

*Jiddu Krishnamurti*

*Five Public Meetings in New  
York City - 1950*

## *Table of Contents*

<i>First Public Talk in New York</i> .....	1
<i>Second Public Talk in New York</i> .....	7
<i>Third Public Talk in New York</i> .....	13
<i>Fourth Public Talk in New York</i> .....	20
<i>Fifth Public Talk in New York</i> .....	27

## ***First Public Talk in New York***

First Public Talk in New York

Sunday, June 4, 1950

I think it is important to bear in mind that there is a difficulty in understanding each other. Most of us listen casually, and we hear only what we want to hear; we disregard that which is penetrating or disturbing and listen only to the things that are pleasurable, satisfying. Surely, there can be no real understanding of anything if we listen only to those things which gratify and soothe us. It is quite an art to listen to everything without prejudice, without building up defenses; and may I suggest that we try to set aside our acquired knowledge, our particular idiosyncrasies and points of view, and listen to find out the truth of the matter. It is only the truth that really and fundamentally frees us - not speculations, not conclusions, but only the perception of what is true. The true is the factual, and we are incapable of looking at the factual when we approach it with our private conclusions, prejudices, and experiences. So, if I may suggest it, during these talks we should try to hear not only what is being said verbally but the inward content of it; we should try to discover the truth of the matter for ourselves.

Now, truth can be discovered only when we are not pursuing any form of distraction, and most of us want to be distracted. Life, with all its struggles, problems, wars, business crises, and family quarrels, is a bit too much for us, so we want to be distracted, and we have probably come to this meeting in search of distraction. But distraction, whether outward or inward, will not help us to understand ourselves. Distraction - whether the distraction of politics, of religion, of knowledge, of amusement, or the distraction of pursuing so-called truth - however stimulating for the time being, ultimately dulls the mind, encloses, circumscribes, and limits it. Distractions are both outward and inward. The outward ones we know fairly well; as we grow older we begin to recognize them if we are at all thoughtful. But though we may discard the obvious distractions, it is much more difficult to understand the inward ones; and if we merely make these meetings into a new form of distraction, a new stimulation, I am afraid they will have very little value in the understanding of oneself - which is of primary importance.

Therefore, one has to understand the whole process of distraction, because as long as the mind is distracted, seeking a result, trying to escape through stimulation or so-called inspiration, it is incapable of understanding its own process. And, if we are to think out any of the innumerable problems that confront each one of us, it is essential to know the whole process of our own thinking, is it not? Self-knowledge is ultimately the only way of resolving our innumerable problems, and self-knowledge cannot possibly be a result, an outcome, of stimulation or distraction. On the contrary, distraction, stimulation, and so-called inspiration merely take one away from the central issue. Surely, without knowing oneself fundamentally, radically, and deeply, without knowing all the layers of consciousness, both the superficial as well as the profound, there is no basis for thinking, is there? If I do not know myself in both the upper and the deeper layers of the mind, what basis have I for any thinking? And in order to know oneself, no form of distraction is helpful. Yet most of us are concerned with distractions. Our religious, political, social, and economic activities, our pursuit of various teachers with their particular idiosyncrasies, our clamoring after what we call knowledge - these are all escapes, they are obviously distractions away from the central issue of knowing oneself. Though it has often been said that it is essential to know oneself, we actually give very little time or thought to the matter; and without knowing oneself, whatever we think or do must inevitably lead to further confusion and misery.

So, it is essential in all things to understand the process of oneself because without knowing oneself, no

human problem can be resolved. Any resolution of a problem without self-knowledge is merely distraction, leading to further misery, confusion, and struggle - this, when one thinks about it, is fairly obvious. Seeing the truth of that, how is it possible to know the whole content, the whole structure of oneself? I think this is a fundamental question which each one of us has to face, and in considering it together, you are not merely listening to me giving you a series of ideas, nor am I expounding a particular system or method. On the contrary, you and I are trying to find out together how it is possible to know oneself - the "oneself" who is the actor, the observer, the thinker, the watcher. If I do not know the whole process of myself, mere conclusions, theories, speculations, are obviously of very little significance.

Now, to know myself, I must know my actions, my thoughts, my feelings because I can only know myself in action, not apart from action. I cannot know myself apart from my activities in relationship. My activities, my qualities, are myself. I can know the whole process of my thinking, the conscious as well as the unconscious, only in relationship - my relationship to ideas, to people, and to things, property, and money; and to study myself apart from relationship has very little meaning. It is only in my relationship to these things that I can know myself. To divide myself into the 'higher' and the 'lower' is absurd. To think that I am the higher self directing or controlling my lower self is a theory of the mind, and without understanding the structure of the mind, merely to invent convenient theories is a process of escape from myself.

So, the important thing is to find out what my relationship is to people, to property, and to ideas, because life is a process of relationship. Nothing can live in isolation, except theoretically, and to understand myself, I must understand the whole process of relationship. But the understanding of relationship becomes extremely difficult and almost impossible when I look into the mirror of relationship with a sense of condemnation, justification, or comparison. How can I understand relationship if I condemn, justify, or compare it with something? I can understand it only when I come to it anew, with a fresh mind, a mind which is not caught in the traditional background of condemnation and acceptance.

To understand myself is essential because whatever the problems, they are projected by me. I am the world, I am not independent of the world, and the world's problems are my own. To understand the problems around me, which are the projection of myself, I have to understand myself in relationship to everything, but there cannot be understanding if I begin by comparing, condemning, or justifying. Now, it is the nature of the mind to condemn, to justify, to compare, and when we see in the mirror of relationship our own reactions and idiosyncrasies, our instinctive response is to condemn or justify them. The understanding of this process of condemnation and justification is the beginning of self-knowledge - and without self-knowledge, we cannot go very far. We can invent a lot of theories and speculations, join various groups, follow teachers and Masters, perform rituals, gather into little cliques and feel superior to others - but all this leads nowhere, it is merely the immature action of thoughtless people. To find out what is real, to discover whether or not there is reality, God, one must first understand oneself because whatever the conception one may have of reality or of God, it is merely a projection of oneself, which can obviously never be real. It is only when the mind is utterly tranquil - not forced to be tranquil, not compelled nor disciplined - that it is possible to find out what is real, and the mind can be still only in the understanding of its own structure. Only the real, that which is not a projection of the mind, can free the mind from all the tribulations, from all the problems that confront each one of us.

So, we must first see the importance, the necessity of understanding oneself, for without understanding oneself, no problem can be resolved, and the wars, the antagonisms, the envy and strife will continue. A man who would really understand truth must have a mind that is quiet, and that quietness can come only through the understanding of himself. Tranquillity of the mind does not come through discipline, through control, through subjugation, but only when the problems, which are the projections of oneself, are completely understood. Only when the mind is quiet, when it is not projecting itself, is it possible for the real to be. That is, for reality to come into being, the mind must be quiet - not made quiet, not controlled, subjugated, or suppressed, but silent spontaneously because of its understanding of the whole structure of

the 'me', with all its memories, limitations, and conflicts. When all this is completely and truly understood, the mind is quiet, and then only is it possible to know that which is real.

Some questions have been given to me, and I shall answer a few of them this morning, but before doing so, let me say that it is very easy to ask a question, hoping for an answer. I am afraid, however, that life has no answer like yes or no. We have to discover the true answer for ourselves, and to discover the true answer, we must examine the problem. To examine the problem, especially a problem that concerns us intimately, is very difficult, for most of us approach it with a prejudice, with a desire to find a result, a satisfactory answer. So, in considering these questions, let us investigate the problem together, and not wait for me to tell you the answer, because truth must be discovered each minute, not merely explained. Truth is not knowledge - knowledge is merely the cultivation of memory, and memory is a continuity of experiences - and that which is continuous can never be the truth. So, let us investigate these questions together. I am not saying this merely to be rhetorical - I actually mean it. You and I are going to find out the truth of the matter. If you discover it for yourself, it is yours, but if you wait for me to give the answer, it will have very little value, for then you will merely remain on the verbal level and hear only words, and the words will not carry you very far.

Question: What system would assure us of economic security?

Krishnamurti: Now, what do we mean by a system? The world is torn at the present time between two systems, the left and the right. The world is broken up by beliefs, by ideas, by formulas, and we seek economic or physical security along certain lines. Now, can there be security according to any particular system? Can you base existence on any particular belief, conclusion, or theory? There is the system of the left and the system of the right. Both of them promise economic security, and they are at war with each other - which means that you are not secure. You are not secure because you are quarreling over systems and cultivating war in the process. So, as long as you depend on a system for security, there must be insecurity. Surely, that is fairly clear, is it not? Those who hold to beliefs, to Utopian promises, are not concerned with people - they are concerned with ideas; and action based on ideas must inevitably breed separatism and disintegration - which is actually what is taking place. So, as long as we look for security through a system, through an idea, obviously there must be separatism, contention, and disintegration, which invariably brings about insecurity.

The next problem is this: Is economic security a matter of legislation, of compulsion, of totalitarianism? We all want to be secure. It is essential to be physically secure, to have food, clothing, and shelter, otherwise we cannot exist. But is that security brought about by legislation, by economic regulation - or is it a psychological problem? So far, we have considered it merely as an economic problem, a matter of economic adjustment, but surely it is a psychological problem, is it not? And can such a problem be solved by economic experts? Since the economic problem is obviously the result of our own inclinations, desires, and pursuits, it is really a psychological problem; and in order to bring about economic security, we must understand the psychological demand to be secure. I do not know if I am making myself clear.

The world is now torn up into different nationalities, different beliefs, different political ideologies, each promising security, a future utopia; and obviously, such a process of separatism is a process of disintegration.

Now, can there ever be unity through ideas? Can ideas, beliefs, ever bring people together? Obviously, they cannot - it is being proved throughout the world. So, to bring about security, not for a small group of people, but for the whole of mankind, there must be freedom from this process of division created by ideas - the idea of being a Christian, a Buddhist, a Hindu, a nationalist, a communist, a socialist, a capitalist, an American, a Russian, or God knows what else. It is these things that are separating us, and they are nothing but beliefs, ideas; and as long as we cling to beliefs as a means of security, there must be separation, there

must be disintegration and chaos.

So, this is fundamentally a psychological, not an economic problem; it is a problem of the individual psyche, and therefore we have to understand the process of individuality, of the 'you'. Is the 'you' in America different from the 'me' that lives in India or in Europe? Though we may separate ourselves by customs, by formulas, by certain beliefs, fundamentally we are the same, are we not? Now, when the 'me' seeks security in a belief, that very belief gives strength to the 'me'. I am a Hindu, a socialist, I belong to a particular religion, a particular sect, and I cling to that and defend it. So, the very attachment to belief creates separatism, which is obviously a cause of contention between you and me. The economic problem can never be solved as long as we separate ourselves into nationalities, into religious groups, or belong to particular ideologies. So, it is essentially a psychological problem, that is, a problem of the individual in relationship to society; and society is the projection of oneself. That is why there can be no solution to any human problem without understanding oneself completely - which means living in a state of complete inward insecurity. We want to be outwardly secure, and so we pursue inward security; but as long as we are seeking inward security through beliefs, through attachments, through ideologies, obviously we will create islands of isolation in the form of national, ideological, and religious groups, and therefore be at war with each other.

So, it is important to understand the process of oneself. But self-knowledge is not a means of ultimate security - on the contrary, reality is something which has to be discovered from moment to moment. A mind that is secure can never be in a state of discovery, and a mind that is insecure has no belief, it is not caught in any particular ideology. Such a mind is not seeking inward security, therefore it will create outward security. As long as you are seeking security inwardly, you will never have security outwardly. Therefore, the problem is not to bring about outward security but to understand the desire to be inwardly, psychologically secure, and as long as we do not understand that, we shall never have peace, we shall never have security in the outer world.

Now, one is horrified, very often, to discover in oneself appalling distortions. How is one to be free from them? There are different ways of attempting to be free, are there not? There is the psychoanalytical process, and there is the process of control, of discipline, and the process of escape. Can one be free fundamentally through the psychoanalytical process? I am not condemning psychoanalysis - but let us examine it. First of all, the 'me', the whole structure of the 'me', is the result of the past. You and I are the result of the past, of time, of many incidents, experiences; we are made up of various qualities, memories, idiosyncrasies. The whole structure of the 'me' is the past. Now, in the past there are certain qualities which I dislike and want to get rid of, so I go into the past and look at them; I bring them out and analyze them, hoping to dissolve them; or, using the actions of the present as a mirror to reflect the past, I try to dissolve the past. Either I go to the past and try to dissolve it through analysis, or I use the present as a means through which the past is discovered; that is, in present action I seek to discover and understand the past. So, that is one way.

