

Jiddu Krishnamurti

Five Public Meetings in Rome

- 1966

Table of Contents

<i>First Dialogue in Rome</i>	1
<i>Second Dialogue in Rome</i>	13
<i>Third Dialogue in Rome</i>	22
<i>Fourth Dialogue in Rome</i>	31
<i>Fifth Dialogue in Rome</i>	37

First Dialogue in Rome

First Dialogue in Rome

Thursday, March 31, 1966

I think it would be a good idea if we could investigate the word serious. Most of us think we are quite serious. We think we are serious if we follow a certain action to which we are committed, or pursue to the end a particular idea, a particular belief, or having committed ourselves to a certain ideology, we pursue that throughout life, not deviating from it. We also think we are very serious if we have a concept, a formula of life, and carry that out throughout our existence.

Now, is that seriousness? If we have committed ourselves to a particular belief, and pursued that belief, if we have given ourselves over to a certain ideological formula, and have lived according to that formula or according to a belief, which is a concept, does all that constitute seriousness? I am just questioning it because that word has great content in it. If we could, as it were, open up that word, and investigate its significance and its structure, then perhaps we could establish a communication with each other, because what we are talking about is quite serious. We are not using words just for the words' sake, or having a reputation, to keep up that reputation. We are not saying something that we don't mean, at least the speaker is not. And so, to establish a relationship between the speaker and yourself, we must understand the verbal meaning, the content of words, the nature of the usage of words. I think it would be worthwhile if we could investigate that word serious.

If you are going to come here to all these discussions, then either you are very serious, or you are just being entertained by a speaker who perhaps has a new set of ideas. So it seems to me that it's important to understand this word serious. I do not consider any person who is committed to a belief, a dogma, a formula, a course of action, to be serious at all. We have to establish that. To be really serious means to be free - free to investigate, to find out, to have passion to pursue. People do have passion to pursue according to a formula. A man who believes ardently pursues; he lives a life, but it is a life committed to an idea; and a life committed to an idea, to a formula, to a belief, to a concept, to a utopia, is just going round and round in circles. It is really a form of self-worship through identification with a belief.

By using that word serious we mean something entirely different. To inquire into, or examine into, the reality of life, into what is existence, we must be totally free; otherwise, we can't examine. If we are conditioned by belief as Catholics, as Protestants, or as Anglicans, for whom the recent visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury is very important, then we are not free to investigate. It seems to me that a person who is serious, who is essentially free, demands freedom. He may not be free, but he demands it; and in the very demanding of it, he becomes serious because he has no concept of what freedom is. If we have a concept of what freedom is and are committed to that concept, then we are no longer free to investigate freedom. But if we deny the whole commitment to a formula, to a concept, to a utopia, to a conditioned state or to propaganda - on that basis we may discuss. If the mind has been brainwashed through propaganda, through a certain belief, such a person is not free to inquire, and therefore he is not serious. I hope that's clear. If it is not clear, you and I will have no relationship in our talking together. We must really deny this two thousand years of propaganda, of which we are the result. Our social, economic, cultural structure is the result of propaganda, of our religious beliefs, and with that background, with that conditioned mind, it's impossible to examine, or to inquire into a different way of living.

Please let us establish that relationship with each other. It is not possible to discuss or talk over together any

issue if you and I are not both at the same level of intensity. If I am factual, argumentative, and you are not serious in the sense in which I am using the word, then you and I have no contact. Can we establish that? Our talking together is not an intellectual examination of the whole process of living. If we are discussing, if we are merely talking together intellectually, then it will have very little more meaning than going to a cinema. But if we are not intellectual, if we are really serious in trying to find out a different way of living because we have come to a crisis, a tremendous crisis in consciousness - not economic, social, or religious, but deep - then these discussions can be of great value. In the deep consciousness of man, there is a crisis because he has to face a tremendous change in the world, not only outwardly, but inwardly. The outward response depends on the inward state, naturally; and if the inward state is merely a response of a conditioned mind, then of course the crisis doesn't exist at all. If I am a dyed-in-the-wool Catholic, my response to this enormous change that's going on outwardly will be very limited. It will have no value at all.

Is it possible to find a way of life, a way of daily living, which is basically and radically free, and therefore revolutionary? There is only one revolution for me, and that is the religious revolution. The others are not revolutions at all; economic, social, political, and all the rest are not revolutions. There is only one revolution, which is the religious mind in revolt, not as a reaction, but a mind that has established a way of life in which there is no contradiction. All our lives are in contradiction, and therefore in conflict, either the conflict born of trying to conform, conflict through fulfillment, or the conflict engendered by social influence. Human beings have lived in this state of conflict as long as human history is known. Everything they touch turns into conflict, within and without. Either it's a war between people or life as a human being is a battlefield within. We all know this constant, everlasting battle, outwardly and inwardly. Conflict does produce a certain result by the use of the will, but conflict never is creative. That's a dangerous word to use; we'll go into it a little later. To live, to flower in goodness, there must be peace, not economic peace, the peace between two wars, the peace of politicians negotiating treaties, the peace which the church talks about, or what the organized religions preach, but peace that one has discovered for oneself. It is only in peace that we can flower, can grow, can be, can function. It cannot come into being when there is conflict of any kind, conscious or unconscious.

Is it possible to live a life without conflict, in the modern world with all the strain, struggles, pressures, and influences in the social structure? That is really living - the essence of a mind that is inquiring seriously. The question of whether there is God, whether there is truth, whether there is beauty can only come when this is established, when the mind is no longer in conflict.

Can we discuss this?

Question: How is one to avoid this conflict?

Krishnamurti: You can't avoid conflict. You have to understand the nature of conflict. It is one of the most difficult things to understand conflict. We have tried to avoid conflict, so we take to drink, sex, church, organized religions, social activities, superficial amusements - every form of escape. We have tried to avoid this conflict, but we haven't been able to. The very avoidance is contributory to conflict.

Question: Could you say something about the terms of conflict?

