world retire behind the monastery walls, thinking they have avoided conflict with the world, their avoidance is not the ending of conflict. They are merely following blindly or so-called intelligently the pattern set, and they dare not step out of that

pattern because of insecurity. Their security lies in following the pattern and therefore they are totally insecure. The mind is everlastingly seeking security and therefore is afraid of insecurity, and the seeking of security is the breeding of fear.

So, can the mind live without any sense of security? That does not mean to become hopeless, despairing, cynical, bitter and all the rest of it. The mind can be free totally of all sense of security when it sees that security breeds insecurity and fear. And you can only see it, see the totality of anything, when the observer is the observed. Therefore fear ceases only when the observer is the thing which he observes as fear; and in that state there is no conflict at all. Such a mind, which is not tortured, not in conflict, that observes the totality of existence without any division, only such a mind is a religious mind and it is only such a mind which can see what is truth - not the tortured mind, which is disciplined, forced, struggling, beaten, cynical, bitter, or which does socially good works. Without such a religious mind there can be no peace in the world. Can we now ask questions? As we were saying yesterday, to ask a question is very important but it is far more important to ask the right question. It is only the right question that receives the right answer, and when you do put the right question you already have the answer, you don't have to ask. (Laughter). No don't smile, it is not a clever remark; it is the fact. But we never ask fundamental, right questions because we do not know how to ask. Or, if we do know, we are too frightened because by the very asking we may discover what is true, and truth may be the most deadly, dangerous thing. So we never ask, but are always waiting for someone else to answer.

Question: If you love your own child, your attention to your child is fairly complete, but if you are a teacher you cannot give attention to all the children.

Krishnamurti: You can watch your own child, the questioner says, with great affection, but if you are a teacher you cannot do that. So the problem is, how to watch when you want to be a good teacher, isn't it? Now, what is a teacher? In a school you know more than the child and you are imparting, giving him information. You want him to learn, you want him to acquire knowledge, you want him to know the ways of the world, not only technologically, outwardly, but also you want to help him to understand his inward structure. You are teaching him, so you are the instructor, the leader, the teacher helping him. And you say that in that state it is not possible to love. Is that right?

Questioner: Not altogether. The trouble is that you are limited in your activities because of the parents.

Krishnamurti: When you are a teacher you are limited in your activities because of the parents, because of society. You may love your child, and you may be a good teacher and love many children, but you say your helping the child is conditioned by the society and by the parents. So, what is one to do? You cannot scrap the parents! That is obvious. (Laughter). And you cannot break down the society. I wish you could, but you can't. So what is one to do? Which means, what? That you not only have to educate the parents but also educate the educator. Right? You have to educate the parents and you have to educate the teacher himself. It is not just a one-sided affair. Again it is the total phenomenon of the society in which we are living. The parents throughout the world are only

concerned that the child shall make a good living, a good marriage, be secure, fit into the established order, that he must not revolt. That is what is happening in Russia - the child, the student must not criticize, he must accept the social structure of Communism. And the same thing happens here in a slightly different way. Every parent wants his child to have a safe job, a good home, and goodbye. In that state there is no affection at all. Love is something totally different. If the parents loved there would be no wars. (Do you mean to say that the Americans love their children who are being shot to pieces in Vietnam, and the Vietnamese being shot to pieces also? Do you think if they had loved this would have arisen, this phenomenon?) We educate our children wrongly, which means that we are only concerned with giving them a technological efficiency. We are not concerned with their inward structure and their inward being, because we do not want a revolution, inwardly, because that means that our whole social structure may be destroyed. And we do not want any kind of disturbance. Nobody wants to be disturbed. The Communists when they get into power do not want disturbance, nor the particular Democratic Party when it gets into power, they do not want any disturbance either. As human beings we do not want to be disturbed, and so we create a society in which we hope there will be no disturbance. But life is a movement in which there is disturbance as well as peace. When you understand the totality of this movement there is neither the so-called peace between two wars, nor is there the fear of disturbance - there is quite a different movement altogether. And that movement cannot be understood, even by the most educated teacher, if he himself is not part of that total movement of life.

Question: When you get up in a state of fear and you bring yourself into that state of quiet mind which you talk about, that silence, can you then put your finger on the source of that fear?

Krishnamurti: When you find yourself in a state of fear can you find out from where that fear arises. Is that it?

Questioner: First you have to get into complete silence...

Krishnamurti: Madam, I did not say that you must first get into a state of silence. That becomes another ideology. I explained very carefully the state of a mind that understands. You understand only when the mind is very quiet. That is all. And then you ask if, when you are quiet, will you then be able to trace the source of fear. Do you see what you have asked? First you think you have that state...

Questioner: I hope to get it.

Krishnamurti: If you hope, you will never get it. It occurs, and you cannot go after it. You are asking if, when it happens, you will then be able to trace the source of fear. Then you will have no need to trace the source of fear at all. Then there is no fear at all. I carefully explained it, the speaker went into it in detail - that a mind that is occupied with its own ideologies, which thinks that it should be silent and which struggles to bring about that silence, quietness, will never know silence. If it happens to be silent, then there is no fear, then you do not have to trace fear, then you will meet it. You see you are speculating. You know, when a man is hungry the mere description of food will not satisfy him. He wants food. What most of us are doing is imagining we want food and then describing the food. We are not really hungry to find out, hungry to face this whole phenomenon, demanding to understand: not accepting, not obeying. Unfortunately most of us are satisfied

by mere definitions, by ideologies, and therefore we leave the hall with empty hands.

Questioner: You said ideals prevent action. Can you go over that again?

Krishnamurti: I said ideals stop action, prevent action. That is, when I am violent, if I have an ideology of non-violence I am pursuing non-violence as an ideal, but sowing the seeds of violence. But if I have no ideology at all, then I am confronted with the fact of violence. Then I will deal with it directly, not through an idea. And so long as we have an idea of how to deal with violence, then the idea becomes an escape from the fact and therefore we are postponing action. That is what we are all doing. But if each of us wanted peace in the world, we would have it. We don't. We are Dutch, French, English, German, with our separate sovereign governments, with our separate religions, with our separate feelings, thoughts, and we are all the time creating war, psychologically. We don't want peace, which means to live every day peacefully, without competition, without comparison, without condemnation. Then we would lead a life that is peaceful and therefore there would be peace in the world. But we don't want peace. We want only peace for our pursuits, which means the peace which brings about destruction.

21 May 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 3RD PUBLIC TALK AMSTERDAM 24TH MAY 1967

WE WERE TALKING about fear, how to meet it and how to go beyond it completely. I think we should also consider a wider and deeper issue. which is, whether it is at all possible totally to renew the mind - the mind which has lived forty million years and during that time gathered many kinds of experiences and conditioned itself - whether it is at all possible for such a mind totally to become young, fresh. It seems to me this is an important issue that we should talk over together. Because as one observes, through repetition, imitation, conformity, the mind begins to deteriorate, begins to weaken, and has not got the same stamina and clarity as formerly. It gets more confused; there are more and more conflicts; and so the mind loses its elasticity, its freshness, its youthful capacity for decision. The question is whether it is at all possible for the mind to renew itself. Perhaps many of us have not asked such a question and I think we should discuss it, go into it, this evening.

For us thought, the whole mechanism of thought, is very important. And perhaps the very act of thinking may be the cause of deterioration, the cause of a mind losing its capacity to see very clearly, to act directly, and perhaps be able to understand the nature of love. So before we begin to go into this question of what is the central factor of the deterioration of the mind (which may be the whole mechanism of thought), we should consider not only the nature of the mind but also the brain. And whether it is possible for the very brain cells themselves to function not self-protectively, not

in self- centred action, but face much wider, deeper issues.

So we have to ask what is thinking. Because I feel thought is always old, never new; thought is never free. Thought can never bring about a radical revolution in the structure, in the nature of the mind. We have to examine closely what is the nature of thinking. And as we said the other day, we are exploring together, taking a journey together, therefore there is no authority. There is no follower and no teacher. Each one of us has to be the teacher and the follower, that is one has to learn, not from books, not from another, but rather in understanding the process of our own thinking. And to understand that deeply, and to come upon the truth of it, we must put aside every form of authority, every form of agreement or disagreement; because when you examine something, opinions about it, which are based on agreement or disagreement, must entirely cease. We are dealing with facts and not with opinion, which only leads to dialectical argument, which has no value at all. Whereas, we have to understand how we think and what is the nature of thinking. Because, as I said, thought is always old, thought can never be free, thought is always limited and is always of the past.

In understanding thought perhaps we shall understand the nature of time, and we may come upon that sense of love and beauty. For without love and beauty there is no truth. But to understand what love is, and what beauty is, we must go into this question of thought. What is thinking? When one asks that question - 'what is thinking?' - what actually takes place. Either one responds to it immediately, giving an answer; or there is an interval between the question and the answer. In that interval one is

looking for an answer, looking in the storehouse of knowledge trying to find out what is the answer. So between the question and the answer there is an interval of time, and in that interval we are searching, asking, examining, hoping to find it. When you are asked a question which is familiar the response is immediate. When you are asked a question that is a little more difficult there is a time interval. And when one asks a question that cannot be answered by words, which is not to be found in any knowledge, then one says 'I don't know'. I hope that when you are hearing these statements you are listening, not merely to words, but actually going through the whole process of discovery for yourself; and you cannot discover through another. One has to find out for oneself, and then it will be authentic, it will be real. You know, there is a great deal of difference between learning and accumulating knowledge. It is fairly easy to accumulate knowledge; you apply it, you repeat and through that constant repetition and association you accumulate knowledge from which you act. But learning is something entirely different. There is learning but there is no sense of accumulation. What we generally do is to accumulate and then act, which is the idea and approximating action to that idea. Whereas learning is in the very act of doing. It isn't that one has learnt and then acts, but rather in the very movement of acting is the learning. And therefore there is learning all the time, because life is action, life is relationship in action. When one has accumulated knowledge and, having learnt, acts, then the quality of learning changes completely.

So, to listen is quite an art, as we said the other day. We never listen; we listen to the opinions that we have gathered, we interpret

what is being said according to our memory, according to our likes and dislikes, and inclination and tendency; which all prevents actual listening.

To find out what thinking is, not according to some philosopher, not according to the ancients, but actuality to find it for oneself, one has to observe how thought arises. This, please, is important to understand because we are going to go into the question not only of time, love and beauty, but also we are going to find out the truth about death. It is a very complex thing that we are attempting to do this evening. Unless we understand the whole mechanism of thinking, when we deal with time it will lead to a great deal of misunderstanding. But if one observes closely, attentively, thought is the response of the past, the response of memory (memory being the accumulation of experience, knowledge acquired, inherited, conditioned; and this background, this memory, when challenged responds in thought. This is fairly simple, obvious. But because we always respond from the past (the past as thought and action) the mind is incapable of renewing itself; we live, function and act from the past. We are the result of the past. Your thinking, your feeling is the outcome of this accumulated memory and so we never know actually what the present moment is. It is only in the totality of the movement of the present that there is the renewal of the mind. But when the mind is functioning, acting, living through imagination, through thought, through various forms of going back to the past, it is incapable of living in that complete fullness of the present. In that present only is there a renewal. So one observes that thought must always be in the past, thought is always the old, and when the old controls, shapes action, then in that action there can never be

anything new.

You understand what is happening in the world, the younger generation is revolting against the old order in various forms. It takes different forms in America, in England, in Europe. But that revolt is against the established order, and in that revolt they hope to find a new way of living. But as long as thought functions, however much it may revolt, it will still be the same pattern at a different level. So thought is not the way to bring about order, order in the human being and in society. As society now is, it is in disorder, it is anarchic, because it creates wars, it divides itself into nationalities, into classes, into various forms of religion, all of which brings about disorder. The social structure is put together by man, man who himself is in disorder, because he is in conflict, his life is a battlefield. And he thinks that order can only be brought about by thought, intellect, reason; reason being the clarity with which one thinks, logically. But thought in itself is everlastingly the old. Therefore thought cannot possibly bring about a new order. And I think this is very important to understand; not because the speaker says so - the speaker has no value at all - what has value is the truth of what he is saying.

Thought has created time, not time by the watch, chronological time, but psychological time. Thought has created time, the future, the tomorrow, 'I will be', 'I should be'. Please use the words of the speaker as a mirror to observe yourself. There is not only time as the past, psychologically, there is also time as the present and time as tomorrow; the past, present and future. It is a movement, divided by thought as yesterday, with all the accumulation of a million yesterdays, moving into the present, which is today, meeting

different conditions, different experiences, and passing through the present to tomorrow, the future.

This movement of time, psychologically, is the movement of thought. I was happy yesterday and am rather miserable today and I hope tomorrow I will be happy again. I have had a marvellous experience looking at a sunset, the light on the water, the trees with the birds singing, and that remains in my mind as memory, and tomorrow I want it again repeated. So thought, through pleasure, creates the past, the present and the future. One can see it oneself, very simply: all the delights of youth, the pleasures that one has had, and the repetition of those pleasures in the present and the demand of it for the future, all based on thought. Thought creates, breeds, puts together the psychological structure of time. And so thought breeds sorrow; because thought is always pursuing pleasure and avoiding pain. Thought not only engenders sorrow but sustains it. And so one finds thought is time and sorrow. Being in sorrow we say to ourselves that we must find a way out, which is again the whole process of thinking set into motion.

I do not know if you have ever considered the nature of pleasure. There has been a delightful experience yesterday, you think about it, and thought strengthens that delight and gives it nourishment and continuity. Thought is doing this all the time. So thought not only breeds psychological time, but also sorrow. And man has lived with sorrow, as with violence, for millions of years, and has always sought a way out, either to escape from the world through monasteries, through identification of himself with what he calls God, the Saviour, ideals and so on; but he has never been able to solve it, has never been able to go beyond it, because he is

always functioning within the boundaries of thought. So, one asks oneself whether thought can end. Thought must function at a certain level, obviously. Technically it must function when you hear the words spoken in English; it is the accumulation of the knowledge of the English language and you repeat it; the way to your house, your office and so on, there thought must function rationally, sanely, healthily, logically. But that logical thinking is perverted by self-centred activity. And we are asking whether it is at all possible for thought to function at a different level altogether. You know there is, in the human mind, the old brain and the new brain. The brain that has been developed through millions of years, the animal brain always self-protective, always on the defensive. And is it possible for that old brain to be quiet, give an interval between the old and the new? It is this interval which is the timeless, in which thought cannot possibly enter.

Our question is concerned (but not only) with daily living - with all its miseries, turmoil, anxieties, uncertainty, sense of guilt, despair, the hopeless battle without any meaning whatsoever - which we call life. What is the meaning of going to the office every day for forty years, the utter boredom, the loneliness of existence, the repetitive nature of it? The intellectual people invent a significance to life, the more clever they are the brighter the significance. And that's what we call living: a battlefield. And there is death, the unknown, something one doesn't know anything about, but one is afraid of it. We cling to life as the known and are afraid of the unknown. Being afraid we invent various theories, beliefs: the whole of the East believes in reincarnation, to be born anew next life, it gives them hope as in the Christian world there is

the resurrection, again a hope. That is, between living and death there is time. Time, that interval between what actually is and something which we call death, of which we are afraid. This interval between life and death is brought about by thought. Of course there is actual dying: the physical organism, through disease, accident, through usage, dies. But there is fear of death and the sorrow of death as a psychological ending. So there is not only the fear of physical dying, but also the fear of losing all the things that one has learnt, the memories, the experiences, the affections, the family, the hopes, the works, the character, all that one has developed, cultivated, nourished - fear of their coming to an end. We cling to life, life being this extraordinary battle from the moment we are born to the moment we die. That is all we know of life, in which there are moments of great joy, but that joy is at rare intervals and becomes a memory. So our life, as we live it is total disorder. All our relationship, human or otherwise, is a conflict. And that is all we know of life. To that we cling desperately. And we are afraid of something which we call death, of which we know nothing.

Can one find out what it means actually to die, not biologically, physiologically, but psychologically, which is a much deeper issue? Because it is only in dying that there is a renewal and not a continuity. That which has continuity is repetitive, it is of time. It is only when time comes to an end that something new takes place. So the question is: the life we know, which is turmoil, disorder, anarchy, can that come to an end totally? - because that is what we call death, the ending. Can there be a dying to all one's memories, not only to the ugly memories, but to the memories that one has

cherished, that one keeps very carefully locked up? To die every day, to every problem, to every pleasure, and not carry over to tomorrow any problem at all; so that the mind always remains tremendously attentive, active, clear. That is only possible when one dies every day to all the psychological accumulations.

I do not know if you have ever tried to die to a pleasure, without any argument, without any sense of sacrifice, just to completely drop it. If you have, then you will know what it feels like to die, to end a pleasure before the next pleasure begins. In that interval, between the dying of the old and the beginning of thought, the demand for a different kind of pleasure, in that interval is the renewal of mind. And this is very important to understand because society, as it is, is always in disintegration. In society there is no order, there is no virtue, its morality is conditional, changing, and we, as human beings, have created that social order which is disorder, because in ourselves we are in disorder. Order cannot be brought about by thought, through time, through a gradual process. Virtue is not a thing to be cultivated, it is not a thing of habit. Such virtue is of time, is the produce of thought and therefore such virtue is not virtue, it is merely cultivation of a habit, as a means of defence. But when one understands the nature of thought and time, then out of that comes virtue with its own discipline. For discipline is order, but not the discipline of imitation, of conformity, obedience to certain sanctions of society, or to the priest. Discipline comes when thought is understood. You know, there is a discipline which comes when you have to do a thing for itself. And discipline which is merely conformity to a pattern, whether it is noble or otherwise, is not discipline at all; it only breeds disorder,

chaos. But to understand order, which is virtue, one has to understand the nature of thinking. And the understanding or thinking demands discipline. To observe anything very closely, to give attention, to watch something - a bird, an insect, a leaf fluttering in the breeze - that watching is only for an instant, that watching demands tremendous discipline, otherwise you are incapable of looking.

So one sees that order within the skin, within the mind, being, can never be the product of thought. Thought can create habits, conformity, obedience, and that, as one observes, only leads to greater disorder, to greater confusion and misery. And order, which is virtue, is quite a different thing. It is necessary to understand this whole process of thought, how one thinks, why one thinks, just to observe it. If you give your attention to it completely, not merely intellectually or emotionally, but totally, in that totality of attention here is immediate comprehension, and therefore immediate action. And when one sees what the nature of thought is, then one begins to find out what love is. Love is not desire or pleasure. But for us, for most people, love is pleasure and desire. So what is the truth of love? What does it mean? Obviously the word is not the thing. The word microphone is not the microphone. But we are caught in the word, in the symbol, in the imagination of what we think or what we are told that love is. So one must be free of the word, of the symbol, to find out the nature of that extraordinary thing which we call love. Since love is not desire nor pleasure, how does one come upon it? Obviously one cannot cultivate it, that is too immature: to identify oneself with an image which is said to be love, as the Christians do, or as they do in the Orient in their own way. So how

does one come upon that thing? To come upon it one has to find out what beauty is.

What is beauty? Does beauty lie in the object, in the architecture, in the tree, in the face of a beautiful person, the light on the water? Does it lie outside, or is it something that is not dependant on the observer and the observed? And how does that take place in which there is neither the observer nor the observed? I do not know if you have ever looked at a mountain, or a tree in Spring, or water flowing by. You must have observed it and you say how beautiful it is and we think we have understood beauty. Surely beauty is something when there is total abandonment of oneself; when there is no observer at all; when you completely abandon your own ideas, your own feelings, die to everything that you have known. That is, total self-abandonment takes place; say for example, when you observe a mountain, with its snow, light, depth, beauty and majesty, that very thing drives away all thought for a moment, a second, you are stunned by that sight and then the mind becomes completely quiet. In that state you feel something which cannot be put into words but which is the nature of beauty. There the mountain, the river or the flower by the wayside, drives away for a second all your thoughts, all your worries, all your impressions. And can one die to everything that one has thought of oneself, all one's pleasures, one's worries, on the instant, which is the total abandonment of oneself? That demands great austerity. Not the austerity of the priest, nor of the monk, nor of the saint; their austerity is very harsh, it is meaningless, it is an ugly thing. We are not talking of such austerity. Austerity comes only when the mind understands the nature of that interval between the

observer and the observed, and is no longer sustaining the observer through thought. That brings about an extraordinary quality of sensitivity. And a mind that is not sensitive, alert, can never know what love is.