Then there is the way of discipline. I say to myself, "These particular distortions are not worthwhile, I am going to suppress, subjugate, control them." This implies, does it not, that there is an entity separate from the thought process - call it the higher self or what you will - that is controlling, dominating, choosing. Surely that is implied, is it not? When I say, "I am going to dissolve the distortions," I am separate from those distortions. That is, I don't like the distortions - they hinder me, they bring about fear, conflict - and I want to dissolve them, so there arises the idea that the 'me' is separate from the distortions and is capable of dissolving them.

Before we discuss this further, we will have to find out if the 'me', the examiner, the observer, the analyzer, is different from the qualities. Am I making it clear? Is the thinker, the experiencer, the observer, different from the thought, from the experience, from the thing which is observed? Is the 'me', whether you place it at the highest or at the lowest level - is that 'me' different from the qualities which compose it? Is the thinker,

the analyzer, different from his thoughts? You think that he is - that the thinker is separate from thought; therefore, you control thought, you shape thought, you subjugate, push it aside. The thinker, you say, is different from thought. But is that so? Is there a thinker without thought? If you have no thought, where is the thinker? So, thought creates the thinker; the thinker doesn't create thought. The moment we separate the thinker from the thought, we have the whole problem of trying to control, dissipate, suppress thought, or of trying to be free from a particular thought. This is the conflict between the thinker and the thought in which most of us are caught - it is our whole problem.

One sees certain distortions in oneself which one doesn't like, and one wants to be free of them; so one tries to analyze or to discipline them, that is, to do something about the thoughts. But before we do that, should we not find out if the thinker is actually separate from thought? Obviously he is not - the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experienced - they are not two different processes, but a single, unitary process. Thought divides itself and creates the thinker for its own convenience. That is, thought is invariably transient; it has no resting place, and seeing itself as transient, thought creates the thinker as the permanent entity. The permanent entity then acts upon thought, choosing this particular thought and rejecting that. Now, when you really see the falseness of that process, you will discover that there is no thinker, but only thoughts - which is quite a revolution. This is the fundamental revolution which is essential in order to understand the whole process of thinking. As long as you establish a thinker independent of his thoughts, you are bound to have conflict between the thinker and the thought, and where there is conflict, there can be no understanding. Without understanding this division in yourself, do what you will - suppress, analyze, discover the cause of struggle, go to a psychoanalyst, and all the rest of it - you will inevitably remain in the process of conflict. But if you can see and understand the truth that the thinker is the thought, the analyzer is the analyzed - if you can understand that, not merely verbally, but in actual experience, then you will discover that an extraordinary revolution is taking place. Then there is no permanent entity as the 'me' choosing and discarding, seeking a result, or trying to achieve an end. Where there is choice there must be conflict, and choice will never lead to understanding because choice implies a thinker who chooses. So, to be free of a particular distortion, a particular perversion, we must first discover for ourselves the truth that the thinker is not separate from thought; then we will see that what we call distortion is a process of thinking, and that there is no thinker apart from that process.

Now, what do we mean by thinking? When we say, "This is ugly," "That is fear," "This must be discarded," we know what that process is. There is the 'me' who is choosing, condemning, discarding. But if there is not the 'me' but only that process of fear, then what happens? Am I explaining the problem? If there is not the one who condemns, who chooses, who thinks that he is separate from that which he dislikes, then what happens? Please experience this as we go along, and you will see. Don't merely listen to my words, but actually experience that there is only thought, and not the thinker. Then you will see what thinking is. What is thought? Thought is a process of verbalization, is it not? Without words, you cannot think. So, thought is a process of memory, because words, symbols, names, are the product, the result of memory. So, thinking is a process of memory, and memory gives a name to a particular feeling and either condemns or accepts it. By giving a name to something, you condemn or accept it, don't you? When you say someone is an American, a Russian, a Hindu, a negro, you have finished with him, haven't you? By labeling a thing, you think you have understood it. So, when there is a particular reaction which you term fear, in giving it a name you have condemned it. That is the actual process you will see going on when you begin to be aware of your thinking.

Is it possible not to name a feeling? Because, by calling a particular feeling "anger," "fear," "jealousy," we have given it strength, have we not? We have fixed it. The very naming is a process of confirming that feeling, giving it strength, and therefore enclosing it in memory. Observe it and you will see. It is possible to be free fundamentally only when the process of naming is understood - naming being terming, symbolizing, which is the action of memory - because memory is the 'you'. Without your memory, without your

experiences, the 'you' is not, and the mind clings to those experiences as essential in order to be secure. So, we cultivate memory, which is experience, knowledge, and through that process we hope to control the reactions and feelings which we call distortions. If we would be free of any particular quality, we must understand the whole process of the thinker and the thought; we must see the truth that the thinker is not separate from thought, but that they are a single, unitary process. If you actually realize that, you will see what an extraordinary revolution takes place in your life. By revolution I do not mean economic revolution, which is no revolution at all, but merely a modified continuity of what is. But when the thinker realizes that he is not different from thought, then you will see that radically, deeply, there is an extraordinary transformation, because then there is only the fact of thought, and not the translation of that fact to suit the thinker. Now, what is there to understand about a fact? There is nothing, is there? A fact is a fact, it is self-evident. The struggle to understand comes only when the thinker is trying to do something about the fact. The action of the thinker upon the fact is shaped by his memory, by his past experience; therefore, the fact is always shaped by the thinker, and therefore he never understands the fact. But if there is no thinker, but only the fact, then the fact has not to be understood - it is a fact; and when you are face to face with a fact, what happens? When there is no escape, when there is no thinker trying to give the fact a meaning to suit himself or shape it according to his particular pattern, what happens? When you are face to face with a fact, surely then you have understood it, have you not? Therefore, there is freedom from it. And such freedom is a radical freedom, it is not just a superficial reaction, a result of the mind's trying to identify itself with a particular opposite. As long as we are seeking a result, there must be the thinker, there must be the process of isolation; and a person who, in his thoughts, is isolated as the thinker, can never find what is true. The so-called religious person who is seeking God is merely establishing himself as a permanent entity apart from his thoughts, and such a person can never find reality.

So, then, our problem is this: Being aware of a particular reaction, of a response of fear, of guilt, of anger, of envy, or what you will, how is one to be radically free of it? One can see that it is impossible to be free of it through discipline because a product of conflict is never the truth - it is only a result, the effect of a cause. Whereas, if one sees as true that the thinker can never be separate from his thought, that the qualities and memories of the 'me' are not separate from the 'me' - when one realizes that and has direct experience of it, then one will see that thought becomes a fact and that there is no translating of the fact. The fact is the truth, and when you are confronted with truth and there is no other action but seeing it directly as it is, without condemnation or justification, that very recognition of the fact frees the mind from the fact.

So, only when the mind is capable of seeing itself in its relationship to all things is it possible for the mind to be quiet, to be tranquil. The mind that is tranquil through a process of isolation, of subjugation, of control, is not tranquil, but dead; it is merely conforming to a pattern, seeking a particular result. Only a free mind can be tranquil, and that freedom does not come through any form of identification; on the contrary, it comes only when we realize that the thinker is the thought, and not separate from thought. The tranquillity of freedom, of understanding, is not a matter of knowledge. Knowledge can never bring understanding. Knowledge is merely the cultivation of memory, in which the mind seeks security, and such a mind can never understand reality. Reality can be found only in freedom, which means to face the fact as it is, without distorting it. There must be distortion as long as the 'I' is separate from the thing it observes. Surely, the tranquil mind is a free mind, and it is only in freedom that truth can be discovered.

***First Public Talk in New York***

***Sunday, June 4, 1950***

## ***Second Public Talk in New York***

Second Public Talk in New York

Sunday, June 11, 1950

I think it is important to see the necessity of self-knowledge because what we are, that we project. If we are confused, uncertain, worried, ambitious, cruel, or fearful, it is just that which we produce in the world. We do not seem to realize how essential it is for thought and action that there should be a fundamental understanding of oneself - not only of the superficial layers of one's consciousness, but also of the deeper layers of the unconscious, of the totality of one's whole process of thinking and feeling. We seem to regard this understanding of oneself as such a difficult task that we prefer to run away from it into all kinds of infantile, immature activities, such as ceremonies, so-called spiritual organizations, political groups, and so on - anything rather than study and comprehend oneself integrally and completely.

The fundamental understanding of oneself does not come through knowledge or through the accumulation of experiences, which is merely the cultivation of memory. The understanding of oneself is from moment to moment; and if we merely accumulate knowledge of the self, that very knowledge prevents further understanding, because accumulated knowledge and experience become the center through which thought focuses and has its being. The world is not different from us and our activities, because it is what we are which creates the problems of the world; and the difficulty with the majority of us is that we do not know ourselves directly, but seek a system, a method, a means of operation by which to solve the many human problems.

Now, is there a means, a system, of knowing oneself? Any clever person, any philosopher, can invent a system, a method, but surely, the following of a system will merely produce a result created by that system, will it not? If I follow a particular method of knowing myself, then I shall have the result which that system necessitates, but that result will obviously not be the understanding of myself. That is, by following a method, a system, a means through which to know myself, I shape my thinking, my activities, according to a pattern, but the following of a pattern is not the understanding of oneself.

So, there is no method for self-knowledge. Seeking a method invariably implies the desire to attain some result - and that is what we all want. We follow authority - if not that of a person, then of a system, of an ideology - because we want a result which will be satisfactory, which will give us security. We really do not want to understand ourselves, our impulses and reactions, the whole process of our thinking, the conscious as well as the unconscious; we would rather pursue a system which assures us of a result. But the pursuit of a system is invariably the outcome of our desire for security, for certainty, and the result is obviously not the understanding of oneself. When we follow a method, we must have authorities - the teacher, the guru, the savior, the Master - who will guarantee us what we desire, and surely, that is not the way to self-knowledge.

Authority prevents the understanding of oneself, does it not? Under the shelter of an authority, a guide, you may have temporarily a sense of security, a sense of well-being, but that is not the understanding of the total process of oneself. Authority in its very nature prevents the full awareness of oneself, and therefore ultimately destroys freedom, and in freedom alone can there be creativeness. There can be creativeness only through self-knowledge. Most of us are not creative, we are repetitive machines, mere gramophone records playing over and over again certain songs of experience, certain conclusions and memories, either our own or those of another. Such repetition is not creative being - but it is what we want. Because we want to be

inwardly secure, we are constantly seeking methods and means for this security, and thereby we create authority, the worship of another, which destroys comprehension, that spontaneous tranquillity of mind in which alone there can be a state of creativeness.

Surely, our difficulty is that most of us have lost this sense of creativeness. To be creative does not mean that we must paint pictures or write poems and become famous. That is not creativeness - it is merely the capacity to express an idea, which the public applauds or disregards. Capacity and creativeness should not be confused. Capacity is not creativeness. Creativeness is quite a different state of being, is it not? It is a state in which the self is absent, in which the mind is no longer a focus of our experiences, our ambitions, our pursuits, and our desires. Creativeness is not a continuous state, it is new from moment to moment, it is a movement in which there is not the 'me', the 'mine', in which the thought is not focused around any particular experience, ambition, achievement, purpose, or motive. It is only when the self is not, that there is creativeness - that state of being in which alone there can be reality, the creator of all things. But that state cannot be conceived or imagined, it cannot be formulated or copied, it cannot be attained through any system, through any method, through any philosophy, through any discipline; on the contrary, it comes into being only through understanding the total process of oneself.

The understanding of oneself is not a result, a culmination; it is seeing oneself from moment to moment in the mirror of relationship - one's relationship to property, to things, to people, and to ideas. But we find it difficult to be alert, to be aware, and we prefer to dull our minds by following a method, by accepting authorities, superstitions, and gratifying theories; so, our minds become weary, exhausted, and insensitive. Such a mind cannot be in a state of creativeness. That state of creativeness comes only when the self, which is the process of recognition and accumulation, ceases to be, because, after all, consciousness as the 'me' is the center of recognition, and recognition is merely the process of the accumulation of experience. But we are all afraid to be nothing because we all want to be something. The little man wants to be a big man, the unvirtuous wants to be virtuous, the weak and obscure crave power, position, and authority. This is the incessant activity of the mind. Such a mind cannot be quiet and therefore can never understand the state of creativeness.