Krishnamurti: We'll go into that, sir. First let us see the basic necessity, the fundamental, radical necessity of freedom and peace. We don't know what it means yet. We can see, perhaps only intellectually, the necessity of a mind, a heart, the whole structure of a human being not having conflict, because then there is peace. That peace is really a form of moral behavior because a mind that is not peaceful cannot behave, cannot have right relationship; and right relationship is behavior, conduct, virtue, morals, all the rest of it. If both of us understand the necessity of ending conflict - understand it even verbally for the moment - then we can proceed; then we can begin to investigate what conflict is, why conflict comes into being, and whether it is at all possible to end conflict by increasing, or by insisting upon, a factor which is called the will. Let's begin

slowly. It's a tremendous subject; we can't brush it off in an afternoon. What is conflict, both outwardly and inwardly? We can see outwardly the wars, which are the result of nationalities, economic pressures, religious, personal prejudices. There have been religious wars right through the world. Perhaps Buddhism has not contributed to war, except recently Buddhist priests have burned themselves, but it is totally against the teaching. They are told never to touch politics, but politics is the new alcohol. It gives intoxication; that is nationalism. We can see the contributory factors of war, outwardly, outward ideologies; we don't have to go into all that.

Then there is the inward conflict, which is much more complex. Why is there conflict in us? We are examining; we are not saying that we should or should not be without conflict. We are examining it, and to examine we must be very clear in our thinking, very acute in our observation; we must be intensely aware in observing the whole nature and the significance of conflict. Why is there conflict? What do we mean by that word struggle! We are examining the meaning of the word, not what brings about conflict. When are we at all conscious of this word, of the fact? Only when there is pain; only when there is a contradiction; only when there is the pursuit of pleasure and it is denied. I am aware of conflict when my form of pleasure in fulfillment, in ambition, in various forms is thwarted. When pleasure of ambition is frustrated, then I am conscious of conflict, but as long as the pleasure of ambition continues without any blockage, I have no sense of conflict at all. There is pleasure in conformity. I want to conform to society because it pays me; it gives me profit. For security, for a means of livelihood, to become famous, to be recognized, to be somebody in society, I must conform to the norm, to the pattern set by society. As long as I am conforming to it completely, which is a great pleasure, there is no conflict; but there is conflict the moment there is a distraction from that conformity.

Comment: I am trying to read some book on philosophy and there is a conflict or tension between my limited understanding right now and the understanding in the book, which I am trying to attain.

Krishnamurti: That's quite a different question. Why do I want to read a book? Why should I try to understand someone, whether it is Buddha, Christ, or a philosopher? Why?

Comment: I think a person is looking for something.

KRISHNAMURTI: What for?

Comment: Well, for myself, I'd say the truth.

Krishnamurti: What are we seeking, and why should we seek? This really requires a great deal of examination. You can't just say it is God, truth, this or that; this requires tremendous inquiry. Why do we seek? What are we seeking - God, truth, happiness, a better way of life, more sex, more money, more pleasure? You want God, and they want a new society. Then what? You want something sublime, and they want I don't know what. Before we say we are seeking, why are we seeking and what are we seeking? If there is a motive for seeking, there is no seeking.

Comment: Maybe we are investigating to see.

Krishnamurti: We are always seeking with a motive. I am unhappy and I want to be happy. I like to see the country, I love to drive and I want a car - that's my motive. As long as I have a motive, is there any seeking? The seeking is dictated by my motive; therefore, the seeking is limited.

Comment: It is conditioned.

Krishnamurti: It is conditioned. And is there a seeking if there is no motive at all?

Comment: It seems as though there is a certain unknown which draws us toward itself.

Krishnamurti: To come upon the unknown, there must be freedom from the known. We must go into this very slowly. So, let's begin again. When are we conscious of conflict? When there is physical pain, we become conscious; we do something about it. If there is no pain at all, we carry on, and that's what we want - to live a life in which there is no pain at all. Psychologically this is a fact.

Comment: There are times when people do things even though there is pain.

Krishnamurti: That may be because they are committed to a certain formula, certain beliefs, a certain concept of life, and they say, "This is part of it." Comment: It may be a certain person that they are doing it for.

Krishnamurti: Then why have pain?

Comment: I think it's just there.

KRISHNAMURTI: You can't accept pain as it's being there. Why should it be there? If we could go into this a little more closely, a little more slowly, step by step, perhaps we'll get at it.

Question: When we go into something in inquiry, even on a word, isn't there a search for something?

Krishnamurti: Surely, sir. The word search came when we said "examine." What do we mean by seeking? If a man is very clear in his thinking, in his feeling, in his relationships, in his daily life, there is no conflict; why should he seek? The light in itself is sufficient. Clarity itself is sufficient. That is the basis of existence, and from there we can proceed. But without laying the foundation of right relationship, in which there is no conflict, we are seeking something outside. Right relationship means no conflict between man and man. If we try to go beyond, try to find something else without establishing that, without laying the foundation of that, we won't go any further. The search for truth, God, merely becomes an escape.

Comment: Though theoretically clarity and light are sufficient, are the foundation, in the actual order we start out in darkness.

KRISHNAMURTI: Why do we start out in darkness? Education, the social structure, the influences on our life, propaganda - oh, there are so many contributory factors to this darkness.

Question: Are they contributory factors to the darkness, or are they attempts to shed light on the darkness which was there prior to education or whatever?

Krishnamurti: The past is infinite. Can one say, "Before the past there was clarity"? It comes to that, doesn't it?

Look, sir. If a man is born in India, or in Europe, he becomes a Hindu, or a Catholic, or a Protestant, whatever it is. He is conditioned by society, whether it is communist society, Indian society, or European society. He is conditioned by environment.

Comment: We are part of our environment, but it seems like we are not absolutely conditioned by it.

Krishnamurti: We are conditioned. Ninety percent of us are conditioned.

Comment: Ninety-nine percent.

Krishnamurti: We are conditioned.

Question: What happens to the one percent?

Krishnamurti: Let's find out. To find out if there is one percent at all, you must uncondition your ninety-nine percent; otherwise you can't find out.

Comment: Just because a person is living in a certain social structure, holding certain dogmas or beliefs, there may be two ways of doing it. He may have been born into a religion or a certain society, and just continues along in that, never questioning it. . . .

Krishnamurti: Yes, sir. Or? Or? Comment: Or the person is actually choosing. . . .

Krishnamurti: Ah, wait, wait! This is a famous fallacy, choosing. What makes him choose? Why should he choose at all?