And is there a moment when death is no longer a fear, when life is no longer a battle? Is there ever such a moment when time has stopped, when thought is totally in abeyance? There is such a moment and that moment is love. And with, out love, do what you will, build marvellous buildings, go to the moon, wipe out poverty, do away with wars because they are not profitable - do what you will - without that love there can be no order. But we don't want order. We have lived in such disorder for so many centuries we are afraid of order. If we want order, which is peace, we will live peacefully. That means no nationality, no belief, no dogma, no competition, no division of people; but we don't want all those things because we are so used to live a life of battle. And we say, if there is no strife we shan't make progress, we shan't be active. We would rather cling to the thing known though it breeds disorder, chaos and misery, than bring about order and peace.

Perhaps some of you might like to ask questions? To find out the right answer you must know why you ask a question. Why do we ask questions? What kind of answer do we want? An answer which is very disturbing we will reject; an answer that cuts right across the way of our life, nobody wants. We want an answer that is comforting, satisfying to our self-pity (in sorrow there is a great deal of self-pity). So when we ask a question we must find out from where it springs. And we **MUST** ask questions, we must doubt everything. We cannot possibly accept, obey, (I am not

saying that you mustn't obey the policeman) but psychologically we do accept, follow, obey and therefore we never find out what truth is. Truth can only be found by asking the right question, not of another, but of ourselves. If you put the right question you will find the answer in it.

Question: Sir, is the feeling of responsibility part of the order, the discipline you were talking about?

Krishnamurti: The feeling that one has of responsibility, is that part of the order we have been speaking about at this meeting? Can it be? I wonder what we mean by that word responsible. To me that is a very ugly word. But what do we mean by that word responsible? Responsible for my husband, for my children, responsible to the country, responsible to the Government, responsible to the God that man has invented. I wonder why we use that word at all. Are you responsible when you love? Or are you only responsible when you have duty and you cease to love? When do we use that word? Do investigate the meaning of that word. I am responsible to my wife, my husband, to my country; take those three. What does that word mean when I say I am responsible?

Question: Sir, I cannot understand why you do not antagonize these people because when I say these things it always does, I can only imagine that the trappings of respectability with which you are surrounded is overawing them...

Krishnamurti: But Sir, we are answering that lady's question first.

Question: Oh, I thought that question was already forgotten about.

Krishnamurti: No, I am sorry we haven't answered it. Sir to the lady it is important. It may not be important to you but to that person it is important. The lady asks - what is responsibility, does that bring about order, is that part of that order we are discussing? We will answer your question afterwards, Sir.

We were saying that responsibility is part of the respectability which we worship. And it seems to me where there is respectability there is no order, we are only concerned with being a perfect bourgeois. Please Sir just listen; does love have responsibility and will it use that word? When you say I am responsible to God, whatever that may mean, that God is the projection of your own imagination, it is a projection of yourself, identified, clothed in certain forms of respectability, of what you consider to be holy. But it is still your projection. And you are responsible to that God, that is, responsible to yourself, to what you have projected. And in that respectability, in that responsibility, is there any affection? When you do something out of duty is there any love in it? When a soldier is sent abroad to kill because of his responsibility for his country, is there any love? So order can only come about when there is love, when there is real affection, when there is compassion.

Your question was Sir, if I understood it rightly; why do people get angry with me?

Question: No. I said why do people NOT get angry with you. That is something quite different from what you were saying,

Krishnamurti: All right Sir, I'll repeat it.

Question: Although I have only asked a question I have already made a woman here angry and some people behind me angry.

Krishnamurti: All right Sir, but that's...

Question: I make them angrier than you do...

Krishnamurti: Yes Sir; why do not those of you who are listening get angry with me for saying these things? I am also surprised. (Laughter) Please, Sir, when people hear that their Gods are false, why don't they get angry with the speaker? When the speaker says thought is very old, don't depend on thought, it has no meaning, why don't you get irritated? Why do you listen? Because, you see, what we are saying denies everything that man has put together, it cuts at the very root of the social order that we worship, that we cling to. Perhaps when you hear what is being said, because you are sitting quietly, not because you respect the speaker - that has nothing whatever to do with it - perhaps you see the truth of what is being said. And you can't get angry with truth - it is SO. It is raining and you can't get angry with rain. In the same way perhaps, when you listen, you see what the speaker is saying is true and there is no occasion for you to get angry - it is so. One gets angry only when personalities, when harshness enters into the business. When there is a certain sense of compassion, attention and care, then I don't see why we should get angry with anything.

24th May 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 4TH PUBLIC TALK AMSTERDAM 28TH MAY 1967

WE HAVE BEEN talking over together several things which, it seems to me, are quite important. There is another thing we should consider also, which is the whole question of a mind demanding experiences. Without understanding that question and that problem we cannot come to the next question which we shall go into a little later: whether the mind can come upon a quality of innocence. Innocence is far more important than immortality. And to go into that question very deeply, one has first to understand (obviously not intellectually) a mind demanding experiences. A petty mind, a narrow, shallow mind is always seeking more and more experiences. I mean by that a mind that is always concerned with itself, its self-centred activities, a mind that is not very deep. Such a petty mind may be clever, erudite, have a great deal of technical and analytical capacity, but it still remains a petty, shallow, little mind, the very essence of a bourgeois mind. And we are not using that word 'bourgeois' in a derogatory sense. This mind, most of our minds, are very heavily conditioned and therefore rather narrow, well established in tradition, in experience, in adjusting themselves to the every day demands of a monotonous, laborious, rather useless life. Such a mind, being very limited, is always exploring wider and deeper experiences. It demands not only biological, physiological experiences of sex and so on, but also it demands wider experience of consciousness.

Our daily life, as we know it, the life that one leads, is pretty monotonous, empty. And following a routine of well established

habits and traditions, the norm is set and the mind follows that, and continues until it dies, comes to an end. Such a mind, which we shall call for the moment, narrow, limited, petty, shallow, demands many experiences. It has had physical experiences such as sex, satisfying various sensory pleasures, but also it demands much wider experiences. And that is why there is this craze in the world at the present for taking drugs like L.S.D., hoping thereby to expand consciousness and have greater, wider more meaningful experiences. I think one should understand this craving.

What is an experience, what is involved in experience? When one wants the most marvellous experience that one can possibly have, what is involved? What do we mean by this experiencing? Is it a legitimate demand; is it possible really to have a totally new experience? We mean by experience, to go through something; that is the dictionary meaning of that word: to go through an experience, to go through a response to a challenge to the very end of it. In this process of experiencing several things are necessary. (And in observing oneself, I hope each one of us who is listening to this morning's talk is not merely hearing a lot of words, either agreeing or disagreeing, but actually examining, using the speaker's words as a mirror to observe himself.)

To understand this question deeply, you have to observe your own mind in operation. Why do we want experiences? What is involved in experiencing? Obviously we demand it because our lives are empty, shallow, petty, we have had enough of the daily routine and we want something wider, deeper, more lasting. So we are looking for experiences. And of course, there is the ultimate experience of a religious mind (a mind that is not really religious

but that is caught in the traps of religious organizations, which are merely the continuity of propaganda and not religion at all). Such a mind wants the experience of the ultimate, some mystical state reality, God or the projection of its own conditioning. If you are a Christian you will experience that which you have been conditioned to; an Indian, or Asiatic, they are conditioned to their own particular psychology, culture. In this process of experiencing (if one observes, as I hope you are observing yourself) is there anything new at all? Or is it merely the continuity of what has been, modified, extended and given a different significance?

In this demand for experience, which is natural, one has to go into the question of what is an experience, what is its nature, and is any new experience at all possible. Being dissatisfied with things as they are in our life, we stretch out our consciousness, hoping to grasp some new fundamental, original, pristine experience. And in that we do not completely understand what is involved. All experiences are a response to a condition. There are always challenges, if one is greatly alive, to which we either respond adequately or inadequately, totally, or partially. This response to a challenge is the experiencing - otherwise there is no experience at all. And when we ask for deeper, wider, more significant experience, a process of recognition is involved, isn't it. If I don't recognize a new experience, it is not an experience at all. If there is an experience, if something takes place in consciousness and I don't recognize the nature of it, it ceases to be an experience.

So, to experience a thing I must recognize it. And to recognize it I must have had it already, otherwise I can't recognize it. Please follow this step by step. Recognition is necessary in experiencing,

otherwise it is not. And to recognize is the response of memory. Therefore any experience which is recognizable is always the old. Therefore a mind that is seeking a wider and deeper experience and is capable of recognizing it, can never find the new, however much it may demand a new experience. Therefore one has to understand whether it is at all possible to be totally free from the whole structure of memory.

We are not saying that you must have no memory, which is absurd. We must have memory, technological memory, otherwise we shan't be able to live at all. But not the memory of a mind that is always seeking the new, and translating what it finds into terms of the old. After all, if you have taken a chemical like L.S.D. it obviously heightens your sensitivity, heightens your perception, you see much more clearly, much more directly; then the interval between the observer and observed is not. There is a chemical change in the whole metabolism of the body. And in that state one experiences and that experience obviously is recognizable, otherwise we would be empty. So when there is the process of recognition it is the projection of the past. The mind is always functioning within the field of time, which is of memory. And can the mind go beyond that? Truth is not recognizable, therefore it is always new, fresh. A mind that is seeking truth can never find truth, because it is not to be sought after. A conditioned mind demanding what truth is, demanding that it must find it, will never find it because it is so conditioned. It can never find that immense, immeasurable thing. But without coming upon it, life becomes dull, stupid, drab, meaningless. So is it possible for a mind to come upon that thing which man has everlastingly sought?... a state of

innocency, freshness, which is constantly renewing itself. Is it possible? We are going to go into that this morning, if we can.

As we said the other day, the world, the symbol is not the reality. The word door is not the door. So one has to be very attentive not to be caught in words. Although we have to use words to communicate, words become a terrible hindrance; because we think by understanding the word, defining the word, or the meaning and the structure of a sentence.. through explanation, we think we have understood the whole thing. So we are going to find out whether a mind, that is heavily conditioned, whether such a mind can free itself totally and be in a state of freedom in which the new is joy, great ecstasy, cannot be sought. You can seek pleasure excitement, sensation, seek ways and means of entertainment, certain forms of excitement, pleasure; but joy is something that cannot possibly be sought or put together by thought. And that joy is not related at all to pleasure or desire. So it is important to understand the nature of pleasure and desire.

You know, throughout the world those people who have belonged to any particular organized religion have always said you must be without desire to find reality. That is why there are so many monks and various forms of renunciations of the world, denying pleasure and desire. Monasteries are full of them. And by denying pleasure, desire, they hope to find something beyond these categories. What is pleasure and what is desire? We must understand this very carefully, because otherwise the mind will always be caught in the search for pleasure, or the avoidance of pleasure, or the control of desire; hence the mind becomes a tortured thing. Either the indulgence of pleasure, or the suppression

of pleasure, does deteriorate the quality of mind. And so one has to understand both desire and pleasure, not intellectually, not conceptually but actually. The understanding through a concept, through a formula, is not understanding at all. That is, we have an idea of what pleasure is and try to understand the nature and structure of pleasure through that idea. First we conceive, we formulate an ideology and use that ideology, that concept, to understand. We mean by understanding a direct perception And action without the interval, without the interference of thought and concepts. Only then is there understanding and therefore immediate action.

One can see how desire arises. It is not a very complex issue. There is first perception, seeing, visually, with the eyes; from that there is certain pleasure, if it is beautiful. There is first perception, then there is sensation, then there is contact, then out of that contact desire. You see a beautiful car, there is perception, seeing, sensation, contact and desire. Then thought begins to nourish, sustain and give continuity to that desire. Then it becomes pleasure. All this takes place instantly, I see a beautiful face, a beautiful tree, and I touch that face or that tree and in that there is desire, and that desire is sustained by thought, which becomes pleasure. You can observe this in yourself if you are at all watchful, alert. When one is aware of this, then is it possible, one asks oneself, for thought not to interfere. You understand? One can see very well how desire arises; then thought comes in and says, I want to have it. I want to possess it, I want it to continue. So thought not only gives it nourishment, sustenance, but by thinking about it over and over again, continuity. This is what takes place

when you have sex, or any deep experience.

Please watch what is taking place. You experience; thought experiencing is the present, which is looking at a car; there is direct perception, then thought comes, thought being the old, and gives continuity to that desire by thinking about it, which is pleasure. All this, as we said, is instantaneous. And is it possible for thought not to interfere at all? Because one cannot shut one's eyes, or ears. You see, you hear, you taste, you look at a beautiful sunset, a tree, a lovely landscape with lakes and mountains, you can't shut your eyes to it all. Then thought comes in giving to the new (which is direct seeing) a continuity which becomes the memory. There was a lovely sunrise this morning, one looked at it, it was a beautiful thing, thought captured it and wants that pleasure repeated tomorrow. The old has captured the instant beauty of a sunset sunrise, and so thought can never find the new, thought can never experience the new. And how is it possible, without control, without subjugation, without denial, for thought not to allow itself to interfere? You understand the question I hope the problem is clear. Because we have lived so long a human beings, over two million years, accumulated so much so many thousand experiences, and our innocency is not There is nothing new and man, if he is at all alert and awake, is always demanding the new. And the entity that is seeking the new is always thought. And thought is always the old, because it is the response of accumulated memories, of experienced knowledge. And is it possible for thought not to interfere at all?

Now we are going to find this out, find out for ourselves if it is at all possible. But if you say it is not possible you have already

blocked it. Or, if you say it is possible you have also blocked it. Either agreement or disagreement with that statement prevents you from going further, which may be what you want. But if you want to go into it very deeply there must be neither acceptance nor denial, but examination. And to examine there must be freedom, freedom from opinion, from conclusion. That is to say, thought, which is always old, always conditioned, never free-though it may talk endlessly about freedom, peace and love - thought can never find the new. All our life is based on thought, from the moment we wake up in the morning until we go to sleep, thought is in operation, cunning, desperate, hopeful, in despair, seeking pleasure, denying sorrow, and so on and on endlessly. Therefore we are living always in the past, always. So when we ask this question, whether thought can have a stop, whether thought which is in time can come to an end, we are asking a most fundamental question. A fundamental question cannot be answered by somebody else. When you ask a fundamental question all authority has gone. Therefore when all authority, of every kind, is put aside, denied, then you can find out for yourself. We are asking a question that demands attention. We are asking whether thought can come to a stop (though thought is necessary at certain levels) whether thought can come to an end and not interfere. When you look at the sunset, at a tree, at a bird on the wing, when you see a face with which you have lived, to look at it as though for the first time! Though you walk in the same path, the same road, to look at the whole thing as though it had never happened before! - that is important, because from that there is a discovery of something entirely different. So is it possible for thought to stop? You know,

man has tried this in different ways, through drugs, through control, through meditation, through the demand for that state when you can receive grace. Or by identifying, to lose oneself entirely in something, in the country (which is an idea), in patriotism (which is again an idea), in a projection which one calls God (which is again a concept, an image, a symbol). Man has tried so many ways, by control, by suppression, by identifying himself with something which he calls greater, to forget himself totally; through sex, through a particular activity to which he is committed - like the Communist who is committed to a particular ideology and having identified himself with it he works endlessly for that ideology; but it is still identifying himself with an idea, he is working for himself, calling it for the collective, and so on. So is it possible for a mind to become totally empty, totally fresh, completely innocent, although it has lived a thousand years?

To come upon this one has to enquire into what is awareness. And one also has to find out what it is to be attentive. To be aware of the lights, of the shape of the hall, the roof, the carpet, the colour, just to be aware of it without any choice, without any comparison, without any condemnation - just to observe. I do not know if you have ever tried it. If you have, and if you are aware, then you will see how you judge, condemn, approve: 'I like', 'I don't like', 'this is ugly', 'this is beautiful', 'this particular colour I don't like at all, it is repulsive', 'that colour is very attractive'. Such statements prevent that awareness, which is to be aware without any choice; then only are you watching, then only do you see. You know, when you are completely attentive, in that state you see; it's only love that sees and nothing else, not thought, not the mind, not

the intellect. So one has to learn how to look, how to hear. As we said the other day, learning is not accumulating, learning is always the active present, It is not that having learnt you observe; you see only in the instant present. And when you are so aware, then you begin to discover for yourself, without any preacher, any teacher, any book, any philosophy, theologian, priest, or psychologist, you begin to discover the nature and the structure of your own self: how you look, how you feel, what you think, what your motives are; you are aware of yourself instantly. And from that awareness there comes the state of attention. You know most of us are inattentive, that is our habit. We are never attentive. Attention means complete attention, not intellectual, emotional attention, but the total attention which one gives when one is completely in front of a danger, or in face of a crisis. That attention is virtue. It is only in that attention virtue can flower. And when there is that attention, then you will find that out of it comes complete aloneness. I do not know if you have ever experienced what loneliness is. I think one has. To be lonely, that is to feel oneself isolated, having no relationship with anything; in that sense of loneliness there is despair - there are moods, one is familiar with that sense of loneliness - and one runs away from it by turning on the radio, by reading a book, by sex and ten different activities. That loneliness is the very essence of self-consciousness. And when one goes beyond that, there is this state of attention in which there is complete aloneness, which is not isolation, which is not separation, which is not a withdrawal. Because it is only this aloneness, when the mind is no longer a plaything of thought, when thought has been understood totally - then out of that comes this sense of

aloneness. it is that which is innocence, and it is that innocence which is beyond all mortality. It is only that innocence which can come upon the new, that which is always new, which is timeless. This whole process man has sought through meditation. Perhaps you do not know that word. The whole of Asia knows the meaning of that word. Here you may use a different word. Man has tried through meditation, through control, through following a system, a method, to come upon this innocence, this freshness, this reality, which is not of time. One can only come upon it when one has understood what it means to experience, what pleasure and desire mean, and also the nature of awareness and attention. Then out of that total comprehension comes the solitude and aloneness which opens the door. And no one - no drug, no priest, no God, no religion - will ever give the energy to open that door.

Perhaps, if you feel like it, we can ask questions and discuss what we have talked about this morning or at the previous meetings. The speaker hopes that he has not stopped you from asking questions because he has said, when one asks the right question the answer is in the question itself. To ask the right question the mind must be extraordinarily sharp clear and there must be that sense of care which is affection - otherwise when you put a question out of bitterness, anger, hopelessness or despair, it becomes meaningless.

Question: Sir, could you distinguish between what you mean by the word recognizing, and being aware?

Krishnamurti: I recognize you because we have met before and I am aware of the ways of your speech and so on. in that there is a recognition is there not? I recognize you. If we have been friends,

or lived together, then you have an image of me and I have an image of you. Obviously. And without being aware of these images, which is the image you have about me and the image (if I have one) about you, without being aware of that we may talk about awareness endlessly. So we must understand, it seems to me, how images are built then, when there is no forming of an image at all, recognition is merely a very simple factor, a necessary factor, but through that awareness, in which there is no image, there is then a direct relationship, a direct communication, a direct communion with each other. Have I answered your question, Sir?

Question: Yes Sir.

Question: Since you say you can't recognize experience...

Krishnamurti: No Madame, sorry. I did not say that you can't recognize experience. It is only when you recognize that you experience.

Question: Whenever you start to recognize you say, Oh

Krishnamurti: Quite.

Questioner: So makes you come here?

Krishnamurti: Ah! the lady asks what makes me come here to Holland, to this place, to talk. What has that question to do with what we are discussing?

Question: You must have a type of feeling... a compassion for us.

Krishnamurti: The question is - do you come here because you have compassion? That is the question. Now, what value has it? What value is it if the speaker says 'Yes I come because I have compassion'. What does it mean? Where are you?

Question: What drives you? (Laughter)

Krishnamurti: What is the drive that makes me come here? Look Madame, it is of so little importance. Do listen to me please. What does it matter why the speaker comes here. What does matter, and it matters immensely, is how you listen, what you do with what you have listened to, that is all that matters: how you have listened and what you are going to do with what you have listened to. The other question, why the speaker has come, whether he has come out of compassion or this or that, is really quite meaningless because if he speaks out of affection you know it, it doesn't need any confirmation. And whether he confirms or denies, it of no relevant value. You can't say to the beauty of a sun or of a cloud, 'why are you like that?' You see it is as it and when you look at it what matters is how you look what you do with what you have looked at.

Question: How is one to break a concept that one has fully built?

Krishnamurti: What does that word concept mean? conceive, to conceive an ideology, to formulate an idea - you understand? There is the Communist ideology, the Catholic ideology, the Hindu ideology, the Buddhist and so on. Why do we formulate ideas at all? When do you discover something new, not when you are caught in ideologies, obviously not. The man who discovered the jet, how did he discover. He knew all about the ways of the piston, the structure of a piston engine, with propeller and so on; and he discovered the jet only when there was an interval between what knew and what he was going to find; that is, when the mind is completely silent between the old and the new. It happens to us often, this is nothing mysterious. Only the mischief begins when

we say, 'I want to keep that state when I can discover something new. I want that to continue'. Therefore thought interferes and makes it old and destroys it. We formulate, or conceive ideas because it is much too dangerous to live without ideas and without concepts, formulas; because we have to live most intensely in the present. And to live so completely in the present is a dangerous thing. And therefore formulas, beliefs act as a protection. And a mind that is protecting itself ceases to be a mind. So when one is aware of all that - aware of it, not how to get rid of it, how stop it, how to go beyond it, but just aware of it that is to know the nature and the structure of it, then you will see if you have really looked at it - at the structure of breeding a concept - have really looked with great attention, with care, with affection, then you will find the mind is beyond it. But to give such complete attention, there needs to be a tremendous intensity, energy, demand. But we have neither the energy, nor the intensity, nor the urgency.