So, to transform the world about us, with its misery, wars, unemployment, starvation, class divisions, and utter confusion, there must be a transformation in ourselves. The revolution must begin within oneself - but not according to any belief or ideology because revolution based on an idea, or in conformity to a particular pattern, is obviously no revolution at all. To bring about a fundamental revolution in oneself, one must understand the whole process of one's thought and feeling in relationship. That is the only solution to all our problems - and not to have more disciplines, more beliefs, more ideologies, and more teachers. If we can understand ourselves as we are from moment to moment without the process of accumulation, then we will see how there comes a tranquillity that is not a product of the mind, a tranquillity that is neither imagined nor cultivated; and only in that state of tranquillity can there be creativeness.

There are several questions, and in considering them together, let us as individuals experiment together to find out the truth of each question. It is not my explanation that is going to dissolve the problem nor your eager search for a solution, but what dissolves any problem is to unravel it step by step and thereby see the truth of it. It is seeing the truth of our difficulties which dissolves them, but to see things as they are is not easy. Listening is an art, and if in listening we can follow what is said experimentally, operationally, then there is a possibility of seeing the truth and thereby dissolving the particular problem which may confront each one of us.

Question: What mental attitude would you consider best suited for the achievement of contentment in today's troubled world, and how would you suggest we attain it?

Krishnamurti: When you want to attain contentment, you have an idea about it, haven't you? You have a

preconception of what it is to be contented, and you want to be in that state, so you seek a method, you want to know how to attain it. Is contentment a result, a thing to be achieved? Is not the very search for a result itself the cause of discontent? Surely, the moment I want to be something, I have already sown the seed of discontent; because I want to attain contentment, I have already brought discontent into being.

Please let us see the significance of this desire to achieve an end. The end is always gratifying, it is something that we think will give us permanent security, happiness. That is, the end is always self-projected, and having projected it, or imagined it, or formulated it in words, we want to attain it, and then we seek a method for its attainment. We want to know how to be contented. Does not that very desire to be contented, or the search for a method to that end, show the stupidity of our own minds? A man who says, "I want to attain contentment," is surely already in a state of stagnation. He is only concerned with being enclosed in a state wherein nothing will disturb him, so his contentment is really the ultimate security, which is undisturbed isolation. Contentment which is achieved, and which we call the highest spiritual attainment, is really a condition of decay. But if we can understand the process of discontent, see what it is that brings it about, if without coming to any conclusion, we can be aware of the ways of discontent, choicelessly watching its every movement - then, in that very understanding, there comes a state of contentment which is not a product of the mind, the thought process, or of desire.

Whatever the mind produces is obviously based on thought, and thought is merely the response of memory, of sensation. When we seek contentment, we are pursuing a sensation that will be completely satisfying, and sensation can never be contentment. If I am aware that I am contented, if I am conscious of it, is that contentment? Is virtue self-conscious? Is happiness a state in which I am conscious that I am happy? Surely, the moment I am aware that I am contented, I am discontented - I want more. (Laughter) Please do not laugh at these things, because by laughing you are putting it away, you are not taking it in. It is a superficial reaction to something serious which you do not want to face and look at.

Contentment is a thing that cannot be achieved - though all the religious books, all the saints and the Masters, promise it to you. Their promise is no promise at all; it is just a vanity which gratifies you. But there is a possibility of understanding the whole process of discontent, is there not? What is it that makes me discontented? Surely, it is the desire for a result, a reward, an achievement, the desire to become something. In the very process of achieving a reward, there is punishment, and the man who seeks a reward is already punishing himself. Gaining implies discontent. The longing to achieve creates the fear of loss, and the very desire to attain contentment brings discontent. It is important, is it not, to see this, not as a theory, not as something to be thought about, discussed, and meditated upon, but as a simple fact. The moment you want something, you have already created discontent, and all the advertisements, everything in our society, is instigating this desire to possess, to grow, to achieve, to become. And can this struggle to become something be called evolution, growth, progress?

Surely, there is a process of understanding discontent, and in the process of understanding it, you will see that discontent is the very nature of the self, the 'me'. The 'me' is the center of discontent because the 'me' is the accumulation of memories, and memories cannot thrive unless there are more memories, more sensations. Until you and I understand the 'me', which is the center of discontent, until we go into it and understand this whole process of becoming, achieving, there must always be discontent. How can a mind that is agitated by the desire for a result ever understand anything? It may be quiet for a time in the isolation of its own achievement, but such a mind is obviously self-enclosed, and it can never know the tranquillity of that contentment which is not a result. The mind that is caught up in a result can never be free, and it is only in freedom that there can be contentment.

Question: You say we use physiological needs for our psychological expansion and security. You further show us that security is nonexistent. This gives us a feeling of complete hopelessness and fear. Is this all?

Krishnamurti: This is a complex problem, and let us work it out together. First of all, there must be a physiological security, must there not? You must have food, clothing, and shelter. There must be security in the sense that our physical needs must be satisfied, otherwise we cannot exist at all. But the physical needs are used as a means for our psychological self-expansion, are they not? That is, one uses property, clothes, all the physical necessities, as a means of one's own position, progress, and authority.

To put it in a different way, nationalism, calling oneself an American, a Russian, a Hindu, or what you will, is obviously one of the causes of war. Nationalism is separatism, and that which separates obviously disintegrates. Nationalism destroys physical security, but one is nationalistic because there is a psychological security in being identified with the larger, with a particular country, group, or race. It gives me a sense of psychological security to call myself a Hindu, or by some other name; I feel flattered, it gives me a sense of well-being.

Similarly, we use property, things, as a means of psychological enlargement, expansion of the 'me', and that is why we have all this confusion, conflict, and separation which is taking place in the world. So, the economic problem is not wholly on its own level, but is fundamentally a psychological problem. That is one of the things involved in this question.

Now, as long as we are seeking psychological or inward security, obviously we must deny outward security. That is, as long as we are nationalistic, we must create war, thereby destroying the outward security which is so essential. It is the individual's seeking of inward security that brings about wars, class struggles, the innumerable divisions of religion, and all the rest of the business, ultimately destroying outward security for all. So, as long as I am seeking inward security in any form, I must bring about outward chaos and misery. The mere rearrangement of outward security, individual or collective, without understanding the inward processes of desire, is utterly futile because the psychological necessity for inward expansion will inevitably destroy whatever outward structure has been created. This is a fact which we can discuss and which I will go into later.

Now, inward security is a non-existent state, and when we seek it, what we are doing is merely isolating ourselves, enclosing ourselves in an idea, in a hope, in a particular pattern which gratifies us. That is, we enclose ourselves either in the collective experience and knowledge or in our own particular experience and knowledge and in that state we like to remain because we feel secure. Having a particular name, possessing certain qualities and things, gives you a sense of well-being. Calling yourself a doctor, a mayor, a swami, or God knows what else, gives you a sense of inward security, and that inward security is obviously a process of separation, and therefore of disintegration.

Now, when you actually see that there is no inward security, you say you have a feeling of complete hopelessness and fear. Why is there this sense of hopelessness? Why is there this sense of despair? What do you mean by hope? A man who clings to hope is obviously dead; a man who is hoping is dying, because to him what is important is the future - not what is, but what will be. A man who lives in hope is not living at all; he is living somewhere else, in the future, and living in the future is obviously not living. Now, you say that when you are without hope, you become hopeless. Is that so? When you see the truth about hope, how destructive it is, do you become hopeless? Do you? If you see the truth that there is no inward security of any kind - really see the truth of it, not merely speculate about the psychological state of insecurity - are you hopeless, are you in despair? Because we always think in terms of opposites - when we are in despair we want hope, and when there is no hope we become hopeless. Does this not indicate that we are seeking a state in which there will be no disturbance of any kind? And why should we not be disturbed? Must not the mind be completely uncertain in order to find out? But the moment you are uncertain, you fall into a state of hopelessness, despair, and fear, and then you develop a philosophy of despair and pursue that. Surely, if you really see the truth as regards hope, there comes a freedom from both hopelessness and hope, but one must see it, one must realize and experience that state.

What do we mean by fear? Fear of what? Fear of not being? Fear of what you are? Fear of losing, of being at a loss? Fear, whether conscious or unconscious, is not abstract - it exists only in relation to something. What we are afraid of is being insecure, is it not? We are afraid of being insecure - not only economically, but much more so inwardly. That is, we are afraid of loneliness, afraid of being nothing, afraid of a sense of complete denudation, a total purgation of all the beliefs, experiences, and memories of the mind. Of that state, whatever it is, we are afraid; the state of not being loved, of losing, or not achieving. But when once we see what loneliness is, when we know what it is to be lonely without escape, then there is a possibility of going beyond, because aloneness is entirely different from loneliness. There must be aloneness, but at present we are made up of many things, of many influences, and we are never alone. We are not individuals, we are merely a bundle of collective responses, with a particular name and a particular group of memories, both inherited and acquired. Surely, that is not individuality.

Now, to understand what it is to be alone, you must understand the whole process of fear. The understanding of fear ultimately brings you to that state in which you are completely empty, completely alone; that is, you are face to face with a loneliness which cannot be satisfied, which cannot be filled in, and from which there is no escape. Then you will see that one can go beyond loneliness - and then there is neither hope nor hopelessness, but a state of aloneness in which there is no fear.

As I said, a man who hopes is obviously not living because to him the future is extraordinarily important; therefore, he is willing to sacrifice the present for the future. That is what all the ideologists, all the people who build Utopias, are doing - they are sacrificing the present, that is, they are willing to liquidate you and me for the future, as though they knew the future. All political parties, all ideologists, dangle a hope in front of us, and those who pursue hope are ultimately destroyed. But if we can understand the desire for inward security, see its whole process, and not merely deny it or live in some fanciful state; if through alert watchfulness we are aware of every response of the self, of the 'me', and see that there is no inward security of any kind, whether through property, through a person, or through an ideology - then, in that state of complete insecurity of the mind, there comes a freedom in which alone there is a possibility of discovering what is. But such a state is not for those who hope, or fear, or who want to achieve a result.

Question: How can I experience God in myself?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by experience? What is the process of experiencing? When do we say, "I have had an experience"? We say that only when we recognize the experience, that is, only when there is an experiencer apart from the experience. This means that our experiencing is a process of recognition and accumulation. Am I explaining myself?

I can experience only when there is a recognition of the experience, and the recognition is recollection, memory; and memory is obviously the center of the 'me'. That is, the whole process of recognition and accumulation of experience is the 'me', and the 'me' then says, "I have had an experience." What is recognized and accumulated as experience is the response to stimuli, the response to challenge. If I do not recognize the response to a challenge, I have no experience. Surely, if you challenge me, and I do not recognize the meaning, the significance of your challenge, nor my response to it, how can I have an experience? There is experiencing only when I respond to a challenge and recognize the response.

Now, the questioner asks, "How can I experience God in myself?" Is God, reality, or what you will, a thing to be experienced, a thing to be recognized, so that you can say, "I have had an experience of God"? Obviously, God is the unknown; it cannot be the known. The moment you know it, it is not God - it is something self-projected, recognized, which is memory. That is why the believer can never know God, and since most of you believe in God, you can never know God because your very belief prevents you. But nonbelief in God, which is another form of belief, also hinders the discovery of the unknown, because all belief is obviously a process of the mind. Belief is the result of the known. You may believe in the unknown, but that

belief is born of the known, it is part of the known, which is memory. Memory says, "I do not know God, it is something unknown." So, memory creates the unknown and then believes in it as a means of experiencing the unknown.

Is God to be believed in? The priests, the preachers, the organizers of religions, the bishops, the cardinals, the butcher, the man who flies an airplane and drops a bomb - they all say, "God is with me." The man who makes money, exploits others, the man who accumulates wealth and builds temples or churches, says that God is his companion. All such people believe in God, and surely, their belief is merely a form of self-expansion, it is their own conceit. Such people, those who believe in organized dogmas, who have conditioned their minds according to a particular pattern called religion, obviously can never know the ultimate reality. For the unknown to be, the mind must be completely empty; there can be no experiencing of reality, because the experiencer is the 'me', with all his accumulated memories, conscious as well as unconscious. The 'me', which is the residue of all that, says, "I am experiencing," but what he can experience is only his own projection. The 'me' cannot experience the unknown; he can only experience the known, the self-projected, the thing believed in or hoped for, which is the creation of thought as a reaction from the past. Such a mind is obviously incapable of being completely empty, completely alone, and therefore it can never be free. It is only a free mind that can know what is - that thing which is indescribable, which cannot be put into words for you or me to recognize. The description of it is merely the cultivation of memory; to verbalize it, is to put it in time, and that which is of time can never be the timeless.