Comment: I don't know. It seems like man does choose. ...

Krishnamurti: Why does he choose? Why doesn't he choose Buddhism instead of Catholicism, or communism? Why?

Comment: Some people are. . . .

KRISHNAMURTI: Your tendency, your proclivities, your inclination, your social background, religion - all that pushes you in a certain direction, and you say you are choosing. You see, sir, I question this whole way of choosing. Why should I choose? If a man is free, he has no choice. There is no question of choice. Finished. That is why I said at the beginning that to establish a serious discussion, there must be this examination of freedom and peace. Otherwise you can't proceed. If you say man can never be free, then you have blocked yourself. You have stopped yourself from further examination. If you make an ideal of freedom, again you have blocked yourself. You have not if you say, "Let us find out by denying what it is to be free." To be free is not a reaction. It implies no nationality, obviously - that is, outwardly - though you may have a passport. I have one from India, but I'm not anything, nor do I belong to any religion because organized religions are just like any other organized corporation. Through those I can't find God, or truth. I must be free first to find out. It further implies freedom from anger, jealousy, envy, ambition, competition, wanting fame, prestige - a complete denial of the social structure in which I have been brought up. Otherwise I'm not free; otherwise, I cannot possibly have a right relationship with man. If you and I discuss this question of freedom, and you say, "Well, I stick to my particular conditioning, and let's talk about freedom," this is completely futile. It means really understanding my conditioning, not finding an excuse for it, not saying that it is right or wrong, that it is justified, that I can't escape from it, that it is inevitable, that I have chosen it. I have to examine my conditioning.

Question: Is a yogi who lives on the top of a mountain free from conditioning?

Krishnamurti: No, obviously not. It is merely an escape. Sir, it is so obvious. He may live on the top of a mountain, or in a cell, but he is conditioned; his whole background is Catholic, Buddhist, Islam. He is the expression of his background, which says that you must retire into a monastery, to a hill, to find God. The other background says that you must so identify yourself with the community, with the state, that you are not an individual, that you are no longer thinking about yourself. You have the two extremes.

To come back to the question: "Is it possible to live a life in the modern world without conflict?" Conflict is an awareness of frustration, an awareness of blockage, an awareness of pain, an awareness of competition, an awareness of the importance of the pursuit of your own activities, or of being identified with an activity organized as a religion, of being identified as a communist, and so on.

I feel that man has never demanded freedom, absolute freedom. We want partial freedom - partial freedom being freedom from anything that causes pain, any psychological pain. From that I want to be free, divorced, or any of a dozen forms. The fundamental question is, if I may repeat it, whether it is possible to live without conflict, without war, outwardly, and inwardly without there being a battle with myself, my wife, my children, my society, my neighbor. If there is conflict, it distorts the mind, consciously or unconsciously; and a distorted mind, whether it is on the top of a hill or in a monastery, is still a distorted mind. It can

pursue its own image, but it won't be reality.

Question: Can I live without any conflict at all? It seems something simple like getting up in the morning. Sometimes I just don't feel like getting up. Rationally I know there are certain specific things I want to do today, yet there's a certain part of me that... .

Krishnamurti: Rebels, which is contradiction. That is, one part of me, one part of desire says, "I must go for a walk on this lovely evening," and the other part says, "What a bore walking is; I want to listen to what this chap is talking about," and I have a conflict. I may be putting it on the most absurd level, but that's what we are. Our desires are torn towards one thing, and the opposite of that.

Shall we go into the nature of conflict? Let's not particularize, but get the whole picture of conflict; then you can particularize it yourselves. What is conflict? We have accepted conflict as the way of life - conflict with a man or with a woman. There have been nearly fifteen thousand wars in the last five thousand five hundred years, two and a half wars every year. We have accepted war as the way of life. In ourselves there is this perpetual battle going on: "I must" and "I must not"; "I should" and "I should not." We live in an endless corridor of duality. Not that there is not duality. There is the woman and the man; there is darkness and light. Factually there is no contradiction, but we have created psychological contradiction. Why is there this conflict of duality? - "I must" and "I must not"; "I should" and "I should not."

Comment: Because we don't understand; we don't see.

Krishnamurti: Why don't we see? Because we don't know that we are in conflict. We don't know, and we don't say, "I must find a way out of this completely." We have never said, "I must be totally free from conflict." We have accepted the bourgeois way of life, which is conflict, whether it is in Moscow, in London, in Rome, or in any other place. We have accepted it. If we don't accept it, we have much more trouble; we have infinite bother. That's why we avoid it.

Question: So how do we get out of it?

Krishnamurti: First, let's see it. What brings about conflict?

Comment: Our desires.

Krishnamurti: All right. Your desire. What is wrong with a desire?

Comment: We should have no desires.

Krishnamurti: No, sir. If you had no desire, what would happen?

Comment: I would have peace.

Krishnamurti: Does peace contradict desire?

Comment: No.

Krishnamurti: Therefore you have to understand desire. You have to understand the nature of it, the meaning of it, the whole structure of it. Now, what is desire?

Comment: Something that you believe you need.

Krishnamurti: No, no, before that. What is desire, not desire for something?

Comment: A craving that comes out from your body, from your brain.

Krishnamurti: What does that mean, sir? Go into it. Let us go into the anatomy of desire, before the desire is, before it identifies itself, before desire is created by the object. You follow, sir, what I mean? Both in Asia

and in Europe the religious people have denied desire. They say, "Desire is wrong, evil, sinful; turn your back against it." You must take that into account.

Comment: Yes.

Krishnamurti: That's part of the structure. They say that unless you have tremendous control over your desires, unless you have them trained, those desires will lead you to distraction and not to reality; so you must discipline, control, suppress. That's part of the heritage.

Comment: If we don't suppress the whole thing, we. . . .

Krishnamurti: Wait, wait! Don't say that yet. Go into it, sir; let's see. Before we suppress it, deny it, control it, shape it or whatever it is, let's see how desire comes into being - not the desire for the object or the object that creates the desire, but the feeling of desire itself.

Comment: I am discontented with what I have.

Krishnamurti: No, no. We are not talking of discontent but of desire. I see a beautiful car. Instantly I have a desire for it. That is the immediate reaction.

Question: Is that the same for everybody? You can have five people walking by a beautiful car, and they won't all want it.