Question: Do you think loneliness is a form of projection of oneself?

Krishnamurti: You don't have to project what you are, that is what actually takes place, if you have felt it. I wonder, if I may ask, why we ask questions at all. Not of the speaker, but why we ask. We must ask, we must doubt, we must question everything from the very foundation to the very end of life, one must question, doubt, have no faith, because people who have faith have been led into a great deal of misery: faith in leaders, the political leader or the religious leader, they have brought about destruction, they have brought about anarchy. So we must question, we must doubt, we must ask; but why do we ask and who is going to tell us? Please do

listen to this: who is going to tell us? If someone is willing to tell you, then that person becomes the authority, then you are caught in the same old trap again. So we have to find out why we ask. First, from what motive, from what background, from what intensity, with what clarity, with what drive you ask. Or, is it a casual asking when you are sitting comfortably after a good meal. Or, is the question you are asking because you are dissatisfied, therefore finding in the answer satisfaction? Or are you asking the question to bring clarity to yourself, so that by your own questioning you will begin to see very, very clearly? And one asks questions because one is confused, and a mind that is confused can only receive confused answers, cannot receive clear answers, because it is confused. So you have to find out if you are asking questions out of confusion or are asking questions out of clarity. If there is clarity you will never ask a question. It is only the confused mind that asks, and having asked, because it cannot receive the right answer, remains in confusion. Therefore asking a question reveals your own state of mind to yourself, whether it is confused or not confused. That is why one has to ask questions, and there is great beauty in the discovery of what one actually is.

28th May 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 5TH PUBLIC TALK AMSTERDAM 30TH MAY 1967

THIS IS THE last talk. We have been considering many problems of life and I think we should also enquire into the problem of what is a religious mind. We have talked about fear, death, and also we went into the question of what love is. I think we should this evening consider the state of mind that is able to perceive what is truth. Because man, not only in the West but also in the East has been searching, groping endlessly to find out what truth is, and what God is: if there is a God, if there is such a thing as truth. Every culture, every civilization, every human being throughout the world has been asking this question. And it seems to me that we should not only ask the question seriously, but also find out for ourselves, not theoretically, not as a vague belief in a concept, in an idea, but find out the fact whether there is God or not. There is a whole group of people who deny the very idea of God, because to them it smells too much, it stinks. They throw it out, because in the name of religion so many crimes have been committed; there have been so many wars - in the name of God, in the name of peace there has been such torture - as the Inquisition. And there are those who firmly assert that there is. And to belong to either camp, to the believer or non-believer, seems to me so utterly immature; because both are conditioned to believe. From childhood one is brought up to believe that there is God, that there is a truth, that it must be attained, that only a certain saviour can show the way, or help one. And there is the whole Communist world which doesn't believe it at all, from childhood they are conditioned not to believe.

So there isn't much difference between the believer and the non-believer, because both are conditioned, to believe or not to believe. And it seems to me, to find out if there is such a reality, if there is something beyond the measure of man's mind, one must set aside totally all belief and non-belief - and that requires a great deal of energy; because one can deny, or one can accept, but we believe because we are afraid; our life is so uncertain, our life has very little meaning, it has no significance, no lasting, enduring meaning. So we want to find something that will give us abiding significance, abiding comfort, a depth to our life. So out of this deep loneliness, misery, uncertainty, we create, or put together, an idea called God or truth. And there are those people who say there is no such thing at all; that there is only this present life, which must be lived bitterly, without any hope, without any significance; making the best of it and living as decently, as peacefully as possible.

So, to find out, not intellectually, because the intellect cannot answer this question - it can argue, it can dialectically tear opinion down, or invent a theory - but intellect, with all its cunning capacity can never find out. The more the intellect enquires the more it is inclined to believe, because one observes throughout the world that intellectual people are believers. Or they join the other group, they don't believe. But if one seriously, with full intention, demands of oneself that it is absolutely imperative to find out - not so as to give meaning to life, not as a thing of security, as something that can give comfort - but if one has the intention to find out, then one has to end all belief. Because belief gives hope, and one needs hope; because in the life we lead, the everyday

miserable, conflicting, anxious life, in which there is no answer, such a life demands a hope, needs a hope and therefore it invents according to its culture, according to its climate, according to its temperament and inclination whether it be artistic, material, and so on - such a mind invents, and in what it has invented, in that lies its hope.

But a man who would enquire and come upon this reality, if there is one, must obviously not only deny totally all forms of belief - which doesn't mean he becomes atheistic, a nonbeliever - but also he must deny every form of hope, because hope is born of belief. Again, this doesn't mean that one becomes cynical, bitter, materialistic, callous, indifferent. This is an immense question; it isn't just a matter of belief, a matter of words, a matter of concepts. Man has lived for so long with words, with concepts, with belief, with hope, but has never actually come upon that state of mind which actually perceives what is. And in enquiring into this question there is the danger of falling into the trap of becoming completely superficial; that is, when there is no hope, no belief - which demands tremendous understanding, not merely a denial - but when one does put it aside, then there is the danger of becoming materialistic in the sense, not of not having possessions, houses and so on, but materialistic in the sense of worshipping something in the nature of the State. You know what is happening in the world, you deny God on the one hand and create another kind of God, which is the Communist ideology. You can deny the ideologies of the religions and yet be extremely alert - not be caught in the ideologies of the State, as all important - or in working for the State, or working for man, helping man, and

getting lost in that activity, which is obviously very materialistic - which doesn't mean that one mustn't help man. But to find out if there is a dimension, a totally different dimension, not invented by thought, one must be extremely alert not to create illusion, a fancy, a myth. Illusion exists only when there is a capacity to measure; that is to compare. And when there is no comparison at all there is no possibility of illusion. And this is important to understand, when the mind is enquiring into this extraordinary problem. Also there is another thing one must be aware of, which is, in denying in negating, there is the positive: in the very negation is the positive. That is, to deny war (not merely on the battlefield, but to deny war inwardly, conflict in any form) to totally deny it - in the very process of denying there is the energy which is not contaminated by the negative. That is, most of us are yes-sayers; we say 'yes'. We accept, we never say 'no'. And when we do say no (if it is not a revolt which is rather immature, like a child saying no to its parents, which has no meaning at all) when we deny, the very saying 'no' is the outcome of understanding. In that saying 'no' is the positive, and that positive, which is total energy, has no conflict of duality.

Conflict exists only when are two opposed things, when there is fear, and the state of non-fear; when there is violence and its opposite, which is non-violence. When these two exist within oneself then there is conflict; that is, all conflict comes into being through self-contradiction: 'I want this' and 'I don't want that'. But when one denies the actual, the actual being violence (not the non-violence, which has no reality at all, it has no meaning, it is just an idea) but to deny violence in oneself, in the very denial is the

energy, which is uncontaminated by its opposite.

Look Sirs, I'll put it round the other way. If you deny hate, envy (deny it, not build resistance against it, not escape from it, nor accept it) when you deny hate or violence, which breeds so much animosity, - and you can only deny it when you understand the nature of it, see what is implied in it, not intellectually, but actually - then when you deny that, in that very denial is the positive which is love in which there is no hate. Love is not the opposite of hate. So, when we deny every form of belief, belief in God, belief in saying `there is no God', when you deny both - which is to understand why human beings want to believe (because in that there is a hope, and one projects hope because one is frightened, one is insecure, anxious, in despair) then when you deny all that, negate it, in that very negation is a positive in which there is no conflict whatsoever.

So has one understood that in the total denial of man's structure with regard to what he calls God, or no God, in that negation is a state of mind which is utterly positive, in which there is no contradiction? Such a mind is necessary in order to find out if there is, or if there is not, a God, a truth. Which means a mind that is neither afraid, nor that merely accepts the world as it is. The world as it is needs tremendous revolution, not economic or social, but psychological revolution, deeply, a revolution that is not born of ideas, a revolution not born according to Marx, Freud or Jung, or any of these opposite camps; but a revolution deep in the psyche, and it is only such a revolution that can bring about a different world altogether.

So we are going to enquire together. You know when a man is

hungry he is not satisfied with a description of food: he wants it. In the same way you and the speaker are going to explore this question, but as we said, to explore there must be freedom from every form of belief; otherwise you are tied. It's like an animal tied to a post, it can wander within the limits of the length of the rope, but it is not free. Therefore, to enquire the first imperative necessity is to be totally free of belief - without becoming bitter, cynical, superficial, or merely intellectually inventing theories and living in those theories.

That is, to enquire, search must come to an end. You know, man throughout the ages has been seeking, seeking this immeasurable something. Some people have had, they say, the experience of that, and communicate it to others. And the others want it again, they want it too. So they go after it, they search for it, they seek it out. But that thing cannot be experienced. When you experience that, it is not that. When you say you know what it is, then you don't know. Therefore one must understand this constant seeking, because that is the outcome of discontent. Most human beings are discontented with superficial things, and also at a deeper level there is discontent which can easily be satisfied, and being discontented we want to find something which will give a total contentment. And so we go after it, we ask, we beg, we pray, we demand, we seek. Man has done this throughout the ages. He says, what is truth, what is God, I must find out, I must seek it out. And when you seek, obviously you will find what you have projected. Please do understand this. If one seeks God, or truth, to find it you must already have known it; that is, you must be able to recognize it. And you are able to recognize it you have already known it. It a

vicious trap, and most of us are caught in it, because we are all seeking, seeking, seeking. And that probably is what most of you are here - without understanding the nature searching. So, to enquire is not to seek, when you see the nature of seeking.

When you are not seeking, searching, groping, then there is no authority: the authority of the priest, the authority the saint, the authority of the saviour, the authority of a teacher, including that of the speaker. There is no authority that is necessary to understand and that means complete freedom to find out, not according to somebody. So a mind that is enquiring - rather a mind that is in a state of enquiry which is very different from enquiring - a mind that is in a state of enquiry is entirely different from a mind that is seeking; because in seeking is implied effort, conformity authority and therefore conflict. When the mind is utterly free from every form of authority - whether it is the authority outwardly of the church, or the priest, or doctrine, belief dogmas, rituals, or the authority of one's own experience. then the mind is in a state of constant enquiry, and therefore it is free from illusion. That is, when the mind is free from belief, and is not caught in the trap of its opposite; when the mind is free from fear, and hence at the end of seeking, and therefore free from all authority, then it is in a state of enquiry. Such a mind is not an open mind, like a sieve; on the contrary! It is extraordinarily active, because (as we explained) it is only when there is a total denial of that which is not - total denial of organized religion which is not truth, then in that denial the positive - which is not touched by conflict, and is therefore completely free from all sense of compulsion and imitation, is capable of perceiving what is.

There are two things which it is absolutely necessary to find out about: the understanding of space, and the nature of silence. It is a most interesting thing to find out what space means. We are talking not of the distance between the earth and the moon, but psychological space, the space within. A mind that has no space is a shoddy, little mind, a petty mind; it is caught in a trap and the movement in the trap it calls living. But to find out what space is, inwardly, one must observe outwardly what is space. I do not know if you have ever thought about this. There is space only when there is a centre from which there is observation taking place. You see me, and I see you, because there is a space. You are in space and I am in space. You are the observer and the observed. So this space, psychological space, can only be understood if there is an understanding of the observer, the centre from which there is observation. This hall contains space, because there are four walls and a roof and a floor. Outside this hall there is also space. And within us there is the space which is created by the observer, by the censor: the space in which he lives.

Sirs, I'm afraid we're not conveying this very clearly. As long as there is a centre, that centre must create a limited space within the boundaries of its observation; that is fairly simple. There is this microphone, it exists within space; and it creates space round itself. In us psychologically there is the centre which creates the space between itself and the periphery. Without the centre, space is entirely different; then there is no boundary. When you look at the stars of evening you see the distance between yourself and the star. And when you look at yourself, when the centre is aware, itself, it creates a space round itself. So long as there is centre from which

there is observation taking place, it may observe extensively, but it will always be limited. Therefore the space that we know is always limited. And the freedom from that limitation only comes when there is no observer when there is no centre; it is only then there is freedom. That freedom must exist, and that is space. In that space the mind as thought, with its memories, experiences, which the very centre of the me, the I, the ego - that me, that (as the centre) creates round itself a space, which is consciousness. Therefore all consciousness is always limited. So a mind that is limited by its own centre is not capable of discovering what is true. It is always looking at something according its own limitation. If you are interested in this you can into it for yourself; you need nobody's help. You can observe how little space you have inwardly; we are overcrowded with noise, chattering, endless memories, images, symbols opinions, knowledge, crammed full of secondhand things. There is no space there at all; therefore there is no freedom. And without this space, in which there is no boundary, the mind is incapable of finding out, of coming upon that immeasurable reality.

Then also one must understand what silence is. You know we are never silent; either we are having a dialogue with our selves, or with somebody else. The machinery of thought incessantly active, projecting itself, what it should do, it must not do, how it has been - endlessly chattering, chattering, chattering; or conforming, accepting, comparing judging, condemning, imitating, obeying. Knowing this, there are various forms of meditation which tell you how to control thought. But controlling thought is not meditation at all anybody can concentrate, from the schoolboy to the higher

general preparing for war. And it is only a silent mind that can perceive, that can actually see; not a chattering mind, not a controlled mind, not a mind that is tortured, suppressed - nor yielding, indulging. It is only a very silent mind that can actually see. You only see a cloud, with its full light and beauty, or a leaf, when your mind is completely silent. Then you actually see it. Then in that silence the space between you and the leaf disappears, which doesn't mean you identify yourself with the leaf (which is idiotic). It is when the mind is completely silent, not made silent - you can make the mind very silent by taking a tranquillizer, a drug, or by controlling, forcing it; but such a mind is a stagnant mind, a dull mind. But when one understands the nature of chattering, comparing, the endless gossip that goes on within oneself, the dialogue - when you understand that - and to understand it is not an intellectual process, but actually to be aware of it, as it is taking place - out of that alertness, out of that watchfulness, the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet. Which doesn't mean the mind goes to sleep, or becomes blank. That is, when one has totally denied the world, the psychological world which man has created for himself and has denied the society in which he lives, that is, the psychological structure of society of which we are: the greed, the envy, the brutality, the violence, the jealousies, the hatred; then when you totally deny, you have space and silence. And it is only such a mind that is the religious mind, not belonging to any organized, propagandist religion - it is only such a mind that can see what is the immeasurable. And such a mind cannot, does not experience, because it is a light to itself.

But all this requires tremendous energy. One can derive energy

through friction, through conflict. One can derive energy by committing oneself to a certain form of activity. One can gather energy by identifying oneself with something which one calls greater. Or one can have energy by following certain ideologies and so on and so on. In that energy there is always conflict.

Therefore there is a deterioration of energy But what we are talking about is a state of energy in which there is no conflict whatsoever. Therefore that energy is the highest form of intelligence. And it is only such a mind that is - perhaps - the immeasurable.

If you are so inclined, perhaps we can discuss, talk over together by asking questions. You know, you cannot ask question about what is truth, what is God, what is the purpose of life. Such questions have no meaning whatever. Man who sees light doesn't ask, what is light.

Question: Could you define what is contemplation and what is meditation?

Krishnamurti: The definitions are in the dictionary, but we are not concerned with definition or explanation. We are concerned with the understanding of what actually is. So, what is meditation, and what is contemplation? If you have listened this whole hour attentively, that is meditation. And that is also contemplation. But if you have listened and merely heard words, and gathered a few ideas to carry home to think about, then you have not meditated. You are merely carrying home empty ashes without any meaning. Meditation not according to various groups that exist throughout the world, but actual meditation is a state of mind which looks; regards, observes everything with complete attention; total not just parts of it. Attention is not fragmentary, it is a total thing. And no

one can teach you how to be attentive. If an system teaches you how to be attentive, then you are being attentive about that system and that is not attention; nor attention concentration. Concentration is exclusion. You can concentrate - it is an effort: excluding, building a wall around yourself. But attention has no wall, and such is meditation. That is what meditation is, when the mind is completely silent Questioner: (interrupting)

Krishnamurti: Madam, I haven't finished. Wait a minute Sir! Because meditation is one of the greatest arts of life - perhaps the greatest arts. Because in the understanding of meditation there is love, and love is not the product of systems, of habits, of following a method. Love cannot be cultivated by thought. Love can perhaps come in to being when there is complete silence. And the mind can only be silent when it understands the nature of its own movement, as thought and feeling. And to understanding that, there can be no condemnation in observing thought and feeling. To so observe is discipline. Hence that kind of discipline is fluid, free, not the discipline of conformity. So meditation can take place when you are sitting in a `bus, or walking in the woods full of light and shadows, of listening to the singing birds, or looking at the face of your wife or husband'. Meditation is not something apart; it is the understanding of the totality of life in which every form of fragmentation of life has ceased. And also there is contemplation, to contemplate life, not from a centre, not from your particular idiosyncrasy, tendency, or inclination, but to contemplate the whole movement of life: the misery, the conflict, the confusion, the sorrow, the endless travail of man - to watch that as a total movement. You cannot watch it if there is any form condemnation.

Such contemplation is meditation. And you cannot contemplate or meditate if there is no silence.

Yes Sir?

Questioner: It is not possible totally to observe one's own irrational thoughts..?

Krishnamurti: When you say it is not possible you have answered the question. Questioner: Could it be possible?

Krishnamurti: No Madame. When you say it is not possible you have already blocked yourself. It is like a man saying It is possible. He has also blocked himself, prevented himself from observing. Surely one can observe one's thoughts. Have you ever observed your own anger? Not after it is over, but actually in the state of anger. Have you observed it? - in the state of annoyance, in the state of violence. That means, to observe that, you must be extraordinarily attentive. But most of us are inattentive, because that is the easiest way to live, and the dullest way to live, to be inattentive. And that has become a habit. Then we ask, how am I to break out of that habit. By observing the whole machinery of habit, because all of us live in habits. The mind lives in habit, because it is the easiest way. just to be aware of it - not to condemn it, not to say, it is right or wrong, but just to watch it! and you can watch it only when you care and you have affection. Love is not habit.

Questioner: If you have to be quiet, how can..?

Krishnamurti: You don't have to be quiet, Madame.

Questioner: If you are quiet, you have no thoughts. How can you then with that same mind watch your thoughts..

Krishnamurti: Have you ever observed out of silence Please, just listen. Have you ever observed anything out (silence? Please

don't answer me, I'm just asking you. You have listened for an hour to the speaker. Have you listen out of silence, or with the noise of opinion, judgement, evaluation, accepting or denying? Have you listened out of silence. Then if you have listened out of silence you have understand the totality of life. If you have not, then you will always be asking, how am I to do this, or to do that. just watch please - once. Just watch out of silence a bird, a tree, a movement of clouds. And when you have watched the movement of clouds out of silence, then watch your husband or wife out of silence and you will see how immeasurably, how extraordinarily difficult it is to watch - specially your husband or your wife, because you have images about them. It is only in silence that there is relationship, because in silence and out of silence there is love.

Questioner: What does it mean to stand alone.

Krishnamurti: First of all, are we ever alone? Do you ever walk by yourself in the woods? And if you do, are you alone? You may be alone physically, but you are not alone because you are carrying all the memories, all the conflicts, all the worries - you know, you are the past. You are alone only when all that is gone, when there is no family, no Gods made by thought, when you are no longer pursued by memories; only then are you alone. And it is only that aloneness that can see. Because it is that aloneness that is completely innocent. It is only the innocent that can see the full beauty of life.

Questioner: We are experiencing and recognizing all the time - implying that action is therefore divided.

Krishnamurti: Alright sir. What is action? When do you act? There are two kinds of action, aren't there? When you do

something instantly, because you understand completely and do it instantly. That is when you are confronted by a danger of any kind, there is instant action. And we are not confronted always with danger, but we are acting all the time. That action is derived from idea. There is the ideology first, the belief, and action according to that belief. Therefore there is contradiction between the idea and the action: a di- vision. Look sir, when you say I should be non-violent, I should be happy, I should be this or that, it is an idea; it is a formula, a concept. And according to that, you act. That is, action is always an approximation to that idea. So there is a division between the idea and action. And that is how we live. I want to fulfil, I want to be the greatest man (or whatever silly stuff one wants) and one projects that idea and according to that idea there is action. Therefore action always breeds conflict. Now is there (one has to go into this and there is not the time) is there an action, conscious action without idea? Don't say yes or no, find out! And find out also why ideas, formulas, patterns, have become so extraordinarily important in our lives. Don't you see why these have become important? Because without ideas, without patterns, without formulas and ideologies, the mind has to be tremendously active, alive, watchful. And as we do not want to be alive, watchful, we invent these ideas, because they soften our lives.