So, the important thing is not what you believe or disbelieve, or what your activities are, but to understand the whole process, the whole content, of yourself, and that means being aware from moment to moment without any sense of accumulation. When the mind is utterly tranquil, quiet, without any sense of acceptance or rejection, without any sense of acquisitiveness or accumulation, when there is that state of tranquillity in which the experiencer is not - only then is there that which may be called God. The word is not important. And then there is a state of creation which is not the expression of the self.

***Second Public Talk in New York***

***Sunday, June 11, 1950***

## ***Third Public Talk in New York***

Third Public Talk in New York

Sunday, June 18, 1950

It is most important, is it not, that the various disintegrating factors in our lives should be understood. These disruptive elements exist, not only at the superficial or economic level, but also at the deeper levels of one's consciousness. We can see throughout the world that there is division, not only between various groups of people, but within the individual himself there is conflict, contradiction. Until we understand this contradiction in ourselves, we shall not be able to deal with the contradictions about us. This contradiction which exists in each one, and of which most of us are aware if we are at all thoughtful, cannot be resolved by the desire to be integrated - which merely becomes another problem to contend with; but if we can be aware of and understand the factors that bring about contradiction, then perhaps there will be a possibility of being integrated.

Now, what brings about contradiction in each one of us? Surely, it is the desire to become something, is it not? We all want to become something - to become successful in the world, and inwardly to achieve a result. So, as long as we think in terms of time, in terms of achievement, in terms of position, there must be contradiction. After all, the mind is the product of time. Thought is based on yesterday, on the past; and as long as thought is functioning within the field of time, thinking in terms of the future, of becoming, gaining, achieving, there must be contradiction because then we are incapable of facing exactly what is. Only in realizing, in understanding, in being choicelessly aware of what is, is there a possibility of freedom from that disintegrating factor which is contradiction.

So, it is essential, is it not, to understand the whole process of our thinking, for it is there that we find contradiction. Thought itself has become a contradiction because we have not understood the total process of ourselves; and that understanding is possible only when we are fully aware of our thought, not as an observer operating upon his thought, but integrally and without choice - which is extremely arduous. Then only is there the dissolution of that contradiction which is so detrimental, so painful.

As long as we are trying to achieve a psychological result, as long as we want inward security, there must be a contradiction in our life. I do not think that most of us are aware of this contradiction, or if we are, we do not see its real significance. On the contrary, contradiction gives us an impetus to live; the very element of friction makes us feel that we are alive. The effort, the struggle of contradiction, gives us a sense of vitality. That is why we love wars, that is why we enjoy the battle of frustrations. As long as there is the desire to achieve a result, which is the desire to be psychologically secure, there must be a contradiction, and where there is contradiction, there cannot be a quiet mind. Quietness of mind is essential to understand the whole significance of life. Thought can never be tranquil; thought, which is the product of time, can never find that which is timeless, can never know that which is beyond time. The very nature of our thinking is a contradiction because we are always thinking in terms of the past or of the future, and therefore we are never fully cognizant, fully aware of the present.

To be fully aware of the present is an extraordinarily difficult task because the mind is incapable of facing a fact directly without deception. As I explained, thought is the product of the past, and therefore it can only think in terms of the past or of the future, it cannot be completely aware of a fact in the present. So, as long as thought - which is the product of the past - tries to eliminate contradiction and all the problems that it creates, it is merely pursuing a result, trying to achieve an end, and such thinking only creates more

contradiction, and hence conflict, misery, and confusion in us, and therefore about us. To be free of contradiction, one must be aware of the present without choice. How can there be choice when you are confronted with a fact? Surely, the understanding of the fact is made impossible as long as thought is trying to operate upon the fact in terms of becoming, changing, altering. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of understanding, and without self-knowledge, contradiction and conflict will continue. To know the whole process, the totality of oneself, does not require any expert, any authority. The pursuit of authority only breeds fear. No expert, no specialist, can show us how to understand the process of the self. One has to study it for oneself. You and I can help each other by talking about it, but none can unfold it for us - no specialist, no teacher, can explore it for us. We can be aware of it only in our relationship - in our relationship to things, to property, to people, and to ideas. In relationship we will discover that contradiction arises when action is approximating itself to an idea. The idea is merely the crystallization of thought as a symbol, and the effort to live up to the symbol brings about a contradiction.

So, as long as there is a pattern of thought, contradiction will continue, and to put an end to the pattern, and so to contradiction, there must be self-knowledge. This understanding of the self is not a process reserved for the few. The self is to be understood in our everyday speech, in the way we think and feel, in the way we look at another. If we can be aware of every thought, of every feeling, from moment to moment, then we shall see that in relationship the ways of the self are understood. Then only is there a possibility of that tranquillity of mind in which alone the ultimate reality can come into being.

I am going to answer some questions, and when I do so, let us together explore each problem. I am not the authority, the specialist, the teacher, who is telling you what to do; that would be too absurd for grown-up people - if we are grown-up at all. So, in considering these questions, let us try to explore and discover the truth for ourselves. It is the discovery of truth that is going to free us from our problems, but that truth cannot be discovered, it cannot come to us, if the mind is merely agitated in the current of these problems. In order to discover the ways of the problem, the problem must be unfolded and the mind allowed to be quiet; then we see the truth, and it is the truth that frees us.

Question: How am I to get rid of fear, which influences all my activities?

Krishnamurti: This is a very complex problem requiring close attention, and if we do not follow and explore it fully in the sense of experiencing each step as we go along, we will not be able at the end of it to be free of fear.

What do we mean by fear? Fear of what? There are various types of fear, and we need not analyze every type. But we can see that fear comes into being when our comprehension of relationship is not complete. Relationship is not only between people, but between ourselves and nature, between ourselves and property, between ourselves and ideas; and as long as that relationship is not fully understood, there must be fear. Life is relationship. To be, is to be related, and without relationship there is no life. Nothing can exist in isolation, and as long as the mind is seeking isolation, there must be fear. So, fear is not an abstraction; it exists only in relation to something.

Now, the question is how to be rid of fear. First of all, anything that is overcome has to be conquered again and again. No problem can be finally overcome, conquered; it can be understood, but not conquered. They are two completely different processes, and the conquering process leads to further confusion, further fear. To resist, to dominate, to do battle with a problem, or to build a defense against it, is only to create further conflict. Whereas, if we can understand fear, go into it fully step by step, explore the whole content of it, then fear will never return in any form - and that is what I hope we can do this morning.

As I said, fear is not an abstraction; it exists only in relationship. Now, what do we mean by fear? Ultimately, we are afraid, are we not, of not being, of not becoming. Now, when there is fear of not being, of not advancing, or fear of the unknown, of death, can that fear be overcome by determination, by a

conclusion, by any choice? Obviously not. Mere suppression, sublimation, or substitution creates further resistance, does it not? So, fear can never be overcome through any form of discipline, through any form of resistance. That fact must be clearly seen, felt, and experienced - that fear cannot be overcome through any form of defense or resistance. Nor can there be freedom from fear through the search for an answer, or through mere intellectual or verbal explanation.

Now, what are we afraid of? Are we afraid of a fact, or of an idea about the fact? Please see this point. Are we afraid of the thing as it is, or are we afraid of what we think it is? Take death, for example. Are we afraid of the fact of death, or of the idea of death? The fact is one thing, and the idea about the fact is another. Am I afraid of the word death, or of the fact itself? Because I am afraid of the word, of the idea, I never understand the fact, I never look at the fact, I am never in direct relation with the fact. It is only when I am in complete communion with the fact that there is no fear. But if I am not in communion with the fact, then there is fear, and there is no communion with the fact as long as I have an idea, an opinion, a theory, about the fact. So, I have to be very clear whether I am afraid of the word, the idea, or of the fact. If I am face to face with the fact, there is nothing to understand about it - the fact is there, and I can deal with it. But if I am afraid of the word, then I must understand the word, go into the whole process of what the word, the term, implies.

For example, one is afraid of loneliness, afraid of the ache, the pain of loneliness. Surely, that fear exists because one has never really looked at loneliness, one has never been in complete communion with it. The moment one is completely open to the fact of loneliness, one can understand what it is; but one has an idea, an opinion about it, based on previous knowledge; and it is this idea, opinion, this previous knowledge about the fact, that creates fear. So, fear is obviously the outcome of naming, of terming, of projecting a symbol to represent the fact; that is, fear is not independent of the word, of the term. I hope I am making myself clear.

I have a reaction, say, to loneliness; that is, I say I am afraid of being nothing. Am I afraid of the fact itself, or is that fear awakened because I have previous knowledge of the fact, knowledge being the word, the symbol, the image? How can there be fear of a fact? When I am face to face with a fact, in direct communion with it, I can look at it, observe it; therefore, there is no fear of the fact. What causes fear is my apprehension about the fact, what the fact might be or do.

So, it is my opinion, my idea, my experience, my knowledge about the fact, that creates fear. As long as there is verbalization of the fact, giving the fact a name and therefore identifying or condemning it, as long as thought is judging the fact as an observer, there must be fear. Thought is the product of the past; it can only exist through verbalization, through symbols, through images, and as long as thought is regarding or translating the fact, there must be fear.

So, it is the mind that creates fear, the mind being the process of thinking. Thinking is verbalization. You cannot think without words, without symbols, images; these images, which are the prejudices, the previous knowledge, the apprehensions of the mind, are projected upon the fact, and out of that there arises fear. There is freedom from fear only when the mind is capable of looking at the fact without translating it, without giving it a name, a label. This is quite difficult because the feelings, the reactions, the anxieties that we have are promptly identified by the mind and given a word. The feeling of jealousy is identified by that word. Now, is it possible not to identify a feeling, to look at that feeling without naming it? It is the naming of the feeling that gives it continuity, that gives it strength. The moment you give a name to that which you call fear, you strengthen it, but if you can look at that feeling without terming it, you will see that it withers away. Therefore, if one would be completely free of fear, it is essential to understand this whole process of terming, of projecting symbols, images, giving names to facts. That is, there can be freedom from fear only when there is self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, which is the ending of fear.

Question: How can I permanently get rid of sexual desire?

Krishnamurti: Why do we want to get permanently rid of a desire? You call it sexual, somebody else calls it attachment, fear, and so on. Why do we want to get rid of any desire permanently? Because that particular desire is disturbing to us, and we don't want to be disturbed. That is our whole process of thinking, is it not? We want to be self-enclosed, without any disturbance, that is, we want to be isolated; but nothing can live in isolation. In his search for God, the so-called religious person is really seeking complete isolation in which he will never be disturbed, but such a person is not really religious, is he? The truly religious are those who understand relationship completely, fully, and therefore have no problems, no conflict. Not that they are not disturbed, but because they are not seeking certainty, they understand disturbance, and therefore there is no self-enclosing process created by the desire for security.

Now, this question requires a great deal of understanding because we are dealing with sensation, which is thought. To most people, sex has become an extraordinarily important problem. Being uncreative, afraid, enclosed, cut off in all other directions, sex is the only thing through which most people can find a release, the one act in which the self is momentarily absent. In that brief state of abnegation when the self, the 'me', with all its troubles, confusions, and worries, is absent, there is great happiness. Through self-forgetfulness there is a sense of quietness, a release, and because we are uncreative religiously, economically, and in every other direction, sex becomes an overwhelmingly important problem. In daily life we are mere gramophone records, repeating phrases that we have learned; religiously we are automatons, mechanically following the priest; economically and socially we are bound, strangled, by environmental influences. Is there a release for us in any of that? Obviously not; and where there is no release, there must be frustration. That is why the sexual act, in which there is a release, has become such a vital problem for most of us. And society encourages and stimulates it through advertisements, magazines, the cinema, and all the rest of it.