Krishnamurti: It may be a beautiful woman, or you may want a beautiful house, a lovely garden. The object varies with each person. We are talking of the nature of desire itself, not the object.

Comment: I don't see how we can talk about desire if we don't talk about the person desiring.

Krishnamurti: We are going to; you will see it in a minute, sir. I or you or someone sees something. There is a first seeing - the image, the car, the woman, the house - the first visual perception. It may not even be visual but may be intellectual, a very good idea. There is perception; there is perceiving; then there is the reacting.

Comment: The reaction could be any of a number of things.

Krishnamurti: Oh, yes, of course. I said "reacting"; I didn't give a specific name to the reaction. Then there is the intervention of the mind, of thought, saying, "I would like to have that," or "not that." That's a form of desire, isn't it? It is very simple when you examine what desire is. Perception, contact, sensation, the identification with that, and the demand for the fulfillment of that. All religions have said, "Retire; don't look at the world, at the woman, the money, position; it's death to reality."

Comment: Many religions don't say that.

Krishnamurti: Most do. Otherwise all the Catholic priests wouldn't be in that position. All the Hindus and Buddhists say, "Suppress; get away from desire."

Question: Do you not think it might be better to hold off judgment of religions, which may be historical. . . .

Krishnamurti: No, sir. This is not a question of anything historical. We are discussing the fact - desire.

Comment: Judgment as to whether the desire of life to Buddhism, the Mayan Indians, or to Catholicism. . . .

KRISHNAMURTI: But, sir, this is human structure; not Catholic desire or Hindu desire, but human nature desires.

Comment: I think we have to understand whether a particular religion discourages desire or not.

Krishnamurti: Let's forget religion. There is human desire. That desire has created so much mischief in the world - my desire, wanting to be prominent, wanting to be famous. Unless one understands the nature of desire, merely suppressing it or running away from it has no meaning. I see how desire arises: seeing the object, and the object strengthening desire. This is very simple. What makes it more complex is when the desire has a continuity. I have to find out why there is continuity to desire.

Comment: I may desire to understand something, too. For instance, in reading a book about communism, I want to understand how it developed, what it stands for, what it means, what position it has in the world today.

Krishnamurti: All right; all right.

Question: Shouldn't there be a desire for understanding?

Krishnamurti: Yes, maybe. But we're not discussing the desire for understanding. We are trying to find out the nature of desire, not for something. We don't say the desire for understanding is right or wrong. What we are saying is that we are trying to understand desire itself, per se, not whether desire for this is right or is wrong. I see how desire comes into being. Then also I see how desire has a continuity, and there is the problem - not desire itself, but giving strength and vitality through time to desire. Now, what gives continuity to desire?

Comment: I want a thing and I have it, and then the desire grows.

Krishnamurti: There is desire for it, and I make a lot of effort to get it, which means that there is a sustained desire. Now, what gives substance, nourishment, sustenance to maintain this desire?

Comment: That is the problem.

Krishnamurti: I'm looking at it, sir; I'm looking at the problem. Comment: You think that by getting that thing, something will be added to your life.

Krishnamurti: All right, you get it. We're not going into the question of getting an object of enrichment or one which does not enrich. We are seeing the nature of desire itself.

Comment: The urge to grow is what keeps the desire going.

Krishnamurti: The urge to grow, to keep the desire going means a continuity, a constancy.

Comment: As long as you have the urge to grow, it seems all right to have the desire.

Krishnamurti: I am not saying "grow" or "not grow." You see, you are identifying already with growth, and therefore you're blocking the examination.

Comment: Well, I don't see how I can do otherwise. I am not what I was when I was ten years old.

Krishnamurti: We are not discussing the importance or unimportance of desire. We are trying to find out what gives constancy to desire.

Comment: That doesn't present an answer because I'm not talking about the importance or the unimportance of desire.

Krishnamurti: Please have a little patience; I'm coming to that; you will see it. I have to find out why desire has such potency in my life. It may be right or it may not be right. I have to find out. I see that. Desire arises, which is a reaction, which is a healthy, normal reaction; otherwise, I would be dead. I see a beautiful thing and I say, "By Jove, I want that." If I didn't, I'd be dead. But in the constant pursuit of it there is pain. That's my problem - there is pain as well as pleasure. I see a beautiful woman, and she is beautiful; it would be

most absurd to say, "No, she's not." This is a fact. But what gives continuity to the pleasure? Obviously it is thought, thinking about it. Right, sir?

Comment: Yes.

Krishnamurti: I think about it. It is no longer the direct relationship with the object, which is desire, but thought now increases that desire by thinking about it, by having images, pictures, ideas.

Comment: Yes.

Comment: You fight not to have it.

Krishnamurti: All that fight not to have it, the whole business of thought gives it intensity. Thought comes in and says, "Please, you must have it; that's growth; that is important; that is not important; this is vital for your life; this is not vital for your life."

But I can look at it and have a desire, and that's the end of it, without interference of thought.

Question: It relates to God, too?

Krishnamurti: I don't want to come into that yet. Let's take the simple things first. I have to understand the whole machinery of thought; not suppress desire, not say it is right or wrong, good or bad, noble or ignoble - that's all too immature. But I have to go into the question of what thinking is. If thought doesn't interfere with it, then there may be a different action altogether. I have to find out what thinking is, and if there is any need to think at all. These are the two questions I have to answer before I can say what I am going to do with the desire. Right, sir?

Comment: Yes.

Krishnamurti: What is thinking? The electronic brains are thinking, thinking along the information which has been fed into them. And I think according to my experiences, knowledge, incidents, influences, pain, pleasure - the whole background of my memory, religious, economic; a Brahmin fasting. I react according to the whole of that background. My machinery is much more subtle than the electronic brain, but it works on the same principle.

Comment: I think the electronic brain is just regurgitating facts that have been fed into it.

Krishnamurti: But aren't we doing the same? Wait, madame. Examine it; don't say no or yes. Let's look.

Comment: We are not thinking if we are only giving out what has been fed to us.

Krishnamurti: But that's what we call thinking.

Comment: Ah, I see; that's what we call it.

Krishnamurti: I'm thinking.

Comment: It may be true scientifically, but it is still working on the basis of what has been put into it.