Questioner: When I observe my thoughts there is great tension -

Krishnamurti: When one observes one's thoughts, the questioner says, there is greater strain, greater conflict. Why does this take place? When you observe your thought why should there be strain? There is strain, tension, conflict, because you look at your thought with the eyes of condemnation?, comparison, judgement, you don't

look at it. When I look at that microphone, I can look at it and not make it a strain. But if I say, 'I don't like it', immediately it becomes a strain. We compare and judge because we are conditioned to look at every thing in our life with condemnation, comparison, or justification; never to look at things as they are without any of this. Then you will find, Sirs, life becomes very simple: you can look.

30th May 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 1ST PUBLIC TALK LONDON 16TH SEPTEMBER 1967

I THINK IT WOULD be best, if I may suggest, that I talk for a while and then we can go into the details of what has been said and talk it over together and see if we can't go further into the matter.

I think we ought to keep these meetings quite informal and not have a series of talks in which you participate by merely listening and not taking any part. What would be worthwhile, it seems to me, would be that we share what we are going to talk over together. Because I feel that life has become so complex, the everyday living with all its strains, with all the pressures, the violence, the hatred, the brutality, the massing of opinions and judgments against people, all this has become so extraordinarily complex that unless one thinks and feels very clearly and makes one's way through this confusing world, I do not see how it is possible to come upon something which is not of this world - in which there is no violence, no evaluation of another, but only regard for facts. And so, it seems to me, what is important is to understand the psychological structure of the society in which we are caught, and see if it is at all possible to go beyond it; because most of the people throughout the world are discontented with the structure of society as it is. They are in revolt - the beatniks, the hippies, the long-haired ones and the short-haired ones. There are various forms of drugs to escape from the business world, from the world of the army, from the world of violence, from the world of routine - the structure that has no meaning whatsoever as it is - it is a matter of mere survival without any significance, without any

deep meaning to it.

And we all know this; throughout the world this is going on, there is a major or minor form of revolt - disowning the country, burning the draft card and all the rest of it. There is a great deal of poverty and starvation for which, as the structure of the world is, there is no answer. There is a great deal of discontent - spending one's whole life, thirty, forty years in an office. And the revolution, whether it be of the right or of the left, has the same issue: that of man's relationship to man, the conflict, the misery, the suffering, the agony that each one of us goes through. We have to understand this because each one of us has brought this into being, we have created this society. Each one of us is responsible for the psychological structure of this society, because each one of us is greedy, violent, brutal, amassing judgments and opinions against others and holding on to our prejudices, our nationalities, our beliefs which have become superstition. We have built this society, of which we are part, and until we understand this structure, psychologically, inwardly, and perhaps are able to break through it - which is to go beyond it, not as an escape, not by going into a monastery, but actually become psychologically disentangled - I do not see how there can be a different world or how we can enter into a totally different dimension. Because that is, after all, what most of us are trying to find out - at least those who are fairly sane, fairly balanced, intelligent - a world which is not put together by thought, a world which is not the outcome of our own everlasting struggles and battles.

How we can come upon that world, of which man has talked endlessly - it has been called by different names, in the East it has

one name, in the West another? For man wants to find something that is more than mere physical living, with all its comforts and discomforts and so on. I feel that one cannot possibly come upon this unless we are capable of disentangling ourselves from the psychological structure which we call the society in which we live. So if you will we shall go into that first: whether it is possible, living in this world, to be free of this world, be free of anxiety, fear, despair, of the utter boredom of existence which has very little meaning as it is, and in which there is no affection. And living a daily life in this world, whether the mind can free itself from its own structure, which it has built; psychologically it has built a structure of greed, of acquisitiveness, of envy, of violence, of deep unmitigated despair. I think that is the real issue. People have attempted it by withdrawing from this world into a monastery, by various forms of escape, through drugs, through beliefs, through denials, through complete self-sacrifice and so on. But it seems to me that doesn't lead very far. What they escape into is their own projection, and their own projection is not very enlightening.

So one asks oneself, if one is at all serious, whether a mind caught in its own psychological structure can really free itself from its own bondage. Because it is only in freedom that one can see, that one can listen, observe and watch - being free, not in a particular direction but totally free, all round. Freedom is not in fragments - being free here and not free there. But a freedom that comes into being with complete self-knowledge - by knowing oneself completely - to enquire into such freedom and go into it more deeply, widely, seems to me worthwhile, because every other problem has very little meaning.

So the enquiry is whether freedom is possible for the mind with all its complexity - both the conscious as well as the unconscious mind - the mind that goes to the office, the technological mind, the mind that lives at home with a wife and children, the mind that is in constant battle with itself, and the mind that is groping after something that is real, true, that is of no church, no dogma, no religion. Until one finds that - and one cannot find it without this freedom which comes when there is total self-knowing - any form of search, any form of enquiry into another dimension seems to me utterly futile; such enquiry is based on belief (generally) and belief is essentially superstition. To believe is to be superstitious, which is to avoid facts, to avoid `what is'. And `what is' is this psychological structure which the mind has created for itself, in which it is caught. During these talks and discussions we are going to enquire whether the mind can be free. To enquire sanely, intelligently, healthily, one must become aware of one's own bandages and be free of them - surely? Because if I want to enquire into anything there must be a certain amount of freedom; I can't be tethered to a particular conclusion, to any particular belief or even to any particular knowledge. One must be free of them to enquire - to enquire into one's self which is so absolutely necessary - otherwise you have no basis for any rational, clear thinking.

To enquire one must be free from the dogmas, the particular Freudian or Indian psychologies; if you enquire along their lines you are finding out what they think and you don't know about yourself. That seems to me fairly obvious. If I want to know about myself, I have to put away totally, completely, Freud, Jung, or any psychologist, any analyst or any philosopher, or any religious

teacher, or any form of authority. Because if the mind can put away all that, then I can look at myself actually as I am - discover what actually is and from there find out, move.

First, is one capable of doing that? It demands a great seriousness, it demands energy; to watch oneself in every action, in every thought, in every feeling, in every gesture, to be aware of all this. And is one sufficiently serious or does one merely play with these things and enquire with curiosity, outwardly, into something that has no value at all? So the first thing is to ask oneself if one is serious. I don't see how you can not be serious. Because every indication of what is going on in the world - the wars, the brutalities, the utter loneliness and boredom of everyday existence, the routine - all that must make one very serious. I mean not serious about something, not serious about a particular belief or a particular activity, but that quality of mind that is serious in itself. And I think that is rather difficult, for most of us are serious about something, about a particular fancy, a particular idea, a particular dogma or in seeking a particular experience. Most of those hippies are serious because they want to find out a different way of living, and their seriousness takes innumerable forms: drugs, living in a community and so on, and so on. But it seems to me that the quality of seriousness in itself is entirely different - the quality of seriousness which is not 'about something', which is in itself serious. I don't know if I am able to convey this: a mind that is inherently, inescapably serious. I do not know if you have noticed that serious quality is with the young; a young mind is serious, but the older mind is serious about something. Because the older mind has already found answers, ways of meeting life. It is already

burdened with knowledge, with experience, it is already old; but a young mind is in itself serious and from that seriousness it begins to act and think and feel.

It seems to me that one must have this seriousness to begin to enquire into oneself, healthily, not neurotically. Because what I am is the world; the world as it is, is what I am; the individual as well as the collective: I am all that. This is not some mystical state, this is an actual daily fact. I am greedy and I have created a world that is greedy; I am acquisitive, I am anxious, I am violent, I am competitive, and I have created a psychological structure of a society in which it is possible for those things to express themselves. So the world is not different from what I am, and the individual, as the `me' is the collective - which is the various forms of the `me'. So I think we should not get lost in this battle between the individual and the collective, the whole and the particular. When we exaggerate one, we destroy the other. But when one regards the total structure of man - not the Englishman, the Frenchman, the German, the Russian, the Chinese - but man throughout the world, one sees he is caught in this. Wherever one goes one finds the same problems, the same daily problems, the same daily anxieties, worries, despairs, and fears of death. So when we are enquiring into ourselves we are not isolating ourselves from the rest of the world. It is not a process of unhealthy isolation; on the contrary, it is the most sane thing to do, because one observes the world, the society in which one lives and it is so corrupt, so brutal that one demands a change, an inward revolution. Obviously the outward revolutions, the Communists, the old French Revolution and so on, they have led back to the same old pattern.

But what is necessary is not mere outward economic social revolution, but psychological revolution, so that each one is a different entity altogether. And to enquire into oneself there must first be seriousness; to enquire into oneself one must see actually `what is', both outwardly and inwardly - not having an opinion of what is the outer and what is the inner, but just look.

I do not know if you have ever looked at anything - looked at a cloud or a tree, looked at a flower or looked at your neighbour, or at yourself - looked, watched. I think that watching, looking, is immensely important. We look through the image which we have about the thing which we are watching. You look at me and you have an image about me and according to that image you are looking. Is it possible to look without the image? - to watch, to look, without any evaluation, but merely to observe what actually is? Because we are a mass of contradictions, we are conditioned in various ways, by the climate, the food, the literature, the pressures of society, the propaganda and so on. There is the propaganda of the church as well as the propaganda in the newspapers, of politics or sports, or whatever it is. We are conditioned. And with that conditioning we look at ourselves - that is, if we want to look at ourselves! And so we never observe `what is', we are looking at the projection which we have formed about ourselves. So if one is serious, the first thing to discover for oneself is how one observes anything; how one observes the neighbour, the cloud, and oneself. Can I look at myself actually as I am, psychologically? That watching in itself is an extraordinary discipline, isn't it? To look in itself is a discipline, isn't it? But we have disciplined ourselves to look - which is an entirely different thing. We have spent our

energy in disciplining ourselves - to be, to look, to listen, to strive, to adjust and so on and so on. So the discipline has conditioned us; whereas the very act of listening, looking, at anything, demands in itself a form of discipline.

I want to listen to you, to what you're saying: to listen I must give complete attention. If my mind wanders off I'm not listening. But to stop this wandering is a form of discipline which is a waste of energy. Whereas what is important is the watching: watching not only myself, but the wandering away from what I'm watching. What I am concerned with is watching, not that which I am watching. I want to watch myself but, as I am watching, my thoughts go off, wander off, so I try to bring those thoughts back to the point which I am watching, and so there is a conflict. Whereas if my concern is watching, I watch 'what is' and I am also watching when the mind wanders off, so there is no contradiction. My concern is watching all the time. And that watching in itself creates its own discipline; hence that very enquiry into oneself is its own discipline. And one needs such discipline to go into oneself totally.

For the moment we'll leave it at that and continue tomorrow morning. So let us talk over together what we have talked about.
Questioner: This watching oneself is the most difficult thing.

Krishnamurti: I wonder why? Well, let's talk about it. Please, here there is no authority, I am not an authority. Before we begin to ask questions, let's find out what makes us ask questions. One must ask questions, one must not accept anything, any authority, including that of the speaker. We must have a healthy scepticism about everything. To ask questions surely is necessary. But why do we ask questions? To find out something? And from whom? From

the speaker? Why do you look to the speaker to find an answer - or does the answer lie in the very question, if we know the right question? We can ask innumerable questions, very fundamental ones, superficial ones, or very casual questions. But to ask a question in itself demands a mind that has really enquired, gone into, asked, and begins to find out from within itself. So there is no authority. If one accepts that as a fundamental thing - that nobody is going to answer one's problem - one has to dig into it oneself. I feel that we do not know how to dig, how to look, how to enquire, go into it and it is this incapacity which might produce a question which will be a wrong question, whereas if we are able to find out why one does not have this capacity to go into oneself, to enquire, to look, to search, to answer, to find out, then our questions will have quite a different meaning. Then our questions will be right questions and therefore we will be likely to have right answers. Please, it doesn't mean that I'm preventing you from asking questions, but it is important to find out for oneself, why we ask and the nature of the question - and whether we expect somebody to answer. Or perhaps you ask as an enquiry, so that we can both go together, we can both take the journey into that question. Such an enquiry has meaning. Yes Sir? Questioner: Do you believe that each of us has enough inherent ability to begin to understand ourselves?

Krishnamurti: Has each one of us sufficient intelligence to enquire into himself?

Questioner: Well, I said to 'understand'.

Krishnamurti: 'Understand oneself'. Sir, when you apply yourself seriously to understand something, you begin to

understand it. The scientist applies himself in his laboratory to find out the nature of matter; he may have little intelligence, but the more he applies it the more energy and the more quality of that intelligence comes into being. So here I am - I don't know anything about myself. I know what others have said about me, and I don't accept what others have said. They may be totally mistaken, or may be totally right, but I'm not interested in what others say. So I begin to learn about myself. I watch my thoughts, my feelings, my gestures and the words I use, the emotions I have, my reactions to various things; and out of that watching I am learning. So there is a much more fundamental issue involved, which is - does the learning about oneself demand time? That is - does one gradually learn about oneself? Is it a matter of gradually learning about myself?

Questioner: I think personal experience does show people that in fact we do not have this ability and that to understand oneself thoroughly requires a certain ability. I am a scientist, I am aware of how scientists pursue their work, and people do realize in the course of research that their ability is not sufficient to find the answer. And this is why people like Einstein were able to push the frontiers of science further, because they had a greater ability. And understanding oneself is a very difficult task and I'm asking: have we in fact got the ability? I don't really think we have.

Krishnamurti: Have we got the ability? I think one has if one applies it. Sir, that requires a great deal of energy, doesn't it? We dissipate energy; we dissipate energy in conflict, in judgments, in opinions. But if you are concerned actually with 'what is' and are looking at yourself as you are, which is yourself, surely you have

the energy; that energy will create its own intelligence. Have I that intelligence to enquire into myself? Why do I ask that question?

Questioner: It needs courage.

Krishnamurti: No, it doesn't - I don't think it needs courage or anything of that kind. Why do I ask whether I have the ability or the intelligence to look at myself and go through to the very end of it? Because I am already doubting that I have. So I've already blocked myself. I compare myself with others who have this ability, and through comparison I get lost.

Questioner: I never mentioned courage.

Krishnamurti: You did not, Sir.

Questioner: Can I tell you something?

Krishnamurti: Yes, Sir.

Questioner: I have been wondering for a long time whether or not we create ourselves entirely.

Krishnamurti: Obviously not. We are the product of so many influences, so many ideas, so many strains, propaganda, beliefs, and so on. We are a result and can we go beyond that result? If I was born in India with all the tradition of that particular class of people who call themselves Brahmins (who have been so heavily conditioned for centuries), and have been educated here and there, this entity is the result of all that. It is the product of all that, of education or lack of education - all that. And is it possible to go beyond it? If not, I am a prisoner in the particular trap in which I am caught; I can decorate the trap, make it more comfortable, but it's still a trap. What we are asking ourselves is whether it is possible to go beyond all this, beyond this fear, anxiety, brutality, violence, which we are.

Questioner: Is it best to start this self-enquiry during quiet moments, which occur during meditation, or any time during the day?

Krishnamurti: The word 'meditation' and the word 'quietness' and 'enquiry' seem to me to contradict each other. One has to enquire, or rather be aware of what one is, in every relationship, in every movement of thought and feeling; that can take place when we are in a bus, or a tube, or talking to a friend and so on. But the question of meditation and silence, quietness, surely that is something entirely different. I do not know if you want to go into that - perhaps this is not the moment for it?

Questioner: Sir, enquiry implies no criticism, that seems a bit difficult. You have to avoid criticism, self-criticism.

Krishnamurti: That's it. How do we avoid criticism, self-criticism when we are enquiring, when we are looking? Sir, why do we have to have criticism when we are looking? I look at you, I look at myself, why should I criticize myself? The fact is what I am. Why should I criticize it? I am angry, I am violent - why should I criticise it? What do we mean by criticising? - evaluating it, having a judgment about it? I watch and I realize I am violent. That's a fact. Why should I have an opinion, a judgment, an evaluation about it? And how do I know that I am violent if I'm not judging at all - right, Sir? I have an image of non-violence, haven't I? When I judge, when I criticize, I have an idea that there is a state of mind which is not violent; and so the non-violence is used as a means to condemn violence. Now I have no ideas at all because they have no meaning, but what has meaning is 'what is: that I am violent. Can I watch that violence without any form of criticism,

without any form of evaluation, just observe it? I am violent in my relationships, I am violent in my office, I am violent in Vietnam. Violence has so many different forms - I am violent when I am greedy, envious, competitive, ambitious, when I hate, when I am jealous. Can I watch all its expressions as they happen? And when I watch them, why should I have any criticism about them? They are so. And as I watch, I begin to go into something much deeper, which is: who is the watcher? I watch in myself violence as jealousy, or hate, whatever you will. I watch it. And as I watch, who is the observer that's watching? Is the observer different from that which he watches? Is not the observer himself violent? So the observer is the observed. No?

Questioner: Excuse me, Sir. Judgment is inherent... it is the way it happens. If there is something and you observe it, you are observing it from a position and there is a space between your position and what is observed - this is inherent in the way it happens.

Krishnamurti: Yes, that is - when I watch violence the very word violence has its own images. And the watcher who says, 'I am watching my violence', that very verbalization of the watcher divides the watcher from the watched. Right? Questioner (interrupting: With regard to what you said about seriousness...

Krishnamurti: Let's finish this - sorry, Sir. Look, I watch violence. I see violence as anger, brutality, jealousy, tremendous efforts, competition, all the rest of it; I watch the expression of this violence in different forms. Can I watch them without verbalizing? And is the watcher merely watching without verbalizing? And is the division between the watcher and the watched created by the

word? I don't know if you follow. And if there is no verbalization at all, then is the watcher different from that which he watches? One has to go into this very very deeply - it isn't a matter of casual explanation. Look, one watches a cloud. Do you watch it with a concept, with a word, or do you merely watch it? Not as an abstraction, but when you watch it without verbalisation - and hence there is no division between the watcher and the watched - then is there an observer?

Questioner: Is that the subject-object relationship between the observer, the watcher, and the watched?

Krishnamurti: Yes, yes, Sir. You know, Sir, I have been told by those people who have taken the drug LSD, that the space between the watcher and the watched disappears; the time interval ceases, for a second. And that state of observation in which the observer 'is not' is entirely different from when there is the observer. Now, that LSD, whatever it does (it does a great deal of harm and so on) is a chemical reaction. But we are asking whether it is possible to come to some perception which is not induced by any drug, in which the observer is the observed. That is, the space and time interval ceases. And I say it is possible only when there is only watching, without the interference of the word, which is thought, which is knowledge, the idea, which is rationalized, organized thought. So when it is not there, then is the observer different from the observed? To find this out, to go into it very very deeply, is part of meditation. One has to go into it in detail; perhaps we will go into this whole question of meditation another time. But it is important when we are examining ourselves, looking at ourselves, not to create any conflict, which comes about through

criticism, through denial, through suppression and resistance to 'what is'. And the cessation of conflict only comes when the observer is the observed - which is when the space between the watcher and the watched ceases; because the watcher is violent, as well as that which he watches as violence - obviously! The two are not separate. When I say I am angry, 'I' am not different from 'anger'. Verbally, it's clear, but to actually experience it, to be in that state, is extraordinarily difficult. And we try various tricks like drugs and so on to dissipate that space and the time interval between the watcher and the watched.

Questioner: Sir, is the cessation of that space an involuntary action or a voluntary action?

Krishnamurti: That is, does that space disappear through will, or not? Isn't that it, Sir? Does anything disappear through will? I wish with all my being not to be jealous, but though I may set my will against it, I may resist it, it is always there in full form. So this whole problem of the will - that again would need going into in detail.

Questioner: When you contemplate something which seems in itself to be valuable, like a flower, and as a poet you could become that flower - then there is no difference between you and that, since you have understood it. But if you are contemplating something which seems to be evil (I know making a judgment), but something which one doesn't wish to contemplate, such as violence, then when you have removed the distance between yourself and the violence, what is the good of that? Is it because then you can transcend? Do you understand?