Now, as long as the mind, which is the result, the focal point of sensation, regards sex as a means of its release, sex must be a problem, and that problem will continue as long as we are incapable of being creative comprehensively, totally, and not merely in one particular direction. Creativeness has nothing to do with sensation. Sex is of the mind, and creation is not of the mind. Creation is never a product of the mind, a product of thought, and in that sense, sex, which is sensation, can never be creative. It may produce babies, but that is obviously not creativeness. As long as we depend for release on sensation, on stimulation in any form, there must be frustration, because the mind becomes incapable of realizing what creativeness is.

This problem cannot be resolved by any discipline, by any taboos, by any social edicts or sanctions. It can be resolved only when we understand the whole process of the mind because it is the mind that is sexual. It is the mind's images, fancies, and pictures that stimulate it to be sexual, and as the mind is the result of sensation, it can only become more and more sensuous. Such a mind can never be creative because creation is not sensation. It is only when the mind does not seek stimuli in any form, whether outward or inward, that it can be completely quiet, free, and only in that freedom is there creation. We have made sex into something ugly because it is the only private sensation that we have; all other sensations are public, open. But as long as we use sensation in any form as a means of release, it will only increase the problems, the confusion and trouble, because release can never come into being through seeking a result.

The questioner wants to end sexual desire permanently because he has an idea that then he will be in a state in which all disturbances have disappeared; that is why he is seeking it, striving towards it. The very striving towards that state is preventing him from being free to understand the process of the mind. As long as the mind is merely seeking a permanent state in which it will have no disturbance of any kind, it is closed, and therefore it can never be creative. It is only when the mind is free of the desire to become something, to achieve a result, and hence free of fear, that it can be utterly quiet; and only then is there a possibility of that creativeness which is reality.

Question: Should I be a pacifist?

Krishnamurti: I am afraid I cannot tell you what you should or should not be. We are supposed to be mature, and seeking advice from another in a matter of this kind indicates immaturity. The search for authority only creates corruption; it does not bring freedom. It is only in freedom that truth can be discovered. By following another you will never find what it is to be free of violence.

Let us find out what we mean by pacifism. Is pacifism opposed to violence? Is peace the denial of conflict? Is good the opposite of evil? When you deny vice and go to the opposite, is that virtue? If you deny, resist, put away the ugly, are you beautiful? Is the pursuit of an opposite ever peaceful, ever virtuous or beautiful? The opposite implies conflict, does it not? If you deny violence and pursue peace, what happens? The very pursuit of peace creates conflict because you are denying violence. The very denial creates conflict, and is virtue ever the result of conflict? Is peace the denial of war? War is obviously the extension, the projection of ourselves, is it not? War is the spectacular and bloody projection of our own daily existence. We call ourselves Americans or Russians or Hindus or God knows what else out of our desire to be safe, and this identification with a particular country, race, or group of people gives us a sense of security. But identification with a group or nation means separation, leading to disintegration and war. Surely, as long as I am seeking identification in any form - with my family, with my group, with my property, with my particular ideology or belief - there must be separation, disintegration, and war. Although it is the dream of all ideologists, whether of the left or of the right, to have everybody believing in one particular theory or system, such a thing is an impossibility. Belief always separates, and therefore it is a disintegrating factor.

So, as long as you and I are in conflict inwardly, psychologically, there must be the projection of that conflict in the world as war. Without understanding your own inward conflict, merely to become a pacifist or join an organization for peace has no meaning. A man who merely resists war while remaining in psychological conflict only creates further confusion. But if you really understand this total process of inward conflict, which projects itself in the world as war, then obviously you are neither a warmonger nor a mere pacifist - you are something entirely different because you are at peace with yourself, you are at peace with the world. Being at peace inwardly and therefore outwardly, you will obviously not belong to any nationality, to any religion, to any particular group or class, and if you are brought before the tribunal to be conscripted, or whatever it is called, you will probably be shot. But that is not your responsibility - it is the responsibility of society because society rejects you. After all, society is not very intelligent anyhow. What is society? It is your own projection, is it not? What you and I are, society is. So, don't call society stupid and laugh at it. Society is the structure of ourselves in projection, and if we want to bring about a fundamental revolution in society, there must be a fundamental revolution in ourselves - which is an enormously difficult task. Any revolution based on an idea is never a revolution - it is merely a modified continuity. Ideas can never be revolutionary because ideas are merely the reactions of memory. Thought is mere reaction, and an action based on reaction can never be fundamental, can never be true.

Surely, then, whether or not you should be a pacifist is not the problem. We see that everything in the world is contributing to war. War is obviously no means of settling anything, but apparently we are incapable of learning that. We change enemies from time to time, and we seem to be quite satisfied with this process, which is kept going by propaganda, by our own desire to be revengeful, by our own inward, psychological conflict. So, we are encouraging war through nationalism, through greed, through the desire to be successful, to become somebody. That is, we encourage war inwardly, and then outwardly want to be pacifists, and such pacifism obviously has no meaning. It is only a contradiction. We all want to become something: a pacifist, a war hero, a millionaire, a virtuous man, or what you will. The very desire to become involves conflict, and that conflict produces war. There is peace only when there is no desire to become something, and that is the only true state because in that state alone there is creation, there is reality. But that is completely foreign to the whole structure of society - which is the projection of yourself. You worship success. Your god is success, the giver of titles, degrees, position, and authority. There is a constant

battle within yourself - the struggle to achieve what you want. You never have a peaceful moment, there is never peace in your heart, because you are always striving to become something, to progress. Do not be misled by the word progress. Mechanical things progress, but thought can never progress except in terms of its own becoming. Thought moves from the known to the known, but that is not growth, that is not evolution, that is not freedom.

So, if you want to be a pacifist in the true sense of the word, which is to be free of conflict, you have to understand yourself; and when the mind and heart are peaceful, quiet, then you will know what it is to be without conflict, which will express itself in action, whatever that action may be. But to make up your mind to become something is merely a process of striving, which inevitably creates further conflict and strife. As every war produces another war, so each conflict produces more conflict. There can be real peace only when conflict ends, and to end conflict is to understand the whole process of oneself.

Question: I am not loved and I want to be, for without it life has no meaning. How can I fulfill this longing?

Krishnamurti: I hope you are not merely listening to words because then these meetings will be another distraction, a waste of time. But if you are really experiencing the things that we are discussing, then they will have an extraordinary significance, because though you may follow words with the conscious mind, if you are experiencing what is being said, the unconscious also takes part in it. If given an opportunity, the unconscious will reveal its whole content and so bring about a complete understanding of ourselves. So, I hope you are not merely listening to another talk but are actually experiencing the things as we go along.

The questioner wants to know how to love and to be loved. Is not that the state of most of us? We all want to be loved and also to give love. We talk a great deal about it. All religions, all preachers, talk about it. So, let us find out what we mean by love. Is love sensation? Is love a thing of the mind? Can you think about love? You can think about the object of love, but you cannot think about love, can you? I can think about the person I love; I can have a picture, an image of that person and recall the sensations, the memories, of our relationship. But is love sensation, memory? When I say, "I want to love and be loved," is that not merely thought, a reflection of the mind? Is thought love? We think it is, do we not? To us, love is sensation. That is why we have pictures of the people whom we love, that is why we think about them and are attached to them. That is all a process of thought, is it not?

Now, thought is frustrated in different directions, and therefore it says, "I find happiness in love, so I must have love." That is why we cling to the person we love, that is why we possess the person, psychologically as well as physiologically. We create laws to protect the possession of what we love, whether it be a person, a piano, a piece of property, or an idea, a belief, because in possession, with all its complications of jealousy, fear, suspicion, anxiety, we feel secure. So, we have made love into a thing of the mind, and with the things of the mind we fill the heart. Because the heart is empty, the mind says, "I must have that love," and we try to fulfill ourselves through the wife, through the husband. Through love, we try to become something. That is, love becomes a useful thing, we use love as a means to an end.

So, we have made of love a thing of the mind. The mind becomes the instrument of love, and the mind is only sensation. Thought is the reaction of memory to sensation. Without the symbol, the word, the image, there is no memory, there is no thought. We know the sensation of so-called love, and we cling to that, and when it fails, we want some other expression of that same sensation. So, the more we cultivate sensation, the more we cultivate so-called knowledge - which is merely memory - the less there is of love.

As long as we are seeking love, there must be a self-enclosing process. Love implies vulnerability, love implies communion, and there can be no communion, no vulnerability, as long as there is the self-enclosing process of thought. The very process of thought is fear, and how can there be communion with another when there is fear, when we use thought as a means for further stimulation?

There can be love only when you understand the whole process of the mind. Love is not of the mind, and you cannot think about love. When you say, "I want love," you are thinking about it, you are longing for it, which is a sensation, a means to an end. Therefore, it is not love that you want, but stimulation; you want a means through which you can fulfill yourself, whether it be a person, a job, a particular excitement, and so on. Surely, that is not love. Love can be only when the thought of the self is absent, and freedom from the self lies through self-knowledge. With self-knowledge there comes understanding, and when the total process of the mind is completely and fully revealed and understood, then you will know what it is to love. Then you will see that love has nothing to do with sensation, that it is not a means of fulfillment. Then love is by itself, without any result. Love is a state of being, and in that state, the 'me', with its identifications, anxieties, and possessions, is absent. Love cannot be, as long as the activities of the self, of the 'me', whether conscious or unconscious, continue to exist. That is why it is important to understand the process of the self, the center of recognition which is the 'me'.

***Third Public Talk in New York***

***Sunday, June 18, 1950***

## *Fourth Public Talk in New York*

Fourth Public Talk in New York

Sunday, June 25, 1950

If we could find a way out of our conflict, we would not take recourse to authority, but as we do not find a means of resolving our innumerable and multiplying conflicts, we turn either to inward or outward authority for guidance and comfort. So, authority becomes very important in our lives. Because we are unable to understand and resolve conflict, we use authority as a means of avoiding conflict, and the means then become all-important, and not the fathoming, the exploring of the process of conflict.

So, we have authority of innumerable kinds, inward as well as outward. Outward authority takes the form of knowledge, examples, teachers, and so on, and inwardly it is our own experiences and memories, to which we turn for guidance in moments of conflict and anxiety. So, authority, both outward and inward, offers us a hope of being free of our various troubles.

But can authority of any kind, inward or outward, resolve our problems? The more we seek authorities, ideals, conclusions, hopes, the more we depend on them; and dependence on authority becomes much more significant than the understanding of the conflict itself. The more we depend on authority, the more dependent we become, because dependence ultimately destroys confidence in our own understanding of problems. Most of us have no confidence in our own capacity to find out, to explore the many problems, and when we depend on authority, obviously that confidence is denied.

Confidence is not arrogance. The more one has experienced, the more one is inwardly certain, the more arrogant and obstinate one becomes. Such self-confidence is only self-enclosure, a process of resistance. But there is, I think, a different kind of confidence which is not cumulative. To explore into the nature of conflict, one cannot bring to it that which one has accumulated, and if one explores with previous knowledge, it ceases to be exploration. Then you are merely moving from the known to the known, from certainty to certainty, from what you have experienced to what you hope to experience, and that is not exploration or experimentation. That is merely the cumulative process of knowledge, of experience, and the confidence it brings is assertive arrogance.

Now, I think there is a confidence which is much more subtle, much more worthwhile, and which comes when there is no sense of accumulation of any kind, but a constant exploration and discovery. It is this state of constant discovery, the capacity for constant exploration, that brings about an enduring confidence which is not arrogance. And that confidence, which is so essential, is denied when there is authority of any kind, when we depend on or look up to another for guidance in conduct. When we are dependent, it does give a certain self-assurance even though it entails fear, but that assurance of following someone, belonging to a group, believing in an idea or in certain dogmas, is surely a self-enclosing process, is it not? The mind that is constantly isolating itself is bound to awaken fear, and so there is a wandering from one authority to another, from one emotional exhaustion to another, and in this process our problems are never resolved - they only multiply.

Now, is it possible to look at our conflicts without bringing in any authority, external or inward? Surely, one can be passively aware of conflict without choice or condemnation; that is, one can be aware, not as an observer observing his experience or analyzing the thing in himself which he wishes to destroy, but aware with that passivity in which the observer is the observed. In that state of mind we will see that the problems

are understood and resolved; whereas, if we choose the way of action with regard to a problem, or compare or condemn it, we only increase resistance and therefore multiply the problems. This process of choice is going on at all levels of our being, and that is why, instead of decreasing problems, we are multiplying them. The multiplication of problems comes into being only when we seek an answer, a conclusion, and so depend on an authority, outward or inward. Dependence on authority actually prevents our understanding of any problem, which is always new. No problem is old; as long as it remains a problem, it is a challenge, and therefore it is always new. Problems are invariably self-projected, and therefore it is important to understand the whole process of oneself without authority, without following a pattern or looking up to an example, an ideal, or a leader.