Krishnamurti: Please, let's look at it the other way. You are an Italian and I am supposed to be a Hindu. You have your background, your story, your culture, your religion, your experiences, your knowledge, your daily incidents and memories. And I have my memory, my banks of memory. From that I react; from that I respond.

Question: How does that fit in with the idea of freedom that you spoke about?

Krishnamurti: It doesn't exist.

Comment: If you think it doesn't exist.

Krishnamurti: It does not exist. That is one of the most difficult things until we're free. That's what I was going into. Unless I understand this machinery of thinking - the memory, the whole background of my culture, my tradition of ten thousand years as a Brahmin, this, that - how am I to be free?

Comment: I do it with my mind.

Krishnamurti: No, we haven't come to it yet. First let us see the fact. Then how to be free from it, from which comes a different question - whether this is at all possible. You might say, "Well, if I'm free, what am I? I am nothing. I'm no longer an Italian, with all my culture, with all my glory, with my literature, my art. And if I'm nothing, I'm lost."

Question: Do you think it might be good, along with the examination of memory, to investigate, investigate, investigate?

Krishnamurti: Who is the investigator? Is that what you're saying?

Comment: No.

Krishnamurti: And what is the thing that is being investigated?

Question: What is the process of investigation?

Krishnamurti: We are doing it; we are doing it.

Question: It seems that would be different from the process of memory, or even the process of judgment. See what I mean?

Krishnamurti: I don't quite catch what you mean.

Comment: It's just that you mentioned before that memory is very important in thinking.

Krishnamurti: With all of us it is.

Comment: It really is. It also seems that we have this power of investigation.

Krishnamurti: Wait, wait! Do we investigate as long as we are tethered to the post of the past?

Comment: We have to determine that, upon determining the meaning of investigation.

Krishnamurti: Sir, that's why to investigate, even the greatest scientist must have freedom in his laboratory.

Comment: Right.

Krishnamurti: Otherwise he can't investigate. And also, to investigate very profoundly, he must be free from the knowledge which he has. Otherwise it stops him. Comment: That's the way Freud found out about psychoanalysis. He threw away all conditioning.

Krishnamurti: Yes, sir, but Freud probably got it from some others. That's irrelevant for the moment.

Comment: I think he throws away the past, goes beyond it, like a scientist, a chemist. He doesn't go back.

Krishnamurti: No, no! This is theoretical. I don't know what the scientist does.

Comment: He throws away the past and goes beyond it.

Krishnamurti: Ah, wait; wait. It comes to the same thing, sir. I cannot go beyond it if I am tethered to the past.

Comment: I don't see how one can get away from the past.

KRISHNAMURTI: We are going to find out. You see, you insist on blocking it by saying you cannot.

Comment: The only way I can see investigating is not to find out if there are any preconceived ideas but to live out of experience, using that as a starting point.

Krishnamurti: Experience is not a starting point. Man has had experience for the last five thousand five hundred years about war. Kill, kill, kill in the name of God, in the name of peace, in the name of love, in the name of nations, etc., etc. There is tremendous experience stored up, but experience is not a criterion.

Comment: No, it is not a criterion, but it seems that if we are going to find out what thinking is, we must start with the experience of thinking.

Krishnamurti: No, sir. Do please listen for a few minutes. Thinking is the reaction of accumulated knowledge as experience, as tradition, as the background. That's a fact. Look, sir. I ask your name and you reply immediately, don't you? There is no thinking; at least the thinking is so rapid it has become habitual.

Comment: I can refuse to give my name.

Krishnamurti: Ah, ah, ah! (Laughter) We said, sir, that thinking gives intensity and continuity to desire. Thinking breeds pleasure.

Comment: Right.

Krishnamurti: I see a woman, or whatever it is. It's a pleasure; I think about it. Pleasure gives sustenance and continuity to desire. So, pleasure is the basic principle of our life, whether in the name of God, in the name of killing, or whatever it is.

Comment: Right.

Krishnamurti: You follow, sir? All our ethics, all our virtue, all our relationships are based on pleasure. Right?

Comment: Yes.

Krishnamurti: You admit it so easily? (Laughter) Sir, to discover that is a terrific blow. It isn't just a passing word. My relationship with my wife, with my society, with my God, with my values, with my virtue, everything is based on that. I'm not being cynical but merely factual. Pleasure is what is driving me. Where there is pleasure there is pain. I'm caught in that; there is the conflict. Inherent in pleasure is pain. There is the origin of conflict.

Comment: One must see the fact.

Krishnamurti: See the fact that where there is the pursuit of pleasure in the name of the most high or in the name of the most crooked, it is still pleasure, and therefore there is pain. There is the root of conflict. That's a fact, not how am I to get out of it.

Comment: That's the way of our life.

Krishnamurti: Of course. And I say to myself, "Is there a way of living without this, without pleasure which breeds pain?" This doesn't mean that I can't look at a tree and say, "What a marvelous tree!" Unless I understand this basic principle of pleasure, in which pain is embedded, consciously or unconsciously, there is always conflict.

Question: Suppose I understand it?

Krishnamurti: Then I have to pursue. Then I have to say that I see this fact - that as long as there is the pursuit of pleasure, there is pain. As long as I am eating wrong food, there is pain. The wrong food gives me pleasure; I eat it and I pay for it later. That's the way we live, wrong food and all the rest of it.

How am I to be free of it without conflict? If I deny it, there will be a conflict because I'm caught in it. If I accept it, then that's the way we all live. Comment: We seek pleasure and we die with pain.

Krishnamurti: That's our life. So, how are we to be free of conflict? That's a tremendous question. We have to go into it very deeply. All social, moral, ethical, and religious beliefs and doctrines are based on this. We may deny it, but if we tear it open, it is that. The mind sees this factually, as I factually see this microphone. It sees it as a fact, not as a theory, not as a hopeless state. It is so; it is like that. Then the question is: Is it possible to live without conflict? This does not mean that I must suppress pleasure.

Comment: I must suppress both.

Krishnamurti: Ah, no! If you suppressed both, you'd be dead.

Comment: I don't say we must accept it.