Krishnamurti: Yes, I understand the question. When you look at

a flower it's fairly easy to identify yourself with the flower, but when you look at violence, something which you call evil, by merely dissipating the space between the observer and the observed, will that evil disappear? Isn't that the question? When you look at a flower and identify yourself with that flower, are you the flower? Obviously you're not the flower. I can identify myself with this country, but I am not this country. I'm a human being, I'm not an ideal. So I can identify myself with ideas, with images, but not with 'what is'. I can look at a tree and identify myself with the tree, but I never become the tree. (I hope not!) (Laughter) But what is important, is not identification at all; that we have done - identifying ourselves with a country, with an idea, with a church, with God, and so on - which has led to such appalling misery. But to look at a tree without any identification with it - to look at it, to watch it - as one watches it one finds out how to watch. As you watch, perhaps you begin to love it. And the space between yourself and the tree is not. That doesn't mean you become the tree. It's the same if one watches that which one calls evil. You see, we want to identify ourselves with the good and not identify ourselves with the evil. But can you identify yourself with the good? Goodness can only flower when there is no conflict; but there will be conflict as long as you are identifying yourself with something, with what you call good and denying, resisting that which you call evil. In both, in identifying with the evil, in that there is conflict. Whereas if you observe what is the good and the evil - watch it - then perhaps you can go beyond both.

16th September 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 2ND PUBLIC TALK LONDON 17TH SEPTEMBER 1967

IF WE MAY, we will continue with what we were talking about yesterday.

Either we follow blindly, or intelligently, or according to our inclination. There is really no intelligent following. And blind following, psychologically, is obviously most detrimental, not only to the follower but also to the one who is followed. And if we follow another according to our inclination, that again leads to a great deal of misery. So one observes that any form of psychological following (except of course in the technological field) is most destructive; you follow someone who you consider knows more, accepting what he says, but thereby you distort your own intelligence. Can one follow another intelligently at all? And does not following of a particular authority in the psychological field destroy every form of intelligence? Most of us are inclined, in the so-called psychological field, to accept according to our inclination, which is essentially based on pleasure. And it seems to me that every form of following, imitation, conformity, is contrary to understanding, to learning. So one can, right from the beginning, put aside every form of psychological authority and that is extraordinarily difficult to do for most people; because most people are afraid of going wrong, of not coming quickly to a certain understanding and experience, and if another promises such understanding, such experience, obviously it is very tempting. The inclination to follow becomes stronger when the bait is very attractive; and in the psychological field there are so many baits,

each leader, guru, teacher, promising something. When we imitate and follow, we are not understanding ourselves, which is absolutely necessary. Hence I think from the very beginning we have to put aside every form of authority: the guru, the leader, the teacher, the saviour, the priest, the analyst, the psychologist, the philosopher, the theoretician, (communist or spiritual) - the theologian.

Can we do this? Because if we do not do this - not verbally but actually, inwardly, directly and very simply - I do not see how we can at all be free to learn. And can one stand alone? Because if one is not following any form of authority, both outward and inward, then inevitably there is the fear of going wrong. One can more or less intelligently discard the outer authority of any particular system, guru, teacher, psychologist, philosopher, theologian and priest; that is fairly simple, because one sees through all that very quickly. One can set that aside comparatively easily; but what is much more difficult, it seems to me, is to put aside the authority of our own experience, the authority of our own knowledge, the authority that one has accumulated through learning, which becomes the guide. Therefore we live on the past, so the past becomes a great measure, a great teacher: the past established through centuries of propaganda of the church, or the past of our own experience. Because when one follows the past, the totality of time is not understood. And most of us do accept the past most obediently. In the technological field, obviously, one must rely on that which has been, which has been accumulated, which is so-called knowledge. It would be absurd to destroy all that and begin all over again; but in the psychological field, in the field that lies

behind the mind - behind the skin as it were - there the authority of our own knowledge, of our own experience, which is essentially based on our inclination and tendency and the pressure of environment (which we call the past), that authority becomes our guiding principle. If one observes oneself one can see that very simply. I've learnt something yesterday, or after having lived for so many years have accumulated a certain knowledge through endeavour, through conflict, through sorrow, through pain and pleasure and that memory becomes the guide, and that becomes our authority and therefore all learning comes to an end.

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

And that living thing we are trying to translate in terms of the past, examining that living thing through the past, and that's why we find it so extraordinarily difficult to learn about ourselves;

because we have the standard of the past, the right and the wrong, the good and the bad (not that there is not good and bad), but we have this image established, rooted in the past and that image prevents the understanding of the present, which is the living me.

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

particular course of action; nor the aloneness of the person who is abandoned, who has no place in society. When you repudiate the whole psychological structure of society you are inevitably alone, and that again breeds a great deal of fear. Because most of us are the past and live with the past; the older one gets the more the past becomes extraordinarily significant, it becomes the guide.

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

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

So is it possible to be free of fear? Because that's part of myself.

I've examined the reactions of authority - following, imitation, acceptance, obedience - and I find behind all this there is this quality of fear. And is it possible to be wholly and totally free of this thing called fear?

Now to understand it and go into it, one must be aware of it and not accept it because somebody tells you you are afraid. There is surely a difference between a person who feels hungry and a person who is told that he is hungry. Most of us are told that we are hungry. So is it possible for us to be aware without escape, without justification, without condemning this fear? - fear of death, fear of husband or wife, fear of society, fear of losing a job, fear of a dozen things.

Can we be aware now, as we are talking about it? Take your own particular form of fear and we will go into the very depth of it (we're not analysing collectively). Each one is doing it for himself - the speaker is merely a mirror, is the telephone to which you are listening. But that listening will have very little value if you are not looking, watching listening to this very fear in yourself. So it's your responsibility, it's entirely your work, not the work of the speaker.

One has not only to listen to the speaker attentively, but also as you are listening observe yourself. So this listening is a unitary process - not that you are listening to the speaker and then looking at yourself - but the very act of listening is the observation of yourself. Is that fairly clear? Can we go on?

I am afraid about something, there is no fear as an abstraction; it is in relation to something. I am afraid of something - the past, what people say, death, lack of love, the fear of the wife or the husband, and so on. Now, how do I look at that fear? Please, let's

go slowly, step by step into it. I say, I am observing that fear, I know that I am afraid and I know the reactions to that fear, and now I'm trying not to escape from it, not to suppress it nor even to analyse it, because analysis is a waste of energy. Please understand this: when you look at something very closely, with complete attention, you don't have to analyse, it is all there. It is only when you are inattentive that you have time to analyse. But when the thing is immediate, demanding your complete attention, then you will see the whole thing without any form of analytical process.

What is important is how you observe. One has to learn not about fear (for the moment) but how to observe, how to watch. If I know how to watch, really learn about watching, observing, seeing, then perhaps there is no need to enquire into fear at all! We'll go into that.

So, I have to learn about watching and what does that mean - watching, observing, seeing, listening? Is it possible to observe, watch, listen, if there is already a conclusion, if there is already a formula from which I'm watching, a memory, which dictates my watching, or a previous experience through which I watch? Please, as we go along, if I may suggest, go into it within yourself and you'll see how difficult it is to observe, see. When there is already a conclusion, when there is already a judgment, when you've already an opinion about that which you're going to watch, it is all based on memory: memory from which thought arises. So when there is a watching with thought, there is no watching at all - right? So I have to learn to watch without a conclusion. Is that possible, without becoming vague, abstract, dreamy? That is, when you watch with total attention, is there any conclusion? When I am watching

something with complete attention, there is no space for a conclusion, a formula, memory, an experience which will dictate it.

I watch a flower, and as I watch it the botanical knowledge of that flower comes in and interferes with watching - not that I should not have botanical knowledge about that flower, or about that tree - but that knowledge interferes with watching. When I give my complete attention to it, to the watching of that flower, there is no room for the botanical knowledge at all. It's only when I'm inattentive that the other thing slips in. You can try this and observe it in yourself very simply.

So it's not a question of not having a conclusion, of how to get rid of a conclusion; nor of not having a formula and getting rid of that formula and so on. But the question is, can I watch with that complete attention, not only the flower, which is fairly easy - the clouds, the light on the water, the line of a mountain - but what is much more difficult, can I watch myself, because there the demands are so rapid, the reactions are so quick.

Can I watch fear without any conclusion, without any interference of the knowledge which I have accumulated about that fear, which will interfere with watching that fear? If it does interfere, what you are watching is the past, not that fear. And so, when you watch with attention you're watching it for the first time, without the interference of the past. Then you begin to learn. This is really important to understand; then you are in a position to learn. So learning is not accumulation, it is not a process of accumulation but a process in which all accumulation has come to an end - you are moving. Learning is not the process of having learnt and then applying what you have learnt; but rather, learning

is a constant movement with the fact of what is.

So can I watch that fear without any escape, without any verbalization - verbalization being thought and the image which thought has created as memory - and so look? If one understands all this, that very understanding is a discipline in itself, because watching demands tremendous discipline; not the discipline imposed because you want to understand - in which there is conflict, contradiction. But when you watch, and know that every form of conclusion, judgment, evaluation, memory, distorts that watching - to be aware of all this is a discipline, is a tremendous discipline; but that discipline is the outcome of freedom. And so, can I watch that fear?

Then the question arises: who is the watcher? Who is the entity that is observing that fear? Please go with me a little. It may be a bit complex, a little subtle, but please go on with it. I am watching that fear and I am asking myself who is the watcher, who is the observer? And why is he watching fear? What is important is to watch, not the observer who is watching. Right? I don't know if you are following.

What we are concerned with is watching fear. And when you say I am watching fear, you have gone away from watching altogether, because you have projected the 'I' into the observer. So one has to find out who is this observer, who says, 'I must watch fear'. The observer is the censor who doesn't want fear. The observer is the accumulated knowledge which says: 'fear is a dreadful thing, get rid of it'. The observer is the totality of all his experiences with regard to that fear. So the observer is separate from that thing which he calls fear. There is a space between the

observer and the thing observed. Hence, he is trying to overcome it, find a substitute for it, escape from it, transform it, and hence the conflict between the fear, which is observed, and the observer. Hence this constant battle between the two is a waste of energy.

But now we begin to enquire into who is the observer - not with a conclusion that you have derived from learning and all the rest of it - but to find out actually who is the observer, to watch the observer. Before we watched fear, fear which had developed various forms of escape; we approached that fear with conclusions, with judgments, the idea of getting rid of it and so on. But now I'm watching, or rather there is watching - not 'I am watching' - there is watching the observer. Isn't that so? Before I watched fear; now there is watching of the I who is the observer. Right?

Now, what is the observer? I am watching it. The observer is all this accumulated, conditioned entity - as the Christian, the Nationalist, the Communist, the Socialist; the Roman Catholic, the experience and the temporary memory - I am all that, with all the accumulated racial, inherited memory, all the temporal memory. I am all that. That is watching and therefore that cannot understand it at all. Because that is based on the past, but fear is an active thing and with the accumulation of the past the observer says, 'I am going to look'. Is this fairly clear, can we proceed? - not verbally, but actually step by step. Now there is only watching of the observer, not 'I am watching fear', but watching the observer. I don't know if you see the difference?

Then, as you watch you learn about the observer, and you learn that the observer is merely a series of ideas and memories without any validity, any substance, except as an idea, as a bundle of

memories. But the fear is an actuality; so you are trying to understand the fact with an abstraction - and hence you don't. I don't know if you are following?

Therefore, when this watching of the observer takes place, then there is only watching, not 'the watcher and the watched'. I don't know if you see the difference between the two - when you watch fear, not the observer watching fear. When the watcher watches fear, there is a space between the observer and the observed, between the watcher and the watched. In that space, which is a time interval, there is an effort to get rid of fear; it will take time to get rid of it. 'I will have to do something about that fear', 'I must dominate it', 'I must condemn it'. When there is space between the watcher and the watched, then I say: 'I must escape from it', 'I must find a way, a somebody who will help me to get rid of that fear.

But when there is a watching of the observer, there is the perception that the observer is merely a bundle of accumulated conditioned memories; then the observer is the observed. And therefore watching is all-important, not 'the observer and the observed'. And when one watches so completely, totally, attentively, is there fear? - not theoretically but actually? One can observe the outward fears, that is, fear at the conscious level; at the upper levels of consciousness, we can observe various forms of fear. At deeper levels, at the unconscious level, is it possible to observe fear at all? Because there are hidden fears of which I am not at all conscious. So a problem arises. How am I to watch something hidden, something which I cannot fathom through conscious effort? So I depend on dreams and the whole circus of

interpretati-on - the analyst. And I never question why I dream at all! Is it necessary to dream? I know many analysts say that unless you dream you go mad, that you must dream. But we have never asked ourselves whether it is necessary to dream at all? I don't know if you're following, if it interests you? But it is part of learning about oneself.

We are asking how to examine, how to be conscious, how to unearth, uproot, expose the unconscious with all its fears and motives. At present we're only concerned with fear, and there is that fear deeply rooted in the field which the conscious mind cannot possibly enter. The conscious mind - the upper layers of that mind - can only examine itself; it can't examine something which it doesn't know. The unconscious projects itself in dreams, while one is asleep; that's a very complex process; but it's possibly while you are dreaming to understand what the dream is about, without waking and interpreting. But why should one dream at all? That's a very important question to ask. Not that one should dream and then find the interpretations of that dream, which is such a waste of time; but the question is rather, why one should dream at all? Because dreams and their activities during sleep are a waste of energy; because in sleep the mind refreshes itself, but if you are active, dreaming, fussing around, worrying, the mind is not fresh. So one has to find out why one dreams and whether it is possible not to dream at all.

It is possible not to dream at all and it is possible only when during the day one is awake, aware of every movement of thought, feeling and reaction. Then you are beginning to unearth the unconscious, which the conscious mind cannot possibly do. So you

begin to discover as you're sitting in the bus - if you're watching, not everlastingly reading some magazine or newspaper - if you are watching you will see there are hints, intimations of this fear, and you can pursue it as you are watching it. So one exposes the content of the unconscious through this watchfulness, awareness.

There again, one has to watch, keep awake, watching. And you will find, if you do that - not at casual moments when you have nothing else to do - but seriously with full intention to pursue it, then you will find out for yourself that it is possible, psychologically, to be completely free of fear. You know what that means? There is no shadow, neither inwardly nor outwardly. You see things clearly as they are. That is the clarity of the mind: to see things exactly as they are, both outwardly objectively, and inwardly. When one looks clearly there is no problem. As most of us are ridden by problems, to understand a problem is to understand this whole process, not a particular problem; because one problem is related to every other problem and when I begin to understand one problem completely, to the very end of it, I have understood all problems.

17th September 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 3RD PUBLIC TALK LONDON 23RD SEPTEMBER 1967

THE LAST TIME that we met here we were talking about fear. And this morning I would like to go into it from a different angle.

One of the most difficult things, I feel, is to communicate to another so that one understands very clearly what is being talked about, so that there is no interpretation but actual understanding of what is said. Communication demands a certain quality of a mind that is willing, not only to listen, but also to act in the very process of listening. It is not that one first understands and then acts; in that there is a time interval and in that time interval all kinds of pressures, strains and other activities come into being. Whereas when there is an understanding, that very understanding is the way of action; and to communicate about such a thing - or in fact about anything - between two human beings, is extraordinarily difficult. For communication to take place between two people who know each other fairly well, fairly intimately, the other must be willing to listen - must have a certain quality of attention and affection, otherwise communication ceases. Specially when we are talking about something which demands total attention, not to the speaker and to the words that he uses, but rather to the state of one's own mind and how it reacts, what its responses are, its inward activity. All that demands a certain quality of deep penetration into one's own being. Then I think communication becomes a communion, which is much more important.

To really commune with one another words are not necessary at all. But to commune implies to be at the same level at the same

moment with the same intensity, otherwise communion is not possible. And when we are talking about fear (as we were the other day), to commune about it, each one of us, it seems to me, must be at that level of heightened intelligent awareness at the same time, with the same quality of attention, urgency and intensity. Our intensity may be of short duration (it generally is, because we are so occupied with so many other things), but to be intensely aware and to sustain it, that needs a certain affection, certain care, a certain quality of love.

This morning we are going to talk over together the nature of violence that is so rampant throughout the world and in each one of us. To be entirely free from that violence in all its various forms, one must, it seems to me, meet each other at a level that comprehends the totality of violence - not any particular form of violence - where we can both look wholly at the structure and the nature of violence; and when one can look wholly then one can detect the details without distortion. Because when one can look at something wholly - and that is only possible when there is no personal inclination or tendency interfering with it, or when one is not merely guided by circumstances - it is only then that one can see something entirely. And as we're going to talk over this problem of violence, we're not going to cultivate its opposite, nonviolence - that's an old trick - but rather see how extraordinarily deep-rooted violence is; and to see, there must be awareness in which there is no choice, no argument, no justification, no excuse. When the mind is so alert, then I think one begins to understand not only this violence at the conscious level, but also at a much deeper level. And if we may, this morning we're to go into that.

But before we go into this thing one has to understand, it seems to me, the nature of the unconscious. Because superficially we may be highly sophisticated, polished, outwardly so-called cultured, but inwardly seething with hatred, animosity, greed, violence; and that's rooted very deeply because, after all, we have inherited the various qualities of the animal and as long as the animal is petted, treated nicely, kindly, it reacts accordingly, but the moment you antagonise it then the whole violence comes out. It is the same with us. We act on this principle of like and dislike, and basically in that principle there is violence.

So before we go into it we have to understand the unconscious. First of all, we have accepted that there is an unconscious. The psychologists, the analysts, the specialists, have maintained that deep down there is the unconscious in all of us. There are these phrases, the words that have seeped into the language, the jargon which the analysts and the psychologists use! Those analysts and psychologists say that by going back to your childhood they can trace your conditioning, which has taken place because you have been treated improperly, not been looked after - and so on.

Now, is there an unconscious at all? And why is it that we give such extraordinary importance to the unconscious? It seems to me it is as trivial, as stupid as the conscious mind, as narrow, limited, conditioned, bigoted, anxious, fearful, tawdry, as the conscious mind, and I wonder if there is anything to understand deeply in the unconscious at all. And I think one has to go into this very deeply, because most people are conditioned by the unconscious - or rather by the idea that there is such a thing as the unconscious - with all its motives, its fears, its racially inherited qualities, and so on. And

when one looks at it, when one is aware of it all - not through dreams but actually - one can observe when the racial responses arise, the responses from deep down of a culture in which one has been brought up.

Unless one is obviously somewhat neurotic and unbalanced, I don't think it is of very great importance to examine the unconscious at all. I think it is a waste of time. I know what we are saying is anathema to the specialists, because there is a great deal to be earned with that; it is a gold mine! And when we are trying to understand this so-called unconscious, we must not accept anything anybody says about it; because then we are lost again in the pastures of authority. But by examining for oneself, one can discover how very simple it is, one can discover how one is conditioned outwardly, by the climate, the food, the clothes, the newspapers, the magazines, the radio, the television, the speeches, the politicians, the constant pressure which shapes our thinking, our reactions. And the same thing has been going on inwardly for centuries. You are a Christian or a Hindu because for ten thousand years the propaganda has been going on: that you are a Brahmin, a Hindu, that you must believe, that you must not believe, and so on. And within the last two thousand years you have been conditioned to believe in the saviour, that there is original sin, and it is all there under pressure, in the so-called unconscious, which is part of the whole of consciousness.

And so, if one gives too much value to this (that the unconscious has tremendous significance) one will be caught up in the analytical process, and in its tawdry pettiness. But if one could look at the total state of the mind, not divided up! The Hindus have

divided the mind most beautifully into different categories, that's a game one can go on playing indefinitely; and there are certain types of analysts and psychologists in the West who also play with that. But apart from the specialists, apart from the analysts, here is a human being and he is the result of time, and if we try to understand him according to somebody else, obviously we don't understand ourselves.

So is it possible for me and for you, as human beings living in this world, to look at the totality, not at the fragments? How does one look? The act of looking - not at the total, not at the complete nature and structure of consciousness - that may not be relevant at all, but probably what is relevant is 'How to look'. And as we're going to examine this question of violence, which is so deeply rooted in most of us, we must learn to look; not at the total structure or the nature of violence - but at the 'act of looking'!

Obviously, first one looks with the physical organism; one looks at the tree with the eye. And one can look at that tree without any interference by the past, which is thought. Can one look at the whole consciousness of man - which is oneself - without any interference, judgment, evaluation, which is essentially based on the past? Then what is important is the act of looking and not what you look at. If one knows how to look, then the thing one looks at takes on quite a different quality. One can observe that in one's own everyday life.

As we were saying, violence is part of our nature. The various religious organizations, which are not really religious at all, have tried to soften man, to tame him, to control him, but they have not succeeded; on the contrary, religions have probably produced more

wars. Obviously all so-called spiritual organizations must inevitably create discontent, contention and wars. I belong to my society and you to yours and we're at each other's throats; mine is superior and so on.

So there is in all of us this deep-rooted sense of violence based on pleasure (and therefore on fear), on like and dislike; and that applies to the whole of society in which we live, the society of which each one of us is part; the society for which each one of us is responsible because we have created that society - which again is fairly simple. And to belong to that society in any way inwardly, psychologically, is to make a mess of our lives. You accept all this, do you? So quietly?