Self-knowledge is the beginning of the end of all conflict, and it is only when conflict ceases that there can be creation. Creation cannot be verbalized - it is a state which comes into being when the process of thought is at an end, and only then will the unknowable come to you.

In considering these questions, let us take the journey of exploration together; let each one of us find the truth of every problem for \* himself. It is no use waiting for the particular answer which you or I might like, or adhering to any particular opinion. To find out what is true, there must obviously be that passive alertness of mind which gives the capacity to explore each problem deeply.

Question: I have many friends, but I am in constant fear of being rejected by them. What should I do?

Krishnamurti: What is the problem? Is the problem one of rejection and fear, or is it a question of dependence? Why do we want to have friends? Not that we should not have friends, but when we feel the necessity of having friends, when there is this dependence on others, what does it indicate? Does it not indicate insufficiency in oneself? Does not loneliness indicate an inward poverty? And being lonely, inwardly poor, insufficient, we turn to friends, to love, to activity, to ideas, to possessions, to knowledge and technique. That is, being inwardly poor, we depend on outward things, so the outward things become very important to us. When we use something as a means of escape from ourselves, obviously it becomes very important. We cling to things, to ideas, and to people because psychologically we depend on them, and when they are taken away, as when our friends reject us, we are lost, we are afraid. So, dependence indicates inward uncertainty, inward poverty, and as long as we use or depend on others, there must be fear of loss.

Now, can this loneliness, this inward poverty or emptiness, be filled through any action of the mind? If I may suggest, please listen and follow it out by watching your own mind, and you will find the answer for yourself. I am only describing the experience as we go along, but to experience it for yourself, you must be passively alert, and not merely follow words.

So, being inwardly poor, we try to escape from this poverty through work, through knowledge, through love, through many forms of activity. We listen to the radio, read the latest book, pursue an idea or a virtue, accept a belief - anything to escape from ourselves. Our thinking is a process of escape from what is, and can that inward emptiness ever be covered up or filled? One can know the truth of that only when one does not escape - which is extremely arduous. One must be aware that one is escaping and see that all escapes are similar, that there is no "noble" escape. All escapes, from drunkenness to God, are the same because one is escaping from what is, which is oneself, one's own inward poverty. It is only when one really ceases to escape that one is face to face with the problem of loneliness, of inward insufficiency, which no knowledge, no experience, can cover up; and only then is there a possibility of understanding and so dissolving it. This loneliness, this inward insufficiency, is not merely the problem of people who have leisure, who have nothing else to do in life except study themselves; it is the problem of everyone in the world, the rich and the poor, the man who is brilliant and the man who is dull.

So, can inward emptiness ever be covered up? If you have tried and failed to cover it up by means of one

escape, surely you know that all escapes are futile, do you not? You don't have to go from one escape to another to see that psychological insufficiency can never be filled, covered up, or enriched. By thoroughly understanding one escape, the whole process of escape is understood, is it not? Then what happens? One is left with emptiness, with loneliness, and then the problem arises - is that loneliness different from the entity that feels lonely? Obviously not. It is not that the entity feels empty but that he himself is emptiness, and the separation between the entity that feels empty and the state which he calls emptiness arises only in giving that state a name, a term, a label. When you do not name that state, then you will see there is no separation between the observer and the observed: the observer is the observed - which is insufficiency. In other words, when there is no naming or terming, an integration takes place between the experiencer and the experienced; and then you can proceed further to find out if that state which you have been avoiding as lonely, insufficient, is really so or is merely a reaction to the word lonely, which awakens fear.

Is it the word or the fact that awakens fear? Is any fact ever fearful, or is it an idea about the fact that makes for fear? If you have followed this whole process, you will see that when there is no desire to escape from what is, there is no fear; and then there is a transformation of what is, because then the mind is no longer afraid to be what it is. In that state there is no sense of being lonely, insufficient - it is what it is. If you proceed deeper, you will see that the mind no longer rejects or accepts that state and is therefore quiet, and only then is it possible to be free from that which is qualified as being lonely or insufficient. But to come to that, you must understand this whole process of inward insufficiency, escape, and dependence; you must see how escape and the means of escape become much more important than the thing from which you are escaping; you must discover this division between the thinker and the condition which he calls lonely, and find out for yourself whether it is merely verbal, or an actual state. If it is verbal, then that separation goes on, but if you do not give it a name, then there is only that state which you no longer term lonely - and only then is it possible for the mind to go beyond and discover further.

Question: What is the place of the individual in society?

Krishnamurti: Is the individual different from society? Are you different from your environment? The environment has conditioned us to be Christians, capitalists, communists, socialists, or what you will, and the environment is in turn the projection of ourselves, is it not? Society is the projection of the individual, who is then further conditioned by that society. So, the individual and society are interrelated; they are not two separate states, or two separate entities. As long as you are conditioned by environment, is there a separate individuality? I am not saying that life is one - that is merely a theory. But it is important to discover whether the individual is separate from the environment, is it not? Though we may call ourselves individuals, are we not conditioned by society? Obviously we are. We are an integral part of society; therefore, although we appear to be separate entities, we are not really individuals. Physically, you and I are separate, dissimilar, but there is an extraordinary inward similarity. Whatever may be the superficial differences of race and custom, we are all more or less shaped along the same lines; we are all conditioned by fear, by dependence, by belief, by the desire to be secure, and so on. Surely, as long as we are conditioned by environment, which is our own projection, we are not really individuals, though we may bear different names. There is individuality only when we can go beyond this conditioning. Individuality is a state of creativeness, a state of aloneness, in which there is freedom from the conditioning influences of desire.

So, as long as we are bound by desire, as long as thought is merely the reaction of desire, which it is, there must be the conditioning influence of society, of the environment, and of our own experiences in reaction to society. We are an integral part of society; and if we try to establish a relationship between ourselves and society as though we and society were two separate entities, then surely we shall misunderstand the whole process; then we shall merely resist or fight society. Until we understand how society influences, shapes, controls us through our own instinctual responses of desire, we are obviously not unique individuals though we may say, "I am a separate soul," and all the rest of it. That is merely the assertion of a dogma, a belief - which will inevitably be denied by those who belong to another kind of society; so, we shall be conditioned

in one way, and they will be conditioned in another. As long as we consider ourselves as entities separate from society, we shall never understand either society or ourselves, and we shall always be in conflict with society. But if we can understand the process of desire which creates the environmental influences which condition us, then we can go beyond and discover that aloneness which is true individuality, that uniqueness which is a state of creation.

The important thing, then, is not to inquire what is the individual's place in society, but to be aware of how we are conditioned by our beliefs, our desires, our motives. To be aware of the conscious as well as of the unconscious or collective response of the past to the present, to know both the superficial and the deeper layers of one's own thinking - surely, that is of far greater importance than to inquire what is the relationship between the individual and society. If we really see that, then the reformation of society becomes a minor thing. To reform society without understanding ourselves merely creates the need of further reform - and so there is no end to reformation. Whereas, if we can go beyond the limitations of desire, then there is the revolution of individuality, and it is that inward revolution that is so essential to bring about a new world. Merely reforming the world according to a particular ideology has no significance, because revolution based on an idea is no revolution at all. An idea is merely a reaction of the past to the present. There is inward revolution or transformation only when there is the understanding of desire, and it is this inward revolution which is so essential because it alone can bring about a different world.

Question: I love my children, and how am I to educate them to become integrated human beings?

Krishnamurti: I wonder if we do love our children? We say so, and we take it for granted that we love them. But do we? If we loved our children, would there be wars? If we loved them, would we be nationalistic, divided into separate groups, constantly destroying each other? Would we belong to any particular race or religion in opposition to another? This whole process of separation in life ultimately brings about disintegration, does it not? Surely, war, the ceaseless conflict in society between different groups and different classes, is an indication that we do not love our children. If we really loved them, we would want to save them, would we not? We would want to protect them, we would want them to live as happy, integrated human beings, we would not want them to live in outward insecurity or be destroyed. But since we have created a world of conflict and misery, in which outward security is nonexistent, it indicates, does it not, that we do not really love our children at all. If we loved them, we would obviously have a different world. Don't let us become sentimental. But we would have a different world if we really loved our children because then we would quickly see how to prevent wars; then we would not leave it to the clever politicians, who will never prevent wars, but we would assume direct responsibility for it because we would really have the intention of saving the children.

Surely, then, our whole outlook in education, our entire social structure, must be utterly revolutionized, must it not? That means we can no longer use the children for our personal or psychological gratification as we are doing at present - and that is why we are so easily satisfied, so superficial in what we call "love." But if we do not use the children as a means of self-perpetuation, to carry on our name, if we do not use them in any way for our personal gratification, then we will obviously regard them quite differently. Then our concern will be not to educate the children but to educate the educator. At present, education is merely to make the children efficient, to teach them a technique, the manner of earning a livelihood, and efficiency obviously brings about ruthlessness. Not that one must be inefficient, but this drive to be efficient, this constant attention to success, must entail struggle, strife, contention.

Now, we cannot have integrated human beings unless we understand the process of disintegration. Integration is not the pursuit of a pattern, the adjustment to an idea, or the following of a particular example. Integration can come about only when one understands the total process of oneself, and there cannot be the understanding of oneself as long as we are living superficially. Our whole process of thought is superficial, the process of the so-called intellect, and to the cultivation of this intellect we give great

emphasis. So, intellectually, which is verbally, we are very far advanced, but inwardly we are insufficient, poor, uncertain, groping, clinging to any form of security. This whole process of thought is a process of disintegration because thought invariably separates; ideas, like beliefs, never bring people together except in conflicting groups. So, as long as we depend on thought as a means of integration, there must be disintegration. To understand the process of thought is to understand the ways of the self, and then only is there a possibility of integration, which is not imitation. So, there must not only be the educating of the educator, but we, as mature human beings, must understand our relationship with the children, must we not? And if we really love them, obviously we will see to it that there will be no war, that there will be no struggle in society between the rich and the poor, nor the depredations of the ambitious and the acquisitive who seek power, position, and prestige. But if we want our children to be powerful, to have bigger and better positions, to become more and more successful, surely it indicates that we do not love them - we merely love the acclaim, the glamour, the position, the reflected glory which we hope they will afford us. Therefore, we are encouraging confusion, destruction, and utter misery. I know you are listening to all this, but you will probably return home and continue with those very ways which engender war. Most of us are really not interested in these things. We are interested in immediate answers. We do not want to explore and discover the truth. It is not an economic revolution but only the discovery of truth that will free us, that will bring about a new world.

So, the whole question resolves itself into this - not how to educate the children, but how to educate ourselves and thereby bring about a different society. To do that, one must understand oneself, the ways of one's desire, the ways of one's thought. We must be aware of everything: of the things about us and in us, of colors, of people, of ideas, of the words we use, of our memories, both personal and collective. It is only when one is fully aware of this whole process that one is alone, a unique individual, and only such people can bring about a new civilization, a new culture.

Question: Can prayer form the link between life and religion?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by prayer, and what do we mean by life and religion? Is life different from religion? Apparently with most of us it is, so we use prayer as a means of linking life and religion. Why is life separate from religion? What is religion, and what is life? Is religion the pursuit of an idea? When you say religion is the pursuit of God, surely your God is an idea, is it not? Therefore your God is self-projected. Or, if you deny God and accept another ideology, whether of the left or of the right, it is still a form of religion. So, is religion merely the following of a certain pattern of ideas which promises a reward in the present or in the future? And is religion different from life, from action, from relationship?

What do we mean by life? Life is relationship, is it not? Can there be life without relationship - relationship to people, to ideas, to things, to property, to nature? Can there be life in isolation? And yet, that is what each one of us is pursuing, is it not? In our ideas, in our relationship to everything about us, we are enclosing, isolating ourselves; and being isolated, we want to find a relationship or link with what we call religion - which is merely another form of isolation. That is, because in our relationships we are seeking inward security, we make outward security impossible, and in religion we are also seeking security. Our God is the ultimate happiness, absolute peace. Surely, such a God is an invention of our minds so as to assure ourselves of permanency in the form of ultimate security; and then we ask, "Can prayer form the link between life and religion?" Obviously it can, can it not? Like everything else in our lives, prayer will help us to be more and more isolated because that is what we want. In our relationships, in our possessions, we are seeking isolation, which is a form of security, and in religion also we seek security, permanency. Our God, our virtue, our morality, like our daily activities, are all self-enclosing, self-isolating, so we use prayer as a means of uniting the various isolations.