Krishnamurti: All of us have accepted it, and we live in conflict. If a man says, "No, I don't want to live in conflict; I must find a way out, totally, completely, both consciously and unconsciously," he has to tackle this problem. How is he to be free from conflict? This means freedom from pleasure and pain. Unless this is understood, your inquiry about truth, God, has no meaning whatsoever because God may be something tremendous, not your pet gods. Proceed; how do you go beyond it?

Comment: I believe that each individual can create for himself a concept of happiness that has nothing to do with pain and pleasure.

Krishnamurti: Oh, my lady! No, madame. We said concepts were out. Comment: The individual, each individual...

Krishnamurti: No, no, no! There's no such thing as each individual.

Comment: I must think for myself.

Krishnamurti: You are not an individual. You are the result of your country, your culture, your knowledge. We like to think we are individuals. There is nothing but secondhand.

First Dialogue in Rome

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Second Dialogue in Rome

Second Dialogue in Rome

Sunday, April 3, 1966

We were talking, the other day when we met here, about being serious, what it implies, and how important it is. Only the very earnest and the very serious people, in the sense that we mean, live; the others do not. Considering the enormous complication of modern existence, perhaps outwardly it may be very simple, but inwardly it is very, very complex. We have accepted war both outwardly and inwardly as a way of life. We have never challenged it; we have never questioned it; and perhaps we dare not question it. If we do question it, we have no answers, and our mind is always seeking answers, is always trying to find a way out, a path, a system, a new method through which it can put aside all this confusion and find a different way of life. As we said the other day, man has lived, as far as human recorded history goes, for five thousand five hundred years with war; and that has been our life. We have looked to science, to religion, to priests, to various forms of Hindu escapism, to Zen.

If we are at all serious, we do not trust anyone. We have no faith in anyone, and quite rightly, too. We have no faith in the politician, in the priest, in any organized religion, nor in any book. That again is an obvious fact, except for very, very immature people. And as the world consists of 99.9 percent immature people, we are lost. Not that we are in any way superior, but that's a fact. We cannot look to any authority. It behooves us to find out for ourselves as human beings, not as individuals. We went into the fact the other day that the individual is a local entity - an Italian, a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Vietnamese, or an American, a localized entity - whereas a human being is a total being, a vast quantum of human experience, misery, conflicts, sorrow.

One has to look for oneself since there is no one else to tell what one should do or should not do, what one should think or not think. That becomes extremely difficult because one does not know if one is capable. One wants someone else to point out, and if one looks to someone else, one falls into the trap again - the trap of authority, of following, of books, of priests, and the whole circus of it. What is one to do? How is one to renew or rewrite or examine the whole process of living anew? That is the real issue that was discussed the other day, only I am putting it in different words. There is no guide, no philosopher, no friend, nothing to help us out of this dreadful mess. Either one comes to total despair, complete cynicism, as most so-called intellectual writers have done, invents marvelous philosophies of despair and sticks there; or putting everything aside, all these systems, philosophies, ideas, concepts, beliefs, organized propaganda as religion, if one is capable of doing it - and one has to do it to find out - one then comes to the problem, the central issue. One must find out whether it is possible, living in this world, not escaping from it to a monastery or to a hilltop, whether it is possible to live in this world as a total human being. This means a human being who is no longer at war with the world and within himself - there is no contradiction without or within. Contradiction breeds conflict. Where there is conflict in any form, conscious or unconscious, obviously there can't be affection, love, and all the rest of that. One can't perceive clearly if there is a distorted mind, and there is distortion as long as there is conflict.

We are saying that it is possible to live a life in which there is no conflict at all, at any time. This means denying war, outwardly and inwardly, as a means of life, as a means of living. In examining that the other day - I hope you don't mind my going over it a little bit - we said that there is contradiction as long as there are contradictory, opposing desires. We went into the question of how desire per se comes into being, not desire for something. We also went into the question of what gives potency, continuity, vitality to desire. We said that thought gives it constancy. I see something visually; out of that there is desire, contact,

pleasure; and thought, by thinking about it, gives it nourishment and continuity. Naturally, it wouldn't think about it if it didn't give pleasure. We can observe this very easily for ourselves. I like that woman; I like that house; I like that picture or that music, and I think about it. I sustain by thought the intensity of that desire.

Please, don't accept anything that the speaker is saying, because we are not setting him up as another authority, which would be dreadful. If we observe sufficiently intelligently, we can see this phenomenon going on all the time. The conflict is between the various contradictory desires, sustained by thought, and thought maintains it as long as the desire is pleasureable; otherwise, thought wouldn't even think about it. If you have had a pain, you want to forget it very quickly; if you have had a pleasure, either of a sunset or of any other form, thought gives it movement, vitality, a propulsion, drive. Thought maintains it because there is pleasure in it. Where there is pleasure, there is always pain, if you observe it. That's a fact. There is this basic contradiction in the structure of our thinking: pleasure and pain, the avoidance of pain and the pursuit of pleasure. Yet where there is the pursuit of pleasure, there is in it, inherently, pain. Hence the whole process of our living is contradictory, and therefore potential conflict. Again this is factual; it is not my imagination or your wish or not-wish; it is just a fact. We can see that our values, our ideals, our gods, our search are all based on this desire for the continuance of pleasure. If one goes into this sufficiently seriously and earnestly, one comes to this point.

There are contradictions which are inevitable, natural: man and woman, darkness and light, a dozen forms of contradiction from colors, and so on. Those variations and differences and that duality do not bring us pain. We accept them as inevitable. What gives us pain is the demand for the continuance of a pleasure. This doesn't mean that we must have no pleasure - we will go into that presently. First we must understand this basic principle.

How are we to put an end to conflict? As long as the principle exists there will be conflict. It is not a matter of agreement with me. We have to work at this with intense passion; otherwise, it becomes merely intellectual agreement and blah. We can see very well that as long as there is conflict, we can't think clearly, we can't look clearly, we can't observe in clarity. We may have no conflict superficially, consciously, but unconsciously there is a whirlpool, a world of contradiction. The more extreme the contradiction, the greater the tension, the greater will be the desire to escape, through football, amusement, church, or goodness knows what else. Hence there is a psychotic, unbalanced state, and I go to an analyst to be made normal and to return to conflict again; or if I am normal, to adjust myself to society, which is the very essence of contradiction. The whole psychoanalytical approach to this question seems to be utterly superficial, leading nowhere.