I suppose you listen because you are here to listen and you get used to hearing outrageous things. But what we're talking about is not outrageous. If one really wants to live peacefully - which one must as an intelligent human being - without wars, without contention, without making our whole life into a battlefield, one must understand this violence. And one can see the nature and the structure of society which man has built, and to belong to that society in any way psychologically, inwardly, obviously brings about further destruction, further wars, further misery.

So one asks oneself, is it possible to be free from all inward and therefore outward violence? Not first outwardly and inwardly afterwards - but a movement which is not divided as the outer and the inner. Obviously we are violent because we are fearful; fearful not only of losing a position, a job, a house, a home and outward security, but we are violent primarily, because inwardly we want to be completely secure, secure in our beliefs.

Please, as we are talking, examine yourselves, because we are taking a journey together and it is your responsibility to go into it as much as the speaker's. You can't just sit there and listen casually - such listening has no value at all. But if we are taking the journey together we both have to work. I can't carry you, nor can you carry me. We have to walk together - that is to work together. And to work together demands a great deal of energy, attention; not agreement or disagreement - that only leads us to opinions and judgments. But if we could share together on the journey, then spending an hour together has an extraordinary value.

Inwardly we are essentially seeking security in different forms; to be safe, to be certain, never to be caught in a state of uncertainty about anything: uncertainty in my relationship with another, in my relationship to my wife or husband, in my relationship to ideas which are beliefs, dogmas, to the conclusions which the mind has come to through experience, through knowledge, through enquiry and examination and which says, 'This is so', 'I know'. And one is afraid to be dislodged from a position, from a conclusion to which one has come, and one reacts violently to any form of disturbance. You can see this very well. You know, over the whole world marriage is undergoing a revision and lots of people are objecting to it because we are used to things as they are. The same applies to churches, gods, beliefs, saviours. So there is always resistance to any disturbance, and resistance is violent by its very nature. And when one can look without resistance at one's own forms of resistance, then one begins to understand the nature of violence, the fear of loneliness, fear of this extraordinary boredom with life - the life that one leads every day, spending years and years in an office,

the same house, the same face, the same sexual routine, the same pleasures. Naturally one is bored stiff by all that. Being anchored - and we want to be anchored - we don't mind being disturbed on the periphery. But the question of violence only disappears when we are deeply disturbed, so that we have no anchorage - which means to have no resistance, no defence, no excuse, no justification, no conclusion - so that the mind is intensely aware, sharp, clean. Only then the question of violence disappears.

You know, one has cultivated talk about non-violence and it has been the fashion to use it as a political instrument and also as a means of overcoming this apparently innate violence. And the prophets of nonviolence, whether in the West or in the East, are really extraordinarily violent people; I don,t know if you have noticed that. They have deep-rooted principles according to which they will act and will not act. They force themselves, they control themselves, they deny everything which they want - from sexual relationship to every form of physical pleasure, comfort, to sitting easily, All that is a form of violence, a form of contortion according to a certain principle which they themselves have established. But to understand violence, there is no need to have this principle of non-violence. That is a very easy escape from violence. The fact is we are violent; in our relationships, in our feeling, we germinate antagonism in others, hatred, because in ourselves we are that, and can I look at my violence without this trick of non-violence? Actually look at what I am! Violent in my jobs, violent in my relationships, dominating, feeling superior, exercising my will to achieve something - because all forms of act of will are violent - and we have been nurtured in violence, in will.

And so one also has to see the nature of will. Will is after all the demand, the exercise of one's likes and dislikes highly strengthened; will is essentially based on desire - desire for pleasure and the avoidance of pain, the pursuit of pleasure. To continue there must be the exercise of will, which is the constant thinking about that pleasure and the constant thinking about the avoidance of pain; it is based on this sense of desire, which becomes more and more intense. And has will any place at all? Will being violence, not understanding, not seeing something directly and then acting. The very seeing is the doing - as one does when there is danger. In that there is a great deal involved. We can go into it.

So, violence is a form of will, and can one live in this world without the perpetual exercise of 'I want', 'I don't want', of like and dislike? Which is, after all, to live peacefully. But one has to act in this world, and is it possible to act without this quality of will, which takes so many forms as ambition, competition, drive to achieve, to fulfil, to put away, to resist - and yet act?

Can the mind ever be free from this violence of comparison? We think we understand when we compare; in the technological field comparison is necessary. But in the psychological field, is comparison at all necessary to understand anything? Do I understand myself by comparing myself with somebody else? And in schools, when A is compared with B who is much cleverer, are you not destroying A? So, why do we compare at all? Is comparison not the avoidance of 'what is'? And to understand what is, in oneself, psychologically, why do we need comparison which cultivates competition with all its battles and anxieties, fears, the

exercise of will and so on - which are and forms of violence. Can one see all this not in separate fragments but completely as a whole, so that the very act of looking at `what is', is a dissipation of `what is'?

As we were saying earlier in this talk, to commune there must be attention and affection. Can I commune with this violence with attention and affection? And when I do, is there any form of violence in myself? As we are talking, do please go into it. And then the problem arises - if one is free of violence - what about the other person? How am I to live in a world which is full of violence, acquisitiveness, greed, envy, brutality, wars and so on, how can I live in this world? Will I not be destroyed? That is the inevitable question which is invariably asked.

When one asks such a question, it seems to me, one is not actually living peacefully. If you live peacefully you will have no problem at all. You may be shot because you may resist - you may not want to join the army, but it's not a problem then: you will be shot! It's really extraordinarily important to understand this. Because there must be a total revolution in our life, a psychological revolution, a tremendous crisis in consciousness. Not an economic crisis, a political crisis and wars, but much more significant and worthwhile is this deep inward revolution. Otherwise one cannot live sanely, intelligently in this monstrous world and the more one is intelligent, aware, alert to the whole problem the more one wants to live completely peacefully. Not only one wants to, but one does. That is why (as we said at the beginning) what is important is not, `how to live peacefully', but rather to see the nature of violence in oneself; and to see clearly what one is, that one's mind is a tortured

entity, the mind that is conforming, imitating, resisting, which are all forms of violence. And in that seeing one becomes aware that there is no observer at all, because the observer, the centre, is the very nature of conflict - that is, as long as there is a separation which the observer creates between himself and the observed. Not that the observer wants to identify himself - there is no fundamental unity in identification, that's a trick - but when one realizes the actual observer himself is the entity that breeds violence, then between the observer and the observed there is communion and when that communion takes place there is no observer at all.

Can we talk about what we have stated?

Questioner: It seems this has no appeal to the majority of people and that maybe only a few really listen and understand completely, perhaps some listen casually and forget about it afterwards. As you said, it's very difficult to find this freedom you are speaking of. Meanwhile the world is going on in a dreadful way, the premium is set on domination, power, and affairs are in the hands of politicians. How are we to accept this? Inevitably the world will eventually be destroyed. Perhaps one individual may find the freedom you speak of, but I cannot see it happening on a large scale.

Krishnamurti: Yes, that is the question. Perhaps one individual can change, what about the mass? What about the rest of the people who don't understand, who don't care two pins, who want to live in the mess which they have created in the world. What difference does it make if one human being understands, when the whole world is going on the way it is?

Why are we so concerned with the rest of the world? Please, do look at it - we will go into it. Why do we want to interfere with the rest of the world? Why do we divide the world into the individual and the collective? Is the individual really an individual, or really the collective - in a limited way? Are you so very different from the rest of the English people, from the rest of the world? You have your anxieties, your pains, your worries, your problems, your despairs, your miseries, jealousies, envies, just as it happens across the water, twenty miles away, so why are you so concerned about the rest of the world? I think in that there is a fundamental mistake. Nothing in the world is done by the mass; a few do something. The Communist society was created by very few people - the whole of that cultural explosion which took place in the East was brought about by very few people. The explosive influence of Greece over Europe - again very few! They never thought, 'what's going to happen to the rest of the world?'

I think that way of looking, asking, is a waste of time. You know, when you love something, you're not thinking about the rest of the world, because in that love the whole world is included. In the same way, when we begin to understand the nature of violence and are actually free of it, we'll never ask that question. But when you do ask the question, you become a missionary, a propagandist; the moment you become a propagandist, a missionary, you have come to the end of everything: you create more misery.

Questioner: I don't understand when you say that will has no place at all in understanding and yet a certain discipline is necessary - it seems to be a contradiction.

Krishnamurti: Do you need will or discipline to listen? When

you don't want to listen and are forced to listen because it's profitable, it's worthwhile, it brings you this or that, then you discipline yourself to listen. But when you want to understand something, when you want to understand sorrow (which we'll perhaps go into another time), physical sorrow, the pain, the sorrow which man goes through, when you want to understand it, where is the place of will? But in the very process of understanding suffering here is discipline; the very process is discipline. Sir, look, what does discipline imply - generally, as it is accepted? I believe the root of that word is 'to learn', not 'conform'. It's excellent in the army, when you are drilled - there you don't have to understand a thing except the mechanical process of killing somebody. To understand suffering, to look at it, to find out all about it, does it need discipline? - discipline in the sense of conforming to a pattern, imitating, obeying a certain rule, formula. But to understand something you have to pay attention, you have to love and when you love something, that very nature of love is discipline.

Do you mean to say that you can discipline yourself to love? Exercise will to love? And when you do exercise will, discipline to love, love goes out by the window, doesn't it? So love has nothing whatsoever to do with discipline. But when there is that state of attention which is care, affection, that in itself is discipline. I can't attend if I don't give my whole being to listen. But if I make an effort to listen I'm not listening, there is a battle going on inside me and hence will in itself is a contradiction. It is that which creates duality. There's no time to go into it now, but one can observe it in oneself.

Questioner: But Sir, can't one think of discipline in other fields as well? For example, I discipline myself and exercise will to get up in the morning?

Krishnamurti: Yes, one exercises will in different ways; one exercises will to get up in the morning; then you're in a conflict aren't you? (laughter) But if one has understood what laziness is, and it's good to be lazy, it all depends on what you call laziness! Perhaps you've lived wrongly the previous day, have over eaten, indulged in different ways and so in the morning when you want to get up, your body refuses and you force it and thereby the body loses its own intelligence. But if one knows how to live, not just the previous day but the whole of one's life, then you'll find that laziness has its place and immediate action is also necessary. It is not a division created by the will between the doing and the not doing.

23rd September 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 4TH PUBLIC TALK LONDON 24TH SEPTEMBER 1967

YESTERDAY WE WERE talking about violence, and I think this morning we should go into the question of what is peace - whether it is at all possible in a world that is totally committed to war.

Whether human beings can live at peace in a society that follows war, killing, armaments, as a way of life in a world that is divided into nationalities, into religious groups, all at war with one another. Is it at all possible, living in this society? But as a human being, can one live at peace within oneself and perhaps also outwardly? Because, mere cessation of violence which, I think, we went into sufficiently yesterday, does not necessarily mean a state of mind which is at peace within itself and therefore at peace in all its relationships.

Our relationship to human beings is based on the image-forming, defensive mechanism. In all our relationships, each one builds, forms, an image about the other, and these two images have relationship, not the human beings. The wife forms an image about the husband, very carefully - perhaps not thoughtfully, consciously - but nevertheless it is there; she has an image about the husband, and the husband has an image about the wife. One has an image about one's own country and an image about oneself. To these images we are always adding more and more, to strengthen them. And these images have relationships, if one observes that very deeply. And so the actual relationship between two human beings, or between many human beings, completely ends when there is the formation of images. I think one can observe this in oneself, and

relationship based on these images obviously can never bring about peace in relationship, because the images are fictitious and one cannot live an abstraction. And yet that is what we're doing: living in ideas, in theories, in symbols - as the nation, as images that we have created about ourselves and about others, which are all abstractions, not realities at all. All our relationships whether it be with property, with ideas or with people, are essentially based on this image-forming, and hence there is always conflict.

Is it possible for us as human beings, who have lived for millions of years, who are supposed to be fairly civilized, who have been conditioned by organized religions to talk easily about peace, is it actually possible, not theoretically, not politically, but actually, to be completely at peace within ourselves and therefore in our relationships with others? Because all life is a movement in relationship, otherwise there is no life at all. And if life is based on an abstraction, on an idea, on a speculative assumption, then such abstract living must inevitably bring about a relationship which becomes a battlefield.

And so one asks oneself whether peace is at all possible; not in some fantastic mythical abstract world, but at the office, in daily life? You know there are chants in India about peace; the prayer says, 'May there be peace to everything, to the animals and human beings', and so on - marvellous chants, written probably many thousands of years ago, but during all these years there has not been peace, there have been incessant wars; two and a half wars every year for the last five thousand years. And if one wishes (or rather demands) peace, and lives in peace - what does it mean to live in peace?

I think we should go into this question very carefully, because we have made our life into a battlefield, a conflict - not only with a neighbour, whether that neighbour be next door or a thousand miles away, but also a conflict in ourselves. Our being is a battlefield, torn by various desires, contradictions, fears, frustrations, anxiety and endless sorrow. And can we actually transform all that - become or be completely peaceful?

I know this question has been asked by thousands through thousands of years. They've tried through prayers, through various forms of identification with something greater than oneself. One has accepted various forms of so-called peace, but actually in daily life we are not at all peaceful. We kill animals, we kill each other, and so on.

So is it possible to live completely peacefully inwardly at great depth? Which does not mean that one goes to asleep, or stagnates - on the contrary. We have to find that out, we have to go into it very carefully, and I hope we can this morning.

You know, I think we ought to understand each other about this question and not just merely listen to a series of words and ideas, either accepting or denying them, or blocking oneself, saying, 'Peace is not possible in this monstrous world'. But rather, go into oneself, not psychoanalytically, nor theoretically, but actually, step by step, and find out if it is at all possible to live without any conflict, without any effort, and yet live completely at the highest level.

To go into it completely one must understand the nature of effort, the nature of conflict, because most of us are in conflict, having many, many problems, both psychological and objective,

economic, and problems of the mind and the heart. And these problems inevitably bring conflict; a problem means conflict, otherwise there would be no problem at all. We are talking about psychological problems rather than economic, political ones (I don't know why we are ruled all over the world by such stupid politicians - I don't know if you have considered what the world is being reduced to). And to enquire into this question of peace, not intellect- ually, not verbally, but actually, one has to understand conflict; conflict being a problem, principally a psychological problem.

A problem exists only when we are incapable of dealing with it completely. It only exists when we deal with a total psychological problem fragmentarily, or emotionally, or escape from it.

Apparently we are not capable of meeting a problem entirely. First of all one has to be aware not only of the problem, the nature of the problem, the structure of the problem, but also one has to be able to meet it - not eventually, not gradually, taking time over it - but to meet it immediately and resolve it immediately, so that the problem doesn't take root in the mind. So the first question is: all life is a problem, living is a problem, and there is no escape from it but how to meet it entirely, completely, as it arises, and be beyond it, so that it does not take root in the soil of the mind? And how is this to be done? Because the more one allows a problem of any kind to linger, to endure for a day or for a month or even for a few minutes, it obviously distorts the mind; is it possible to meet a problem without any distortion and be completely free of it, immediately? I do not know if you have thought about it; if you have, you must have gone into it. You must have seen that in every

movement of life unless there is a complete, total meeting of it there is a problem; the inadequate meeting of this movement in life is a problem. And can I - as a human being - meet these problems as they arise and not let a memory, a scratch on the mind, remain? These memories are the images which we carry about with us, and these images meet this extraordinary thing called life and hence there is a contradiction, because life is very real - life is not an abstraction. When one meets life with images, then there are problems.

I hope, that you are listening not to the words, but are using the speaker as a mirror in which you see yourself. After all, that is the purpose of these talks here - not to gather lot of ideas and arguments and make clever repartee, but rather to observe oneself and the movement of one's own mind and heart and one's whole being actually as it is without any image. If you do, then perhaps we can discover how to live completely and totally in peace - with oneself and therefore in relationship with others.

As we said, the problem exists only in time; that is when I meet an issue incompletely. And this incomplete coming together with that issue, creates a problem. When one meets a challenge partially, then that fragmentary meeting brings about a problem. Can I meet that challenge or that issue, that question, that fear or that anxiety - whatever it is - completely, that means with complete attention? It's only inattention that breeds problems. Isn't it? That is when I am not giving my full, complete attention, then I have a problem, and, having a problem, still being inattentive, that problem goes on and I hope to solve it one of these days.

Now take the question of death, which is an immense problem

for most people. Is it possible to meet it completely and not make it a problem at all? Obviously, to meet it, all belief, all hope, all fears about it must completely come to an end, otherwise you are meeting that extraordinary thing with a conclusion, with an image, with a premeditated anxiety. Therefore you are meeting it with time. I don't know if you understand.

Time is that interval between the observer and the observed. That is, the observer, the 'me' is afraid - I am afraid to meet that thing called death. I don't know what it means. I've all kinds of hopes, theories - I believe in reincarnation, in resurrection and so on. As long as there is an interval between the observer with all his beliefs, fears, hopes, sorrows, feelings of self-pity, and that issue, that fact which he observes (a time interval, which is space) there must be contradiction and hence conflict. Are you following all this? Look Sir, I am afraid of dying. Either I rationalize my fears and therefore build a resistance against the inevitable, or I treat life as a jolly good thing and again escape, or I have innumerable beliefs which protect me from the fact. Hence there is a gap between myself and the thing of which I am afraid. In this time-space interval there must be conflict, which is a form of fear, anxiety, self-pity and all the rest of it. Is it possible to meet the so-called death without this space time interval? That is only possible, if one observes very closely and deeply, when the observer has no continuity, the observer who is the builder of the image, the observer who is the collection of memories, ideas, a bundle of abstractions. Is it possible to meet any issue without this time interval and hence with no contradiction and therefore without conflict?

After all, when one is talking about peace one also has to understand what love is, Because I do not see how there can be peace without love. Love is not an abstraction, not an idea. Love is not desire and pleasure. And to understand the nature of love, one has to go into this question of conflict. Essentially, conflict arises when there is a contradiction. That contradiction is engendered by the observer, by a centre which has continuity as memory.

So our question is: living in this world, being conditioned by a society which we have built, a society which is based on war, hate, envy, aggression, of which I am part - can I meet all these issues immediately, completely, and be free of them? The problem is how to observe - how to observe death, fear, greed, aggression, hatred, how to meet it, how to see it without that space and time interval? I hope we're understanding each other; if not, perhaps after I have talked you can ask questions about it.

Your know, various methods have been tried to destroy the space between the observer and the observed; through drugs, through identification, through meditation, following every form of system, method, hoping to eliminate this space interval between the observer and the observed and thereby be free of contradiction and conflict, and so bring about peace.

I do not think any system, any drug, any identification, any form of sublimation can possibly bring about this ending of space. But what does end space and time? It is the way that one looks, observes; I think that is the key - to actually observe without any image; that's why one has to become very simple about all this. To observe a flower without any mentation taking place, to observe without any thought interference; for thought is time and time is

sorrow. And to look at death without fear, without any rationalization, without any hope and belief. Just to observe! That is to actually die to the pleasure that you have had yesterday and to the memory of that pleasure.

But as we said, love is not desire nor pleasure. Pleasure is the continuity of a desire which thought has thought about constantly. yesterday one has had sexual pleasure and thought is thinking about it, chewing; it and giving it continuity. And this thought about desire, which becomes pleasure, is obviously not love because thought cannot engender love; it can engender sensuality, pleasure, further strengthen desire. Desire is normal - when you look at a beautiful tree, a flower, a nice face and so on, the reaction is normal, healthy, but when thought interferes with it, giving it continuity as pleasure by thinking about it, then that pleasure is obviously not that thing one calls love; and thought cannot possibly cultivate love. Is it possible for thought to be completely absent when there is a desire? To look at a beautiful car: seeing, sensation, desire, and then thought comes in saying 'I wish I had it'. And thought, thinking about it, cultivates pleasure. Is it possible to look at that car without any interference - if one can call it so - of thought?

Like love, beauty is not the cultivation of thought. A thing of beauty is not beauty. Beauty is not in the thing, in the building, in the person; but there is that beauty which is not the result of conditioning, in which thought in no way interferes. And observing all this within oneself, if one has gone sufficiently deeply, if you have done it with me, with the speaker this morning, one finds that one can live without any conflict, any contradiction. Contradiction

exits when there is comparison; not only with something, but also comparison with what I was yesterday. And hence conflict arises between what has been and what is. There is only what is when there is no comparison at all - and to live completely with `what is', is to be peaceful. Because then you can give your whole attention to `what is' without any distraction to what is within oneself, whatever it be - despair, ugliness, brutality, fear, anxiety, loneliness, and live with, what is, completely. Then there is no contradiction and hence no conflict.