What do we mean by prayer? And when do we pray? Surely, we pray only when we are suffering, when we are in misfortune, when there is conflict, confusion, when we are in pain. Do we ever pray when we are

happy, when there is rejoicing, when our hearts are full? Obviously not. We pray only when we are in confusion, when we are uncertain, when we don't know what to do - and then we turn to somebody for help.

Prayer, then, is generally supplication, is it not? It is a petition, a demand, a psychological extending of the hand for it to be held, to be filled. And when you ask, you receive, do you not? But what you get is what you want - it is never what you don't want - so what you get is your own projection. That which you receive in response to prayer is shaped by your own fancy, your own limitation, your own conditioning. The more you ask, the more you receive of your own projection, and with that you are satisfied.

But is prayer a process of self-gratification? What happens when you pray? You repeat certain words, certain phrases, you take a certain posture, and when there is a constant repetition of words and phrases, obviously the mind becomes quiet, does it not? Try it and you will see. The repetition of words makes the mind still. But that is only a trick, is it not? The mind is not really still - it is acquisitive - but you have made it still in order to receive what you want. You want to be helped because you are confused, you are uncertain, and you will receive what you want. But that response to supplication is not the voice of reality - it is the response of your own projection and also of the collective projection. Because, we all want an answer, do we not? We all want somebody to tell us what wonderful people we are; we all want someone to guide us, to help us in our confusion, in our misery. So, we receive what we want, but what we want is petty, trivial.

So, prayer, which is a supplication, a petition, can never find that reality which is not the outcome of a demand. We demand, supplicate, pray, only when we are in confusion, in sorrow, and not understanding that confusion and sorrow, we turn to somebody else. The answer to prayer is our own projection; in one way or another it is always satisfactory, gratifying, otherwise we would reject it. So, when one has learned the trick of quieting the mind through repetition, one keeps on with that habit, but the answer to supplication must obviously be shaped according to the desire of the person who supplicates.

Now, prayer, supplication, petition, can never uncover that which is not the projection of the mind. To find that which is not the fabrication of the mind, the mind must be quiet - not made quiet by the repetition of words, which is self-hypnosis, nor by any other means of inducing the mind to be still. Stillness that is induced, enforced, is not stillness at all. It is like putting a child in the corner - superficially he may be quiet, but inwardly he is boiling. So, a mind that is made quiet by discipline is never really quiet, and stillness that is induced can never uncover that creative state in which reality comes into being.

So, when we use prayer as a means of linking life and religion, we are only discovering more ways of self-isolation, more ways of disintegration. To put yourself in a state of receptivity through prayer is a process of disintegration because you want to receive. You may say, "I do not ask anything; I only put myself in a state of receptivity through prayer," but that is merely a subtle form of forcing the mind. Enforcement of any kind can never bring about tranquillity. Tranquillity of mind comes into being only with the cessation of thought, and thought ceases when one understands the thinker, the person who asks, demands. Therefore, self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and without self-knowledge, merely to pray has very little significance. Prayer cannot open the door to self-knowledge. What opens the door to self-knowledge is constant awareness - not practicing awareness, but being aware from moment to moment and discovering. Discovery can never be cumulative. If it is cumulative, it is not discovery. Discovery is new from moment to moment; it is not a continuous state. A man cannot discover if he is accumulating, for accumulation is continuity. Discovery from moment to moment is freedom from the desire which is understood from moment to moment. There is spontaneity of the mind only when you understand the desire that seeks security, permanency, and that desire is the self, the 'me', at all levels. As long as you do not understand yourself wholly, there must be every form of escape, every form of confusion and destruction, and prayers do not help; they merely offer another means of escape. But if you begin to

understand the desire that creates confusion, pain, conflict, then you will see that in understanding there comes spontaneity of the mind; then the mind is really tranquil, without wanting to be or not to be, and only such a mind can understand that which is real.

***Fourth Public Talk in New York***

***Sunday, June 25, 1950***

## *Fifth Public Talk in New York*

Fifth Public Talk in New York

Sunday, July 2, 1950

I think it is quite apparent that there must be a fundamental transformation in society, and it can only begin with a radical revolution within each one of us, for society is not very different from ourselves. What we are, society is. The problems of the world are not separate from our problems. We ourselves have projected them, and therefore we are responsible for them; and the fundamental revolution in outward circumstances, however essential and necessary, can be brought about only when there is a radical revolution in ourselves. A radical revolution, a transformation, a psychological upheaval in ourselves, cannot be brought about through any idea or according to any pattern. Revolution based on an ideology is no longer a revolution - it is merely the modified continuity of an old pattern. Thought can never be revolutionary because thought is the response of memory. Ideas can never bring about a transformation in ourselves because ideas are merely the continuation of that response, either verbalized or in the form of symbols, images, and so on. When we desire to bring about a transformation in ourselves according to a pattern pre-established by thought, such a transformation is only the modified continuation of memory; being a projection of ourselves in a different form, it is a continuation of the conditioned state, and therefore it is no transformation at all. Revolution based on an ideology, however inclusive, is not a revolution because an idea is the projection of thought, which is memory. The response of memory can never bring about transformation. What can bring about transformation in ourselves, and therefore in society, is to understand the whole process of thinking, which is not different from feeling. Feeling is thinking; though we like to keep them separate and rely either on the one or the other, they are interrelated; they are not dualistic but a unitary process.

So, as long as we do not understand the whole process of thinking and feeling, obviously there can be no radical revolution within and so without. The understanding of thought, which is feeling, is self-knowledge, and self-knowledge cannot be bought. No study of books, no going to lectures, will give self-knowledge. Self-knowledge comes only when we are aware of ourselves from moment to moment, naturally, spontaneously, easily, without any sense of enforcement - aware, not only of our conscious thinking, but also of the unconscious, with all its content. It is like looking at a map and allowing it to unfold, and the moment we block it by discipline, by any form of practice, the unfolding of self-knowledge comes to an end.

What is important, surely, is to be aware without choice because choice brings about conflict. The chooser is in confusion; therefore, he chooses; if he is not in confusion, there is no choice. Only the person who is confused chooses what he shall do or shall not do. The man who is clear and simple does not choose - what is, is. Action based on an idea is obviously the action of choice, and such action is not liberating; on the contrary, it only creates further resistance, further conflict, according to that conditioned thinking.

So, then, the important thing is to be aware from moment to moment without accumulating the experience which awareness brings because the moment you accumulate, you are aware only according to that accumulation, according to that pattern, according to that experience. That is, your awareness is conditioned by your accumulation, and therefore there is no longer observation, but merely translation. Where there is translation, there is choice, and choice creates conflict, and in conflict there can be no understanding.

As we have been discussing for the last four weeks, the difficulty in understanding ourselves exists because we have never given thought to it. We do not see the importance, the significance, of exploring ourselves

directly, not according to any idea, pattern, or teacher. The necessity of understanding ourselves is perceived only when we see that without self-knowledge there can be no basis for thought, for action, for feeling; but self-knowledge is not the outcome of the desire to achieve an end. If we begin to inquire into the process of self-knowledge through fear, through resistance, through authority, or with the desire to gain a result, we shall have what we desire, but it will not be the understanding of the self and the ways of the self. You may place the self at any level, calling it the higher self or the lower self, but it is still the process of thinking, and if the thinker is not understood, obviously his thinking is a process of escape.

Thought and the thinker are one, but it is thought that creates the thinker, and without thought there is no thinker. So, one has to be aware of the process of conditioning, which is thought; and when there is awareness of that process without choice, when there is no sense of resistance, when there is neither condemnation nor justification of what is observed, then we see that the mind is the center of conflict. In understanding the mind and the ways of the mind, the conscious as well as the unconscious, through dreams, through every word, through every process of thought and action, the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet; and that tranquillity of the mind is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom cannot be bought, it cannot be learned; it comes into being only when the mind is quiet, utterly still - not made still by compulsion, coercion, or discipline. Only when the mind is spontaneously silent is it possible to understand that which is beyond time.

In considering these questions, as I have often reminded you, there is neither denial nor acceptance. We are going to explore each question, and the answer is not apart from the question. In going into the question as fully and deeply as we can, we shall see the truth of it, and it is that truth that will free us from the problem.

Question: You have shown me the superficiality and the futility of the life I am leading. I should like to change, but I am trapped by habit and environment. Should I leave everything and everyone and follow you?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do you think our problems are solved when we follow another? To follow another, no matter who it is, is to deny the understanding of yourself. And it is very easy to follow somebody. The greater the personality, the greater the power, the easier it is to follow; and in the very following you are destroying that understanding because the follower destroys - he is never the creator, he never brings about understanding. To follow is to deny all understanding and therefore to deny truth.

Now, if you do not follow, what are you to do? Since, as the questioner says, one is trapped by habit and environment, what is one to do? Surely, all that you can do is to understand the trap of habit and environment, the superficiality and the futility of your life. We are always in relationship, are we not? To be is to be related, and if you regard relationship as a trap from which you want to escape, then you will only fall into another trap - the trap of the teacher whom you follow. It may be a little more arduous, a little more inconvenient, a little less comfortable, but it will still be a trap; because, that also is relationship, and there too there are jealousies, envy, the desire to be the nearest disciple, and all the rest of the nonsense.

So, we are trapped because we do not understand relationship; and it is difficult to understand relationship if we are condemning, identifying ourselves with something, or if we are using relationship as a means of escape from ourselves, from that which we are. After all, relationship is a mirror, is it not? Relationship is a mirror in which I can see myself as I am. But to see ourselves directly as we are is very unpleasant, and so we avoid it by condemning it, justifying it, or merely identifying ourselves with it. Without relationship there is no life, is there? Nothing can exist in isolation. And yet all our efforts are towards being isolated; relationship for most of us is a process of self-isolation, self-enclosure, and therefore there is friction. When there is friction, misery, pain, suffering, unhappiness, we want to run away, we want to follow someone else, to live in the shadow of another, and so we turn to the church, to a monastery, or to the latest teacher. They are all the same because they are all escapes, and our turning to them is obviously prompted by the

desire to avoid that which is; and in the very running away we create further misery, further confusion.

So, most of us are trapped, whether we like it or not, because that is our world, that is our society; and awareness in relationship is the mirror in which we can see ourselves very clearly. To see clearly, there must obviously be no condemnation, acceptance, justification, or identification. If we are simply aware without choice, then we can observe, not only the superficial reactions of the mind, but also the deep and hidden reactions, which come out in the shape of dreams, or in moments when the superficial mind is quiet and there is spontaneity of response. But if the mind is conditioned, shaped, and bound by a particular belief, surely there can be no spontaneity, and therefore no direct perception of the responses of relationship.

It is important to see, is it not, that no one can give us freedom from the conflict of relationship. We can hide behind the screen of words, or follow a teacher, or run to a church, or lose ourselves in a cinema or a book, or keep on attending talks; but it is only when the fundamental process of thinking is uncovered through awareness in relationship that it is possible to understand and be free of that friction which we instinctively seek to avoid. Most of us use relationship as a means of escape from ourselves, from our own loneliness, from our own inward uncertainty and poverty, and so we cling to the outer things of relationship, which become very important to us. But if, instead of escaping through relationship, we can look into relationship as a mirror and see very clearly, without any prejudice, exactly what is, then that very perception brings about a transformation of what is, without any effort to transform it. There is nothing to transform about a fact; it is what it is. But we approach the fact with hesitation, with fear, with a sense of prejudice, and so we are always acting upon the fact and therefore never perceiving the fact as it is. When we see the fact as it is, then that very fact is the truth which resolves the problem.

So, in all this the important thing is not what another says, however great or stupid he may be, but to be aware of oneself, to see the fact of what is, from moment to moment, without accumulating. When you accumulate, you cannot see the fact; then you see the accumulation, and not the fact. But when you can see the fact independently of the accumulation, independently of the thought process, which is the response of accumulated experience, then it is possible to go beyond the fact. It is the avoidance of the fact that brings about conflict, but when you recognize the truth of the fact, then there is a quietness of mind in which conflict ceases.