If we have really gone very deeply into this question, then what are we to do? If we have not gone that far - not verbally, not intellectually, but actually - there is no point in talking things over. It has no value at all. Unless we have done it, we might just as well gossip about someone, discuss the beauties of morning, talk about pictures and modern art, and carry on. We understand the problem very clearly, don't we? We see the importance of having a very clear mind. We might say that that is impossible - that the mind will always be conditioned, by communism, by the church, by society, or by propaganda; that it is bound to be conditioned, and therefore there is no escape from this conditioning. If we accept that, there is no question; there is no problem. All we have to do is to make the conditioning a little more clean, a little more palatable, a little more civilized, a little more decorated. But if we don't accept that, if we see the absurdity of it, then we must have a clear mind, and that clear mind can only come when there is no conflict, conscious or unconscious.

The problem then arises: How are we to come to this? How are we, seeing the basic issue that where there is pleasure there must be pain, that the pursuit of pleasure in any form is the breeding of pain and therefore of contradiction and conflict, how are we to come out of it? If such a proposition, such a question, such a challenge is put to us, how do we respond? We have to answer this; let's talk it over together. There is perpetual war outside between nations, for economic, social, ideological reasons; there is tyranny,

oppression, dogmatism, both religious and political; there is all that on one side, and there is the battle inside, the unending battle - that's our life. Tracing it, watching the flow of all the ways of man, the ways man has lived through centuries upon centuries, one comes to this essential central issue. As human beings, what do we do? How do we answer it? How do you answer it? You understand the question, the problem? Who is to end it? Is thought to end it? Is will to end it? And who is the entity that wields the power as will to end it? If we say we will live in peace by suppressing all desire, all pleasure, then we will become dead sticks. If we say we will end it through the action of the will, determination, choice, force, that in itself is violence. Any exertion of will, which is opposition, resistance, breeds conflict. It isn't an easy problem! It isn't just a slick problem that we can answer very easily and superficially.

Question: Is the logical structure of man in a position to do this?

Krishnamurti: I don't know what you mean, sir, by logical structure. Do you mean that the very brain cells have accepted the reaction through centuries of growth, development, pressure - have accepted this way of life? The brain itself - the cells have said, "There is no way out; I'll accept it." Having accepted it, yet resisting it, not wanting it, they invent ways and means to escape from it: drink, sex, multitudinous forms of escapes. Never wanting to go near this conflict, which is eating out the individual's heart and mind, he becomes a psychosomatic case. Do you understand the problem? I see the importance of living without conflict. I not only see it intellectually, but see it, not as a theory, a speculative hope, or a wish. I see it as clearly as I see that flower. That state must come into being. How am I to get it? How am I to come upon it? By exertion? By making more effort, which is the will? The very effort is a contradiction. To overcome something I have to exert, and the very exertion implies a contradiction. I see will, determination, the exercise of choice as a decisive factor. I say, "I will," and thereby create resistance; the very resistance brings contradiction, and I am again back in conflict.

Look, sir; take a very simple thing. If I smoke and want to give it up, by saying "I am determined to give it up," I have already created a conflict. I want to give it up. I force myself to give it up. The very force is strengthening the conflict. Yet I must give it up. Perhaps I give it up through fear because it affects my lungs. I may give it up, but there is this constant fear. So will - and this requires tremendous comprehension, real understanding - will is not the way to peace, to the cessation of conflict. To break through that you must have such clarity. It's like a man who has taken the wrong road and insists on going on that road; that's what we have done. We know through experience, through knowledge, through information, through everything, that the road leads nowhere; yet we keep on going in the same way. If we see that will is no way out, we must abandon it, not only with regard to this, but totally.

Comment: So I go on smoking.

Krishnamurti: All right, do it, but do it consciously. Know where it is going, what it is doing to you. Understand all the implications of being caught in a habit, being a slave to habit. If you want that, go to it. That's what we are doing anyhow. We know very well that one of the major factors that bring on war is nationalism; we realize the poison of that, and yet we keep on. We are Italians, Russians, Indians. And the mind saying that it wants to achieve a state of mind which has no conflict is already a factor which is going to breed conflict. Comment: Then there is no hope.

Krishnamurti: Ah, wait a bit, sir; I don't say that there is no hope.

Comment: The only weapon we have is will.

Krishnamurti: Ah, no; will doesn't do anything.

Question: All right, what is the alternative?

Krishnamurti: Wait, sir, wait! If you don't see that as false and give it up as false, you won't see the other.

You can't say, "Well, I'll keep to this until he proves to me the other." You can't find the other unless you give this up. I mean, you can't have one foot there and one foot here.

Comment: The word alternative is conflict.

Krishnamurti: Obviously. This is really a very, very tremendous question. We can't just banish it away in a morning. Just as a man has lived on war, competition, ambition, and greed, he also lived on will, resistance, and fighting. I must be that, and I am going to work for it. The stronger the will, the more achievement, the more success, the more revolution. That's what we live on. And if we see that will under any circumstances is not the way out, we have cleared the field, cleared the field to look somewhere else. But if we say, "Well, show me the other," we haven't cleared the field to look. We are like that man who said, "I belong to all religions because I don't know; there may be something to them all." This is really a very complex and profound thing to understand - that the action of will only produces more conflict. We can see that intellectually because we can prove it statistically, but we're not dealing with statistics. Intellectually we say, "Yes, I see that," but the intellectual perception is not action. Intellect, however clever, however bright, however sound, is not going to solve this problem. We have used will as the way of conquering, the way of going beyond the conflict. The problem in that comes also: Who is the entity that exercises will? Who is the 'me', the 'I', the thinker? When we say, "I will do this," who is the 'I'? When we deny or accept will as the way of life - as most human beings do, 99.9 percent of them - we live in conflict. But if we don't accept it as the way of life, then we have to see who it is that is exercising this will. Again we have to go back to desire.

Question: So the 'I' is desire?

Krishnamurti: Obviously. A bundle of desires, with its memories. Don't let us go into that for the moment.

Comment: But investigation also comes from having a will to see more clearly.

Krishnamurti: Ah, wait a bit! Is that so? Look at that flower. Do you exercise will to look at that flower? Please, let's begin slowly. When do you exercise will? You want to look at that tree, or something more pleasurable, and you exercise your will to cut that out and look at this.