The understanding that comes only through observation of what is, is peace; which doesn't mean that you accept what is, on the contrary, one can't possibly accept this monstrous, corrupt society in which one lives, yet it is what is. But observe it, all its psychological structure, which is me, observe that me without any judgment, any evaluation - to see actually what is and as one observes the `what is', be changed completely. Therefore one can live at peace with one's wife or husband, with one's neighbour, with society, because one is oneself, daily, living a life of peace.

Questioner: Krishnaji, is dying to everything every day the gateway to love.

Krishnamurti: I am afraid it's not, that's just an idea. I do not know why we give such extraordinary importance to ideas. We want love, we don't know what it is, but we want it. And to get that, one searches, seeks, one invents various gateways, paths, still in the realm of ideas, and one knows very well that an idea can never open the door to love - never, because idea is organized thought and thought can only give pleasure, can only breed further satisfaction. After all, there is the relationship of people who are

married, the deep satisfaction that one derives, which one calls love. To find out what it is that man has sought and called love, you can't seek it, you can't go after it. Oh, it's so simple, isn't it, really?

Questioner: Please Sir, sometimes when one is in great despair, and anxiety, peace will suddenly come - I do not know why.

Krishnamurti: Peace suddenly comes, when one is in great anxiety or great despair - it happens. Is that peace? I'm not saying it is not. When one is exhausted by sorrow, in that exhaustion and loneliness, in that sense of complete cessation of everything that has been - the companionship and everything else having come to an end - in that there is a great deal of sorrow. Sorrow is also self-pity, and out of this turmoil perhaps one gets a breath of peace. But surely sorrow is not the way to peace? (Questioner interrupting). Perhaps you do get, you learn, something out of sorrow and that learning does bring peace; that is the question. Do you learn anything from sorrow? Yes? Let's observe it, shall we, don't say yes or no.

Questioner: Perhaps it brings you to a crisis?

Krishnamurti: Sorrow is the result of a crisis, and what does one learn out of sorrow? Wait a minute Madam - we'll find out what causes it. But do you learn anything from sorrow, and when you do learn, what have you learnt? Either not to have any more sorrow, how to defend yourself, how to resist sorrow, or how to avoid sorrow - but actually what has one learnt? And what is sorrow? The sorrow of loneliness, the sorrow of not being loved, or loving, the other person not responding, the sorrow of ignorance about oneself, the sorrow of death in which there is a great deal of self-

pity.

What do we mean by sorrow? And because we don't understand it, we worship it in the church.

Questioner: Sorrow is non-reconciliation with the fact.

Krishnamurti: But why should you be reconciled with the fact? The fact is. Why should you seek reconciliation with the fact, with what is? Because you have an idea, an image about the fact.

So what is sorrow? And why is it that man has never solved it, never ended it in himself? Is it possible to completely end sorrow, not theoretically but actually? It can end only when there is complete understanding of oneself. Self-knowledge is the ending of sorrow. We don't want to take the trouble to study ourselves, and we invent so many ways of escaping from sorrow.

As long as there is the observer with all its memories, this entity that is separate, that brings about a time interval between what is and himself, there must be sorrow, sorrow being conflict. And to end that sorrow actually, not in words, but to end that sorrow every day, is to be aware of the total movement of oneself all the time.

Yes, Sir?

Questioner: Can one attain the state of peace near nature in a non-industrialised civilization, on an island somewhere, away from violence?

Krishnamurti: I am afraid if one runs away one won't find peace because we are the mess. You know, they have tried to find peace in monasteries, by renouncing the world, by never looking at a woman - because a religious man says woman is a temptation, is of the devil - you know all that stuff, and he has withdrawn from life into a monastery or taken a robe.

Questioner: In a primitive society - not necessarily in a monastery.

Krishnamurti: Go back to a primitive society? Sir, to live with oneself is one of the most difficult things in life, whether you live in a primitive society or in a highly industrialized, so-called cultured society. One can't escape from oneself. And it is oneself that is creating this havoc. Therefore, what is important is not the society in which we live, but rather the of the relationship between yourself and society in which you are. Either one can understand oneself totally, immediately - that is the only way to understand oneself, there is no other way. Or one can say: I will gradually learn about myself, every day, little by little, adding more and more to my knowledge about myself. When you add knowledge about yourself, you are not studying yourself, you're studying what you have acquired and through that knowledge you are looking at yourself. Yes Sir?

Questioner: It appears that we don't take the trouble of looking into ourselves, looking at our sorrow, our miseries and what we are. But Sir, I can see this in part and went out of my way to give full attention to what I am, to look at sorrow, to look behind indolence, not being in contact with reality. But the more I look at it, the more I think about it, the more it seems that I am confused - and I just feel confused.

Krishnamurti: I understand, Sir. What is confusion? Confusion exists only when I am not facing what is. And when one is confused, the more one tries to clear oneself of confusion the more confused one gets; so firstly, what does one do when one is confused?

I am confused. I do not know what to do; there are various choices. And I realize where there is choice there must be confusion. And I am confused, so what shall I do? First, I stop, don't I? I stop, I don't search, ask, demand, look, watch. If you've ever been lost in a wood you don't go chasing about, you first stop, look around. But the more one is confused the more one chases, searches, asks, demands, begs. So the first thing - if I may suggest - is to stop completely, inwardly. And when you do stop inwardly, psychologically, all movement of search, choice, enquiry, your mind becomes very peaceful, very clear. Then you can look. It is only with clarity that one can look, not with confusion.

Questioner: When one looks, various images arise and trying to look without images is distraction.

Krishnamurti: I don't quite understand this question. I look at you, I don't know you. And therefore I have no image about you. But if I know you I look at you with the image I have about you. That image has been built, put together, by what you have said - either as an insult or in praise - and with that image I look at you. The image is a distraction from looking at you. I can only look at you when I have no image of you at all; then I am really in relationship. Is it possible to die to the image I have built, the images I have made about you for so many years, living with you as a wife or a husband, or a neighbour - or the image that I have about the relationship - all that? Can I die to all that? If I don't die, those images are an abstraction or a distraction, and therefore it is not possible to look. If I have an image about the tree, I cannot look at the tree. Questioner: One of our problems is how to look at you without an image. I for instance, have heard you first when I

was aged twelve and now I am about fifty. This lady over here had the same problem I had this morning as regards death. We understand the significance, you talked about that years ago. Now, my image tells me: Krishnaji said yes, or no, and I see the truth of this - let's die to each moment. This lady repeated this and brought a new phrase in. I think it is a very real problem at all these discussions and meetings.

Krishnamurti: Yes, Sir, I understand that. You have an image about me because you have listened and the image has said to you, die to everything that you have known. But you don't die, you have your particular pleasures, carefully stored up, memories of the things that you have had, the remembrance of past things which you cherish.

But these images are not going to help you to meet that enormous thing called death. And so is it possible to die to every form of the known, including the image of the speaker? Otherwise the image becomes the authority, which means abstraction becomes an authority, not the actual state. You see, we are always doing this, aren't we? Always ploughing, ploughing, ploughing. Never sowing. Because we are so frightened to sow and see what happens. We may have produced weeds, or we may produce most marvellous grain, but we want to plough, and never sow. You can only sow when there is no image whatsoever.

24th September 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 5TH PUBLIC TALK LONDON 30TH SEPTEMBER 1967

DURING THE LAST four talks we have been talking over several problems together, and I think this morning perhaps it would be worthwhile to spend some time in trying to find out if life has any significance at all. Not the life that one leads, because modern existence has very little meaning. One gives intellectual significance to life, a theoretical, intellectual, theological, or (if one may use that word) mystical meaning to it; one tries to search out a deep meaning - as some writers have done amidst the despair of this hopeless existence - inventing some vital, deep, intellectual reason. And it seems to me that it would be very much worthwhile if we could find out for ourselves, not emotionally or intellectually, but actually, factually, if there is in life anything really sacred. Not the inventions of the mind, which have given a sense of holiness to life, but actually whether there is such a thing. Because one observes both historically and actually in this search, in the life that one leads - the business, the competition, the despair, the loneliness, the anxiety, with the destruction of war and hate - life as all this has very little meaning. We may live seventy years spending forty or fifty years in an office, with the routine, the boredom and the loneliness of it, which has very little meaning. Realizing that, both in the Orient and here, one then gives significance and worthwhileness to a symbol, to an idea, to a God - which are obviously the inventions of the mind. They have said in the East that life is One: don't kill; God exists in every human being: don't destroy. But the next minute they are destroying each

other, actually, verbally, or in business and so this idea that life is One, the sacredness of life, has very little meaning.

Also in the Occident, realizing what life actually is, the brutality, the aggressiveness, the ruthless competition of everyday life, one gives significance to a symbol and those symbols upon which all religions are based are considered very holy. That is, the theologians, the priests, the saints who have had their peculiar experiences, have given a meaning to life and we cling to those meanings out of our despair, out of our loneliness, out of our daily routine, which has so little meaning. And if we could put aside all the symbols, all the images, the ideas and the beliefs, which one has built throughout the centuries and to which one has given a sense of sacredness, if we could actually de-condition ourselves from all those extraneous inventions, then perhaps we could really ask ourselves if there is a something that is true, that is really holy and sacred. Because that's what man has been seeking amongst all this turmoil, despair, guilt and death. Man has always sought in various forms this feeling of something that must be beyond the transitory, beyond the flux of time. And could we this morning spend some time in going into this and trying to find out for ourselves if there is such a thing? - but not what you want, not God, not an idea, not a symbol. Can one really brush all that aside and then find out?

Words are only a means of communication but the word is not the thing; the word, the symbol is not the actuality, and when one is caught up in words, then it becomes very difficult to extricate oneself from the symbol, the words, the ideas which actually prevent perception. Though one must use words, words are not the

fact. So if we can also be aware, on guard, that the word is not the fact, then we can begin to go into this question very deeply. That is, man out of his loneliness and despair has given sacredness to an idea, to an image made by the hand or by the mind. The image has become extraordinarily important to the Christian, to the Hindu, to the Buddhist and so on, and they have invested the sense of sacredness in that image. And can we brush it aside not verbally, not theoretically, but actually push it aside, completely see the futility of such an activity? Then we can begin to ask - but there is no one to answer, because any fundamental question that we put to ourselves cannot be answered at all by anyone and least of all by ourselves. But what we can do is to put the question and let the question simmer, boil - let that question move and one must have the capacity to follow that question right through. That is what we are asking this morning: whether there is, beyond the symbol, the word, anything real, true, something completely holy in itself?

To understand that, or to come upon it, one must first investigate this whole question of experience. Because most of us want experiences, our daily life is so shallow, empty and dull. With all the sensations, the sexual experiences, the delights of a morning, a cloudless morning and the tint and the colour of the leaves - with all that we want deeper, wider experiences; and drugs seem to satisfy, to give that experience, to expand the mind as they call it. Taking certain drugs, thought is in abeyance and there is a feeling that there are paths through all - take a trip and experience something tremendous! Most of us want deep fundamental lasting experience: an experience that will be completely satisfying, an experience that will never be destroyed by thought. So it seems to

me that one has to go into this question of experience and what is involved in it. Unless one understands this, the exploration into the discovery of something that is real, true, will become impossible as long as you are merely seeking an experience which will be completely gratifying, completely satisfying - for that is all we want, don't we? We want an experience that will completely give us a sense of fullness; an experience that will gratify totality. Behind this demand for experience there is the desire for satisfaction. We want to be satisfied and nothing satisfies us - sex, so-called love, so-called daily existence which is very shallow - we want something very deep and very satisfying and so there is our demand for great, wide, deep experience. So the demand for satisfaction dictates the experience; and we have not only to understand this whole business of satisfaction but also the thing that is experienced. To have great satisfaction is a great pleasure; the more lasting, deep and wide that experience the more the pleasure. So pleasure dictates the form of experience that we demand, we want; pleasure is the measure by which we measure the experience.

So in seeking something fundamental - as what is true - and is there anything which is really holy in life? - if pleasure is the measure then you have already experienced, you have already projected what that experience will be; therefore it is no longer valid. And what do we mean by experience? When you experience anything, it doesn't matter what it is, what does that mean? Seeing a sunset is an experience, there is a reaction to that colour and from that reaction you have certain sensations, ideas and so on, and that you call experience - the challenge and the response to that

challenge. You must recognise the experience otherwise it will not be an experience at all. If I am incapable of recognising an experience, is it an experience at all? To experience implies recognition; I must recognise that it was an experience of such and such a kind. So when I recognise an experience, it has already been, it is already old. I hope I am making myself clear.

So every experience has already been experienced, otherwise I wouldn't recognise it. Therefore it is already old. I experience something according to my conditioning, so I recognise that experience as being good, bad, beautiful, holy and so on, according to my background, according to my conditioning. The recognition of the experience must inevitably be old, so there is no new experience at all. If I say I have had a new experience, to recognise it as new and to know it is new, implies I have already recognised it, therefore it is already old. Please, we are talking it over together, I am not asserting anything.

So recognition plays a great part in all experiences and therefore all experiences which are recognizable are by their very nature old. There is nothing new through experience which is recognizable. We are now trying to find out if there is anything true, real, holy - and if I say I have experienced it, it means I must recognise it and if I recognise it, it is already the reaction of the past; so it is not new at all. So what is one to do? You understand? I hope I am making myself clear.

So when I demand an experience, when one demands an experience as one does - an experience of reality - to experience it implies you must know it, that you have recognised it, and the moment that you recognise it you have already projected it;

therefore it is not real but is still within the limit of time, it is still within the field of thought. So if one realizes that, how is one to find out? How is one to see what is true? We can discuss this after I have talked, we can go into it.

It is really a very interesting question this. It involves not only putting the question but how to meet the question, how to respond to that question. If one is merely seeking satisfaction through an experience, then satisfaction is the measure and anything that is measurable is within the limits of thought and is apt to create illusion. One can have marvellous experiences and yet be completely in delusion. You can see Christ, Buddha or whatever it is and you will inevitably see these people in visions according to your conditioning. The Catholic believer who practises, he strengthens his background and his conditioning and the experiences become stronger - and to him that is the real - but it is obviously a projection of his demands, of his own urges, of his own background and therefore it has no validity at all.

So to investigate this question is meditation. You know that word has been used both in Asia and here in a most unfortunate way. There are those people who come from India who talk about meditation and give you a certain word and by thinking about that word you will have an extraordinarily transcendental experience - which is sheer nonsense, because you can repeat Amen or Om or Coca Cola a hundred times (please, it isn't a subject for laughter). One can repeat these words indefinitely, and obviously you will have certain experiences, because by repetition the mind becomes quiet. it is a well-known phenomenon which has been practised for generations, for thousands of years in India, the Mantra Yoga it's

called, and it is so obvious, it is so infantile. One can induce the mind, by repetition of a word, to be quiet, to be gentle, to be soft, but it is still a petty little mind, it is still a shoddy little thing. It's like the experiments of those people who take a piece of stick, which they pick up in the garden, and put it on the mantelpiece; every day they put a flower there, give a flower to it! Within a month they are worshipping it and not to give a flower to that stick is a calamity, a sin! One can make the mind, induce the mind to do anything it wants, or produce any vision. But meditation is not following a system, it is not repetition, a constant imitation; meditation is something that demands an astonishingly alert mind, great sensitivity in which there is no sense of bringing something about through demand, no illusion. So one has to be free of all demands, therefore of all experience, because the moment you demand, you will experience; and that experience obviously will be according to your conditioning.

To be free of demand and satisfaction necessitates investigation into oneself; it necessitates understanding the whole nature of demand. Demand is born out of duality. 'I am un- happy and I must be happy.' The demand that I must be happy, in that very thing is unhappiness. The opposite always contains its own opposite. So when one makes an effort to be good, decides to be good, in that very goodness is its opposite, which is evil. If one could only understand this and therefore that any demand of life, any demand that you must experience the truth, reality, that very demand is born out of your discontent with 'what is', and therefore that demand creates the opposite.

In the opposite there is what has been. So one must be free of

this incessant demanding: the mind that is always comparing, measuring, which breeds illusion. And one must know the nature and the structure of this effort, the effort of duality (the mind is really non-dual, but there's not time to go into that). This means knowing oneself so completely that the mind is no longer seeking, asking, demanding, and therefore it is completely quiet. All that is part of meditation; not the endless prayers, repetitions and the forcing the mind to be still. That breeds conflict and conflict must inevitably exist when there is duality. There is the duality that is created by the observer and the thing he wishes to be, which is observed. And there is the mind that is trying, not to experience, but to uncover, to discover - not follow, not imitate, not become something. The becoming is another form of duality and therefore of conflict.

All this process of knowing oneself is the beginning of meditation - not putting the mind to sleep, not having visions or transcendental experiences through some footling word - but to uncover the conditioned and the state of mind which is ourselves in its relationship to society, in its relationship to another. To discover oneself and penetrate deep - all that is meditation. One has to go into it very deeply, but not in the sense of time and measure - one must use the word `deep', but when one uses it, it has its opposite which is `shallow'. For when one wants to be deep, then there is conflict and therefore depth is the shallow. So the mind investigating all this becomes highly sensitive, highly aware; and obviously a mind that is tremendously alert, awake, is silent. A chattering mind says `this is' distraction, because I want to concentrate on `this other; but such a division is also a distraction.

And being highly intelligent - for intelligence is to be completely sensitive, aware, in which there is no choice at all and hence no conflict - then out of that comes a silence which is not the opposite of noise, nor the cessation of noise. And it is only in such a silent mind that there is no demand, no illusion, because of no desire to be satisfied and therefore no desire for wider and deeper experiences; it is only such a mind that can discover what is sacred. That is meditation and in that meditation to discover it - not to be told or to copy and obey and all that immature nonsense. Then in that silence, which is really not an experience at all, but a state, in that silence one discovers, one comes upon something that has no word, that is not measurable - when the mind with its brain, which has stored up so many memories, when all that becomes extraordinarily quiet - and it is only in that state there is a possibility of discovering something that man has sought throughout the centuries.

Questioner: If one meditates in order to discover, is not that in itself a demand?

Krishnamurti: Obviously. You don't meditate because you want to find truth, or to find happiness, bliss, but to understand oneself and learning about oneself is a constant process; that I said is meditation, not in order to discover something. You know, the word `discover' is an unfortunate word, but I don't know what other word to use; one can use different words, but the essence of meditation is self-knowing: to know oneself. And you cannot know yourself if what you have learnt about yourself becomes the measure. I don't know if you see that. I watch myself and I have learnt something about myself: that I am greedy. I have learnt

about greed, the nature of it, and having learnt, I measure with what I have learned all future greed; and therefore I am not studying the future greed as it arises but I am only measuring with what I have learnt. Therefore - see the structure of it! - the measure of what I have learned creates its own opposite and hence the conflict. Therefore all opposites, greed and non-greed, when I demand or exercise will, or force myself not to be greedy, in that very demand to be not greedy is greed. See this please! Please understand this.

I am violent, human beings are dreadfully violent and we say we must not be violent, and trying not to be violent is itself a very form of violence. But if one is really aware of violence, that is, the nature of violence, aggression and so on - we won't go into all that - being aware of that and not wanting to change it, not wanting to get to the state of nonviolence, to understand violence is in itself freedom from violence - not its opposite.

So learning about oneself is absolutely necessary, obviously. I must learn - but the learning is not having learnt measure with what I have learned. Therefore learning is always an active inactive present - not having learnt something previously, which then becomes the measure, which then is the opposite of what should be and hence the conflict. So meditation is not a process of self-hypnotism, which most people indulge in, nor is it a form of inducing the mind to be quiet. Again see what is involved, if I induce the mind to be quiet, the very inducement is the noise which is going to make the mind quiet which it is not. I don't know if you see all this?

Questioner: Then how does one make the mind quiet?

Krishnamurti: You cannot. You see when you put that question, 'How am I to make the mind quiet?' you have already asserted something born out of uniqueness. Therefore when you say 'my mind must be quiet', you are creating a duality and the quietness is noise, only you call it 'quietness'. Please Sir, it is very important to understand this. There is only fact, 'what is', and nothing else. So the mind will only become quiet naturally, non-neurotically (and be at the same time active, tremendously active) when there is self-knowing. When I know myself - as I begin to understand myself in every minute (which is not accumulative), then out of this watchful sensitivity and intelligence comes about a silent mind, which is not a dead mind.

Questioner: Would you say why you have come here to speak to us?

Krishnamurti: God knows! (laughter) To answer that question several things are involved. One can make a speech in order to derive satisfaction, nourish oneself through the audience; you know the favourite trick of people who indulge in talks. Or you want to fulfil yourself through the audience. Or you want to convey something to them, tell them something. Now if you brush all that aside, then the question would be, 'Why do you talk at all, if you don't do any of these things'? Then why? You might just as well ask a flower why it blossoms.