So, do what you will, you cannot escape through relationship; and if you do escape, you will only create further isolation, further misery and confusion, because to use relationship as a means of self-fulfillment is to deny relationship. If we look at this problem very clearly, we can see that life is a process of relationship; and if, instead of understanding relationship, we seek to withdraw from it, enclosing ourselves in ideas, in superstitions, in various forms of addiction, these self-enclosures only create more of the very conflict we are trying to avoid.

Question: What is wisdom? Is it dissimilar from knowledge?

Krishnamurti: What is knowledge? Surely, knowledge is the accumulating principle in all of us, which is memory. The acquisitive process is knowledge, is it not? Knowledge is experience and memory. The more we accumulate experience, the more we know. Knowing is a process of verbalizing, and that which has been accumulated, which is experience, memory, or knowledge, can never bring wisdom. Knowledge is the result of experience, and there is experience only when there is an experiencer who is accumulating. The experiencer is the result of his own accumulations, experiences, and knowledge; and what he experiences is according to his conditioning. Therefore, the more he experiences, the more he is conditioned, weighed down. When he experiences, he can only experience according to his background, so the background dictates the knowledge, the translation of experience. Experience, the translation of a fact, cannot bring understanding. Understanding comes only with the suppression of knowledge.

After all, we experience according to our belief. If I believe that there is no God, obviously I experience according to my belief because the background, the conditioning, the training, dictates and translates my experiences; and if I believe in God, then my experience is according to my conditioning as a believer. So, experiencing is a process of the response of the conditioned mind; and where there is knowledge, or the accumulation of experience, of memory, of words, symbols, images, there can be no understanding. Understanding can come only when there is freedom from knowledge. After all, when you have a problem, the more you think about it, worry over it, the less you understand it; but if you can look at it freely, without translating it, without bringing in all the background of your tradition, of your experiences, then you will see that understanding comes out of it.

So, understanding is not the result of accumulation, and wisdom is not knowledge. Wisdom is independent, it is dissimilar from knowledge. Wisdom is from moment to moment, whereas knowledge can never be free from the past, from time. Wisdom is free from time, and knowledge is the very process of time, and the two cannot possibly be joined together. The man who knows can never be wise because the very knowledge of what he has denies wisdom. Knowledge is the process of time, which is the accumulation of experience; and wisdom is freedom from time, which is experience from moment to moment without the process of accumulation.

Question: Though I am young, I am haunted by the fear of death. How am I to overcome this fear?

Krishnamurti: Surely, anything that is overcome has to be overcome again, does it not? When you conquer your enemy, you have to reconquer him again and again. That is why wars continue. The moment you vanquish one desire, there is another desire to be vanquished. So, that which is overcome can never be understood. Overcoming is merely a form of suppression, and you can never be free of that which is suppressed. So, the overcoming of fear is merely the postponement of fear.

Our problem, then, is not how to overcome fear of death but to understand the whole process of death, and understanding it is not a matter of being young or old. There are various forms of death, for the old as well as for the young. All of us are conditioned by our past, by conformity, by the desire for our own advancement, by the subtle accumulation of power, and though we are outwardly active, we may be inwardly dead. So, to understand this process of death needs a great deal of exploration, and not merely adhering to a particular form of belief - that there is, or is not, a continuity after death. Belief in life after death may give you an ideological consolation, and there may be, and probably is, a form of continuity. But then what? What continues? Can that which continues ever be creative? And where there is continuity, is there not always the fear of ending? So, death is a process of time, is it not?

What do we mean by time? There is chronological time, but there is also another kind of time, is there not? It is the psychological process of continuity. That is, we want to continue, and the very desire to continue creates the process of time and the fear of not continuing. It is this fear of not continuing that we are concerned with; it is ending of which we are afraid. We are afraid of death because we think that through continuity we shall achieve something, we shall be happy.

After all, what is it that continues? If we can really understand that, if we can actually experience it as we are sitting here, and not merely listen to words, then perhaps we shall know what it is to die from moment to moment; and knowing death, we shall know life because the two are not very different. If we do not know how to live, we are afraid of death, but if we know how to live, then there is no death. Most of us do not know what living is, and so we regard death as a negation of life, and therefore we are afraid of death. But if we can understand what living is, then we shall know of death in the very process of living. To find that out, we must understand what we mean by continuity.

What is this extraordinary craving to continue that each one of us has? And what is it that continues? Surely, that which continues is name, form, experience, knowledge, and various memories. That is what we

are, is it not? To divide yourself into the higher and the lower self is irrelevant - you are still merely the sum total of all that. Though you may say, "No, I am more than that, I am a spiritual entity," that very assertion is part of the process of thinking, which is the conditioned and conditioning response of memory. There are others who are conditioned to say, "We are not spiritual, we are just the product of environment." So, you are your memories, your experiences, your thoughts. At whatever level you place the thought process, you are still that, and you are afraid that when death comes, that process, which is the 'you', will come to an end. Or, you rationalize it and say, "I will continue in some form after death and come back in the next life."

Now, a spiritual entity obviously cannot continue because it is beyond time. Continuity implies time - yesterday, today, and tomorrow; therefore, that which is timeless can have no continuity. To say "I am a spiritual entity" is a comforting thought, but the very process of thinking about it catches it in the net of time; therefore, it cannot be timeless, and therefore it is not spiritual.

So, what we have is only our thinking, which is also feeling. We have nothing but our name, our form, our family, our clothes and furniture, our memories and experiences, our responses, traditions, vanities, and prejudices. That is all we have, and that we want to continue. We are afraid it will all come to an end, that we shall be unable to say, "This for which I have struggled is all mine." Now, can that which continues ever renew itself? Obviously not. That which continues cannot be reborn, renewed; it can merely have a continuity. Only that which comes to an end can renew itself. There is creation only when there is an ending. But we are afraid to end, we are afraid to die. We want to carry on from yesterday through today to tomorrow. We are building Utopias and sacrificing the present to the future, liquidating people because of the desire for continuity. If we examine very closely what it is that continues, we will see that it is only memory in various forms, and because the mind clings to memory, it is afraid of death. But surely, only in dying, in not accumulating, is there that which is beyond time. The mind cannot possibly conceive, formulate, or experience that which is not of time. It can experience only that which is of time because the mind is the result of time, of the past.

So, as long as the mind is afraid of coming to an end, it clings to its own continuity, and that which continues must obviously decay. Our difficulty is to die to all the things that we have accumulated, to all the experiences of yesterday. After all, that is death, is it not? - to be uncertain, to be in a state of vulnerability. The man who is certain can never know that which is immortal, that which is beyond time. The man of knowledge can never know death, which is beyond time, the unknown. It is only when we die from moment to moment to the things of yesterday and understand the whole significance of continuity that there is the unknown, a new thing. That which continues can never know the truth, the unknown, the new; it can only know its own projection. Most of us live through accumulation; therefore, yesterday and tomorrow become far more important than the present.

There must obviously be chronological time; otherwise, you will miss your train; but as long as we are caught in the projection of the mind, which is psychological time, there is no ending, and that which has continuity is not immortal. Only that which comes to an end is timeless, and that alone can know the immortal.

Question: There are several systems of meditation, both Occidental and Oriental. Which do you recommend?

Krishnamurti: To understand what is right meditation is really a very complex problem, and to know how to meditate, how to be in the state of meditation, is important; but to follow any system, whether Occidental or Oriental, is not to meditate. When you follow a system, all that you learn is to conform, to shape the mind to a particular pattern or drive it along a particular groove. If you pursue it ardently enough, you will produce the result that the system guarantees, but surely, that is not meditation. There is a lot of nonsense taught about meditation, especially by those people who come from the Orient. (Laughter) Please don't laugh or

clap - this is not that kind of meeting. We are trying to find out what meditation is.

You can see that those who pursue a system, who drive the mind into certain practices, obviously condition the mind according to that formula. Therefore, the mind is not free. It is only the free mind that can discover, not a mind conditioned according to any system, whether Oriental or Occidental. Conditioning is the same, by whatever name you may call it. To see the truth there must be freedom, and a mind that is conditioned according to a system can never see the truth.

Now, to see the truth that there can be no freedom through the discipline of any system requires the understanding of the process of the mind, because the mind clings to systems, to beliefs, to particular formulas. To discover the truth of that, surely you have to see that you are caught in a system, and to be aware of the process by which the mind gets caught in a system is meditation. To be aware of the whole process of thinking is self-knowledge, is it not? So, meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge. Without knowing the process of your own thinking, merely to sit in a corner and go off into silence, or whatever you do, is not meditation - it is just a wish to become, to acquire, to gain something. And obviously, concentration is not meditation. Merely focusing the mind on an idea, an image, or a phrase and excluding all other thoughts is not meditation, is it? You may learn concentration in that way, but concentration is exclusion, and when the mind excludes, it is not free.

Why do we want to focus the mind on an image or an idea, or practice a system of so-called meditation - the more mysterious the better? Because we think that by concentration, or through prayer, the constant repetition of certain words, the mind will be made quiet. As I said, concentration is a process of exclusion. We choose a particular idea or thought and dwell on it, and while we are forcing the mind to concentrate on it, other thoughts come in; so, there is a conflict going on, and we spend our energy in this wasteful battle. But if we can be open to each thought as it arises and understand it, then we shall see that the mind does not revert to any particular thought. The mind reverts to a thought because it has not understood it; that is, what is not understood is repeated over and over again, and mere exclusion will not prevent it. So, concentration, which is exclusion, is not meditation. Most of us want to live exclusively, with our private memories, private experiences, private knowledge; and concentration, which we call meditation, is merely a further process of self-enclosure, self-isolation. But the mind can never be free through isolation, however wide your projected idea may be.

Now, you can force the mind to be quiet through what is called prayer, the constant repetition of words, but when the mind is hypnotized into quietness, is that a state of meditation? Surely, that only dulls the mind, does it not? Though the mind may be pacified through discipline, which is based on the desire for particular results, such a mind is obviously not a free mind. Freedom can never come through discipline. Though we think we must discipline ourselves in order to be free, the beginning determines the end, and if the mind is disciplined at the beginning, it will be disciplined at the end; therefore, it can never be free. But if we can understand the whole process of discipline, control, suppression, sublimation, substitution, then there will be freedom from the very beginning, for the means and the end are one - they are not two separate processes, either politically or religiously.

So, discipline through concentration is not meditation, nor are the various forms of prayer. Those are all tricks by which the mind is forced to be still, and a mind that is made still through will, through desire, can never be free. If we really look at all these things - concentration, prayer, systems of meditation, and all the various tricks that we learn to quiet, to hypnotize the mind - we shall discover that they are the ways of thought, the ways of the self; and this discovery is the beginning of meditation, which is the beginning of self-knowledge. Without knowing yourself, merely to concentrate, to conform to a pattern, to follow a system, to quiet the mind through a discipline, only leads to further misery, further confusion. But if you begin to know the ways of your own thought by being choicelessly aware of yourself in relationship, in your talking, in your walking, when you are observing a bird or looking at somebody else, then, in that

awareness, the responses of your conditioned state come into being - and in that spontaneity there is the discovery of yourself as yourself. And the more you are aware of yourself without choice, without justification or condemnation, the more there is freedom. It is this freedom that is the process of meditation. But you cannot cultivate freedom any more than you can cultivate love. Freedom comes into being, not through the search for it, but when you understand the whole process and structure of yourself.

Meditation, then, is the beginning of self-knowledge. When you begin very near, you can go very far, and then you will see that thought, which is the projection of the mind, comes to an end of itself without being compelled, forced. Then there is silence - not the silence that is willed, created by the mind, but a silence that is not of time; and in that silence there is the state of creation, the timelessness' which is reality.

So, without understanding the ways of thought, merely to force the mind to meditate is an utter waste of time and energy and only creates more confusion, more misery. But to understand the process of the self as the thinker, to know the ways of the self as thought, is the beginning of wisdom. For wisdom to be, there must be the understanding of the accumulating process - which is the thinker. Without understanding the thinker, meditation has no meaning because whatever he projects is according to his own conditioning, and that is obviously not reality. Only when the mind understands the whole process of itself as thought, is it capable of being free, and only then does the timeless come into being.

***Fifth Public Talk in New York***

***Sunday, July 2, 1950***