Questioner: Is correct learning non-accumulative?

Krishnamurti: Technologically it must be accumulative. I must learn the technique of how to run something or other; and to learn a language there must be the accumulation of words in that language. But we are talking at the psychological level, not at the

technological level. At the psychological level, any accumulation must inevitably create its opposite. For instance, I know and I don't know, and as I don't know, I must know more about it - hence I am comparing what I know with what I don't know. That is a duality and hence a conflict: I am measuring what I don't know with what I know. And if one goes into it, is there anything to know at all about oneself? You can't put that question unless you have been through a great deal of understanding of yourself. Is there anything to learn about oneself? Not very much.

Questioner: I would like to know how the human mind's conditioning originated.

Krishnamurti: That's fairly simple. Let's finish what I was saying, I will come back to that.

Sir, what is there to know about oneself? - all our conditioning, the racial inheritance, the family inheritance, the psychological twists and inclinations and tendencies, the pressure of environment, a bundle of memories (which is what I am, an abstraction). There isn't very much to learn. I can only say that there is not much to learn after observing myself. But if you say, 'There isn't much to learn about yourself', then you remain just what you are. So one of the fundamental questions in this is, is it not? 'How does a human mind so conditioned change, uncondition itself?'

And what is the origin of this conditioning? That's fairly simple, isn't it? You can observe the animals, how aggressive they are to survive. There is the origin of it. You watch birds, how they mark out the area which is theirs, their property; territorial rights supersede sexual rights, and there is the origin of aggression. And we also hold property, to us property is immensely important, as

are sexual rights and so on. But a much more worthwhile question is: `Is it possible for a mind so heavily conditioned as ours to immediately - not gradually but immediately - be free of all conditioning? And we say it is possible only through meditation, not phoney meditation, not the meditation of long beards or short beards or long hair or no hair, but the meditation that comes into beings as one learns about oneself without accumulation. Then, in that meditation, there is a way of life which is completely peaceful, non-aggressive, not demanding that you be in society or out of society - that meditation brings its own action in which there is no conflict at all.

Questioner: Is meditation a whole way of life?

Krishnamurti: Obviously it is, but to understand meditation one has to observe. You have to observe how you look at the tree, whether there is a space between you and the tree, between the observer and the thing observed, which is the tree. How does that space come into being? The space comes into being because the observer has his own memories about that tree. Or when the observer separates himself from greed and says, `I am not greedy and I must get rid of greed', and there is a space between the observer and the observed and then the conflict. But the observer is the observed because he, being greedy, says, `I must not be greedy', and therefore creates a duality. So meditation is the most extraordinary thing if you know how to do it, and you cannot possibly learn from anybody; and that's the beauty of it. It isn't something you learn, a technique, and therefore there is no authority. Therefore if you will learn about yourself, watch yourself, watch the way you walk, the way you talk, how you eat,

what you say, the gossip, the hate, the jealousy. If you are aware of it without any choice, all that is part of meditation, and as you go, as you journey, as that movement goes, all that movement is meditation. Then that movement is endless, timeless.

30th September 1967

TALKS IN EUROPE 1967 6TH PUBLIC TALK LONDON 1ST OCTOBER 1967

IT SEEMS TO me that one of the greatest problems we have, is the urgency and the necessity of a fundamental revolution in ourselves, a radical change in the ways of our thinking feeling and reacting. And most of us are compelled to modify our attitudes and our activities either by circumstances, or by our own particular tendency and inclination. If one changes according to one's own inclination as one generally does - inclination being pleasure, gratification, tendency being temperament, emotional or intellectual - then it seems to me such change is really very superficial and most of us are satisfied to modify our activities, our ways of thinking, outwardly, on the surface. Or we are guided by circumstances, and again that is not a fundamental radical revolution in ourselves, and I think such a revolution is necessary because society as it is, is a horrifying thing; the brutality, the wars, the aggression - whether that aggression be offensive or defensive.

The division brought about by nationalities, by the politicians, by the religious organizations, by the technological revolution, technical knowledge, all this has made us acquiesce in what is, accept a society that is essentially based on violence and according to the structure of society, we psychologically adjust ourselves. And one sees that it is not a fundamental revolution, a mutation in the psyche. One observes this throughout the world - not only in the Western world, but in Asia where the poverty is immense, degradation is not measurable and fragmentation through class, through language and so on, is really very destructive. Seeing all

this one asks oneself, if one is at all serious, whether a change in the human mind which is so old, so conditioned, is at all possible - or if man must go on suffering indefinitely; war after war, daily conflict, the daily boredom, the routine of life, the loneliness - and out of that loneliness despair. The utter meaninglessness of life as it is. Seeing all that one asks, 'How is a human being to change?' Because human beings have created this monstrous society, and it's only human beings that can bring about a revolution not only in themselves but also in society. And how is this change or revolution, or mutation, to take place? As we said, if it is merely dependent on inclination, on tendency and the pressure of circumstances, then obviously such a change is meaningless. So we have to go into this question rather deeply to see whether it is at all possible to change - change at the very core of our being. And one perceives such a change is necessary. And what will make us change? Punishment, reward, greater security, greater hope, an organized pressure of religious propaganda, or the political chicanery and all that absurdity - will that bring about a change?

I think it is necessary not merely so listen to the speaker but also to ask oneself that question; and if one is at all serious, one does ask it. And the very asking of it - not superficially, not casually, but really with serious intent - brings about a certain quality of energy which is necessary to tackle this problem, because we need a great deal of energy to understand the confusion in which one is, to understand what the structure and nature of change is. To understand it there must be attention - not concentration - because there is a difference between attention and concentration. Concentration is limited, exclusive, it breeds conflicts and in

concentration there is distraction. But in attention there are none of these things - you are completely attentive; if one has experimented or observed this, one can see the difference between concentration and attention very clearly. In attention there is no conflict or distraction whatsoever, whereas in concentration there is distraction, conflict, a forcing upon a certain point which becomes exclusive; in concentration there is resistance. In attention there is no resistance at all. And we need such attention to find out what is implied in change.

According to the anthropologists we have lived two million years or more and during those centuries we have killed each other, destroyed each other, divided ourselves into families, into nations, into religious groups, and all the time we are talking about brotherhood, peace and all that ideological nonsense. But actually in every day of our life we are violent, we destroy animals to eat and we destroy each other in the name of God, in the name of country or whatever, for an ideal. Seeing all this one must naturally ask - and one does ask if one is at all serious - whether a radical revolution is possible. And to understand it and go into it one needs a tremendous energy and vitality and vigour. Therefore that vigour and that vitality does naturally bring about attention. If one does put such a question seriously to oneself one has the vitality.

And as we said the other day - perhaps at every talk - we are always ploughing but we never sow. We're always listening to what other people say. We're secondhand people. We read so many books on psychology, on religion and so on, and we are slaves to what we read. Probably we have never discovered anything for ourselves. We are imitators. We are yes-sayers, but to find out and

to penetrate into the question very deeply, we have to be no-sayers, we have to deny totally everything that we have been brought up to believe. For we do need a totally different kind of society.

So what do we mean by change? One observes that one does have to change - change to what? One is violent, angry, furious at all the absurdities that are going on around one. One wants to change all that into what? Is the opposite of 'what is' - the pursuit of the opposite - is that change? One is violent, and pursuing non-violence, hoping thereby to bring about change, is that radical change? The pursuit of the opposite contains its own opposite. This is very important to understand.

There is hatred and one sees the necessity that hatred must cease and that there must be affection, love, kindness. Is love the opposite of hate and can love be pursued and thereby hate denied? So one must understand, it seems to me, the nature of the opposite, that is, the nature of duality. Because when we talk about change, we are always thinking in those terms - of what is and what should be.

The 'what should be' is the outcome of 'what is', and the opposite must always contain that which is, therefore it is no longer the pursuit of the opposite, it is only the pursuit of what is, modified. Therefore any demand to change must create its own opposite. And therefore the question is, not what to change to, but what do we mean by change at all?

Violence and its opposite must always contain violence - the observer who is violent, perceives that he is violent and creates the opposite which is non-violence, as an idea. He pursues that idea, cultivating non-violence out of violence, and therefore the non-

violence is still violence. Please, this is not mere trickery of words, but is actually what goes on when we are talking about change. The good is not the opposite of evil, but one has this tendency of the evil, which is to do harm, to get angry, to be violent, to be acquisitive, greedy, envious and so on, and realizing that, one demands to be good. The very demand creates the opposite, so in that way there is no change at all, and I think it is essential to understand this. Then we can ask what change is; is there such a thing as change at all?

If one sees the whole structure of what one calls change and the demand that comes when one observes one's own violence, which creates non-violence, then the pursuit of the opposite comes to an end altogether; so there is no duality and hence no conflict. Because all our conflict comes from this duality, this contradiction between what is and what should be. One wants this and one wants something contrary to that. I demand peace but that very demand comes out of a state of mind which is in conflict, which is not peaceful. Therefore the very demand to change does breed the opposite and brings about a conflict in the demand to change.

Is this clearer? If not we'll talk about it a little later.

So then what is change? If the change is not the cultivation of the opposite - which it is not - then what do we mean by change? To answer this question one has to go into the problem of the observer and the observed. The observer being not only the visual perception, but what is behind it, memory, thought, idiosyncrasies, prejudices, a conditioned state. He's the censor, the experiencer, the one who judges, evaluates. That whole bundle of memories is the observer. And that observer is always modifying, changing, it is

not a static observer but under pressure, tension, necessity. There is always a modifying process going on within the observer himself. And, as long as there is the observer, there must be the observed - the opposite.

When one says one is angry, or jealous, or violent, there is the observer asserting he is violent - violence being apart from the observer. So the observer has separated himself from that which he calls violence. Then the observer says, 'I must overcome it'. I must find out ways and means to suppress, or change, or sublimate, this quality, this violence; but the observer has created the violence, he is violent, not the thing which he observes as violence. So, the observer is the observed. That is, the observer separates himself from the observed and creates a distance between himself and that which he observes. The experiencer, demanding experience, separates himself from experience by that very demand and thereby creates the longing, the wish, the conflict to have more experience. He, the experiencer, has brought about a space between himself and the thing to be experienced. But the experiencer is the experienced. So when he says, 'I must change, I see the necessity of change', he the observer, the experiencer, the thinker, does project a pattern, an idea of what should be, and trying to become that, creates the conflict, the contradiction, because he has separated himself from the thing to be observed. Can this observer be without any movement whatsoever? Because any movement on his part to bring about a change within himself creates the opposite and then he is caught in the conflict of the opposite. But the observer is the observed, and when he realizes that, then what does change mean?

Is this all too abstract? I hope not, but we'll see.

So one sees that total inaction is radical change. Total inaction on the part of the observer and therefore the observer is not. If you go into yourselves not theoretically, not with the words of the speaker, but actually observe yourself, you will see this going on in yourself. The pattern of the opposite has been set throughout millennia, good and bad, God and the Devil and all that business. And this constant struggle between the good and the bad is sustained because the observer is both the good and the bad, and the pursuit of the bad or the evil is the pursuit of the observer, not of the good. So realizing that, if one observes it in oneself, one sees that change can only take place when there is no movement or demand on the part of the observer. So total inaction is total revolution.

Let's put it differently. Please, this is not philosophy - this is not another pattern, another ideal to be pursued. All ideals are idiotic. They have no meaning whatsoever. What has meaning is what is. The what is, is this whole structure of the observer. And one can discover it really for oneself if one is attentive, meditative, watching without choice, aware, intense about finding out what it means to change. As we said, let's look at it from a different point of view, approach it differently. We talk a great deal about love. The love of one's country, the love of the family, the love of God, the love of man. 'I love this book'. So to find out what love is, to come upon it as one comes upon a perfume that one has never smelt before one must unburden this word, cleanse it of all the things that we have given to that word. And one has to find out for oneself what the thing is that one calls love. Perhaps that may be

the ultimate solution to all man's difficulties, problems and travails. Because when the husband says 'I love you', and the wife says 'I love you', is it love? Or is there in it sensuous pleasure, possession, domination, comfort, gratification? And all that we call love, and it may be, as man has sustained this thing called love through the family. So to find out what love is, not theoretically, not in abstraction, but actually, one has to understand whether love has any opposite.

Most of us hate violence. We are jealous, acquisitive, dominating and with many inhibitions, and yet we say, 'I love you'. Find out the nature of that love in which there is no conflict whatsoever, and the love which is total contact in all relationships, because only a total contact is total relationship. But if I only touch you at different points, sexually, seeking comfort, domination, then is that love, is that relationship? So to find out, or rather to come upon it, one has to first find out what relationship means. Not only relationship to things, to houses, to furniture, but also to people and ideas. That which we possess, we are. If you possess a house, the furniture, the family, an idea, you are that - obviously. So is possession in any form love? Does not possession breed anxiety, envy, jealousy, domination, fear? And when there is fear, domination, is that love? And in that relationship between man and man, man and woman, and so on, if in that relationship there is a self-centred activity - whether it is the self-centred activity of the wife or the husband - does that not separate the two human beings? Though they say we love each other, each is pursuing his own particular path, his particular intention, and can there be love when there is aggression, when there is competition? Obviously hate and

jealousy are not love. But for us love contains jealousy, for in that love there is possession. To us, then, love is desire and pleasure.

And out of this desire and pleasure arise sexual problems. I wonder why the whole world is tortured by this problem. All the newspapers, magazines, television, radio, talk about this. It has become an extraordinary problem in the world. Why? Partly religions have sustained the problem, because they have said it is wrong; to find God you must be celibate, you mustn't marry, the whole Catholic Church is supporting this view. To serve God you must be a bachelor, for sex is an abomination to all religions. And also it has become a problem for most people in the world, because intellectually they have no escape, intellectually they are slaves, they are not free human beings; intellectually you obey, follow, you read innumerable books - what to think and what to do and what not to do, so intellectually all that energy is bottled up. If one can observe it in oneself, intellectually no one is a revolutionary. Very few are. And emotionally because we are acquisitive, greedy, jealous, fearful, anxious, guilty, there is only one pleasure left which is free. That is sex. When your intellectual energy is cut off, emotionally you are not alive. To become emotionally alive you go to concerts, museums, read books. So you have only this outlet - sex. And only in that there is pleasure, and the everlasting chewing it over. Sex then becomes an extraordinarily important thing in life because love, or what one calls love, is based on desire and pleasure, which is the process of thinking; thinking about the pleasure that you have had, because intellectually you have no pleasure in the deep sense of the word. We read dozens of books, are up-to-date, but having read the latest book to be able to criticize

it, we are still in the pattern of the old, repeated. In that there is no pleasure, because pleasure implies freedom. And emotionally you have so many fears. So thought inevitably makes sex into an immense thing and then it becomes a problem. Because then love is merely desire and pleasure and naturally with it goes so-called responsibility, the responsibility for the family, and the family is inevitably against the whole structure of society. I and my family first, and so the world is divided into families, nationalities, groups and all the rest of it.

So thought, thinking about that from which it has gained pleasure, gives duration to pleasure. I had pleasure yesterday looking at that sunset, or that tree, or that extraordinary light of the evening on the water. Thinking about it has brought pleasure - not when I observed it; when I observed it there was no pleasure, there was a great sense of beauty, quietness of the evening, but the more I think about that quietness, that beauty, the more I derive pleasure from it and I want the repetition of that pleasure. It's the same with sex, with any form of pleasure. So, sex has its own place; we are not discussing what is the right place. But one will discover what is its right place when one understands love, which is not desire and pleasure. Love is not the opposite of pleasure and desire. Because if one only knows desire and pleasure, and wants to come upon this thing called love, to understand what love is, one must understand the structure of thought.

Thought, which is a response of memory, knowledge, experience, is always old. Thought is never free. Thought is always conditioned by past experience and knowledge. So thought can never under any circumstances understand, come upon that thing

called love. The observer is essentially thought, the observer is essentially the old, so the observer is never the new. The new can never contain the observer. The observer cannot hold the new, but when one understands the whole process, then one comes upon this thing called love - which is never old, which is always in the active present, which has no image, because that which has an image, or is represented by a symbol, is always the old created by thought. So when you worship God you are really worshipping your own image which you have projected - and therefore it is not love. It is only your fear and the opposite. So to understand this extraordinary thing which man has sought endlessly, through sacrifice, through worship, through pain, through relationship, through sex, through every form of pleasure and pain, is only possible when thought - which is an extraordinary thing in itself - comes to understand itself and comes to an end naturally.

Then love has no opposite. Then love has no conflict. And without that love, do what you will, there will be no end to problems. You may belong to all the latest groups, or know all the psychologists, all the quacks or all the people who teach meditation and all the rest of it; it's only when there is that love, that there is peace. And then there is a benediction.

Questioner: Is love not desire, in your opinion?

Krishnamurti: Are we discussing opinions? You know, there is no end to opinions, or the truth in opinion, a dialectical approach to life, which is opinion. You have your opinion, and I have my opinion, Marx, and the capitalist opinion. We are not dealing with opinions. We are dealing with facts as they are and to understand the facts, no opinion is necessary whatsoever; neither the opinion

of the Catholic, nor of the Protestant, nor of the Hindu, nor of the Communist. One has to observe the fact; and the fact is, most of us have intense desires, which is natural. When one sees a beautiful car, a beautiful person, a lovely face, it is natural to respond, as you do to a beautiful sky, to a tree that is turning in the autumn; one must respond and respond totally, completely. But in that response thought comes in and says 'that was a great delight, I must continue with that delight'.

Therefore, the demand that it must continue creates its own opposite and hence the conflict of not having it. So desire is normal, healthy, but it becomes unhealthy, ugly, when thought turns it into pleasure and then pleasure breeds antagonism, hatred, and in antagonism and hatred there is no love.

Questioner: Sir, it seems to me that fear is the basis of humour and humour is the basis of compromise.

Krishnamurti: Why do we want to compromise and what do we mean by compromise? We say society is monstrous and are we compromising when we put on a suit made by that society, when we eat the food cultivated by that society? There is a total separation from society - that society which I psychologically have built - when I am psychologically totally free from all the things that belong to society, like greed, envy, belief, which is superstition, its Gods, its immoralities. Then there is freedom from that society; in that there is no compromise whatsoever. Society says you must fight, you must kill another, destroy other human beings for your country, for your God, for your ideals. And when one has affection, this quality of love, will you kill another? Can you compromise and say, 'Well, my friend I'm going to kill you for

your own good, for my freedom'? Is there a compromise at all when you see things very clearly? Is there compromise when you see a poisonous animal, a snake or a deep precipice? You see very clearly there is no compromise - you walk away. There is compromise only when there is confusion. And as most of us unfortunately are very confused about everything, we are everlastingly compromising. But when you have clarity there is enlightenment. To see things as they are, not in your own terms, not according to your own tendency and inclination, to see things actually as they are is to be free of them, and in that there is no compromise, for then there is no confusion whatsoever.

Questioner: What is the difference between isolation and loneliness?

Krishnamurti: Is there much difference between the two? In daily life, however much one is related, however close one may be to one's family, every self-centred activity is a process of isolation. When I dominate my wife or my husband, when I'm jealous, when I'm ambitious - all this is part of self-centred activities which lead to isolation. And when one becomes aware of the extraordinary isolation one has built for oneself, one is lonely. One becomes aware of this agony of loneliness in which no relationship exists whatsoever. It may be while you are with friends in a group, or on a bus, and suddenly you are aware of this intense loneliness, which has been brought about through a daily life of self-centred movement, and becoming aware of that loneliness with its agony, one tries to escape from it. One picks up a paper or one goes to Church, or to a football match, or to a pub. Whether you worship God or go to a pub, it is exactly the same, when there is the sense

of loneliness. And one cannot escape from it. What one can do is to see this self-centred activity in life every day; be aware, not demand that it should end, for then you are back again, in the turmoil of conflict.

Questioner: I find myself incapable of observing wretchedness in others without a feeling that I should interfere. Am I capable of love in the true sense?

Krishnamurti: I see in others sorrow, misery, conflict, and naturally I can't interfere. And do I have love when I observe without interference? You know, that word interfere is rather a difficult word - we are always interfering with others. The whole of education is interference with others. The whole propaganda of the Church is interference with others. All the propagandists, the missionaries throughout the world - whether they are Christian missionaries or the missionaries of Asia, or of the Communists and so on - they are all constantly interfering with others. The husband is interfering with the wife and the wife with the husband. It is an endless movement because we all want to change others, to make them different, to brainwash them to accept our opinions, our judgments, our values.

You know, to be free of all influence, which means to be free of all interference, is one of the greatest things. It is when one is free from all influence that there is love, and that love perhaps will answer the wretchedness, the sorrow of another.

1st October 1967