Comment: This is a simple phenomenon.

Krishnamurti: Keep to the simple; we'll complicate it as we go along. Do you see anything when you determine to see? When you say, "I am determined to listen to what you're saying," all your energy has gone into the determination, not into the listening. This is elementary. To see anything you must have freedom, not determination. To observe there must be no hindrance. If you are not interested in observing, don't observe. Who cares?

Comment: But to see smears of cancer cells that come from lungs as a result of smoking is something of investigation. Everyone doesn't see it, naturally. You have to go to a certain place and investigate what comes from smoking.

Krishnamurti: But I have investigated, and I like smoking, and to blazes with regard to what they have investigated. I don't mind dying.

I am afraid that we are not pursuing the thing we were discussing. To observe a flower, anything, there must be freedom to look, not a determination which is sustained by a motive of pleasure, gain, or pain. I see clearly that will, conscious or unconscious, is not the way because will is really a process, a mechanism of resistance. If I resist, obviously there is no peace, no ending of conflict. This is so, outwardly. If I resist you by will, you are my enemy. I put you away. This is so clear that I don't understand the difficulty. The difficulty comes in because I don't know any other way, and without seeing the depth, the reality, the complexity involved in will, I say, "I'll hold on to that before I go to something else. It is better to have the

evil that I know of, rather than to go after something that I don't know." Anyhow, I'll go into it. Will is not the way; at least for me it is not the way. Consciously or unconsciously, I will not resist. But that doesn't mean that I do not see ugliness, beauty, evil, dirt, squalor, and all the exploitation that is going on in the world. It doesn't mean that I also yield, that I say, "Well, as I have no will, I'll do anything that anyone wants me to do." On the contrary, if what the world wants me to do is based on will, immaturity, and resistance, why should I accept? I have rejected will, which means that I have understood the entity who exercises will, which is desire and the memories of desire, memories of pleasure and of pain. That is the bundle from which will has its being.

Then what am I to do if I have no will at all? Please don't say the opposite, that you're just a leaf in the wind, driven by anyone, anything. That's not at all true, but quite the contrary. Then what happens? Now we come to really quite the most interesting part of it. I see that conflict cannot end through will. Will in itself breeds conflict. The very nature and structure of the will, to which we have become accustomed, the brain cells and all the rest of it, in their very structure breed conflict. I see very clearly that to live intensely, fully, completely, wholly, conflict is not necessary. Conflict, on the contrary, destroys. Will is gone, not verbally or theoretically, but actually - not as a hypothesis towards which I am working, which again becomes another conflict. Then what have I to do? How am I to give up without will, without fear? Smoking, sex, or anything I take as an escape gives me pleasure and becomes a habit, either pleasurable or painful. If it is painful it is easier to give it up, naturally. But a thing that gives pleasure - how am I to give it up without will, which means without time? If I say, "I'll give it up gradually," and day after day diminish the number of cigarettes I smoke, what has happened? There's a resistance all along.

Comment: You have to understand why you smoke.

Krishnamurti: We understand why we smoke. First of all, it's a habit. We did it as small boys, and now it has become constant. We know why we smoke. It gives us something to do with our hands when we are with people, and we fiddle around. It's just that everyone does it, and we do it, too. We are like a lot of monkeys, with our intense restlessness. Take drink, if you don't smoke. It's the same thing with drink, with sex, with any habit. Now please, sirs, this is very interesting. To give up smoking, sex, a particular habit of thinking, a particular way of living, a particular food, may be a very small affair, or a most complex affair. We see will is not the way out, and a gradual process is not the way out. It must be done instantly, without effort. To give up something immediately, no time is involved at all. How do we do it, sirs? I don't know why we make a mystery of it. It's very simple. There's a wasp there, a pretty large one. There it is. What takes place when we see it? There is immediate action to get away from it.

Comment: There is fear.

Krishnamurti: Please don't reduce it so quickly; just look at it; look at it. There is a wasp. You know that it stings, causes pain. There is an immediate reaction - to kill it, to run away from it, or to push it out. It is a physiological reaction; it is not an intellectual process. It may have been at the beginning, but now it is a physical reaction. There is instant movement, instant action. Your brain cells, your nerves, your whole being responds because there is a danger. If you don't respond, there's something wrong with your nerves, with your brain, with your whole nervous organism. You have to respond. So there is a state when you can respond immediately. When you see danger, physical danger, you respond instantly; the body responds before the mind enters. I once saw a tiger in the wilderness; there was immediate reaction, and that reaction is necessary. It is a healthy reaction, and it is instant. I see the habit of smoking, or sex, a particular idea or a particular concept that I have. I hold on to it. It has become a habit. I don't react as I react to the wasp. This means that I don't see the danger as I see the danger of that wasp; I don't see the danger of pleasure in smoking, in a hundred things, the danger of the pleasure of being a nationalist, a Hindu. The Hindu still has its own division, which is a Brahmin. The fact that I'm a Brahmin gives tremendous pleasure. It gives me dignity, position, a sense of identification, vitality, which leads ultimately to war. I don't see the whole

sequence of it. If I see the danger of it as clearly as I see the danger of the wasp, it is finished! I don't have to go to the analysts, and all the rest of the business. Why don't I see the danger of it? Why don't I see the danger of nationalism, racial differences, cultural differences, religious differences, ideological differences as communists, socialists, and the whole works? Why don't I see the danger of it, totally? When I see the danger of it totally, I've finished; I don't even have to think about it twice.

Please discuss with me; otherwise, I'll carry on. Why do I see the danger of the wasp and not the much more dangerous other things? They are much more dangerous because I and my children will be caught in wars. Everything will go up in smoke. Yet I keep on with my vested interests. Why don't I see the danger? To the wasp I'm sensitive, extremely sensitive; to the other I'm not sensitive. Why am I not? This brings another question: Am I sensitive at all? Am I sensitive all around, not just to the wasp? If I am sensitive to one danger, why am I not sensitive to other dangers? It means that I'm not sensitive.

Question: Does conditioning fit in here?

Krishnamurti: Yes, sir, but first let's see that we're not sensitive. I'm not sensitive. I'm sensitive to the wasp, but not to nationalism, not to ideologies, not to anything that really matters. Why?

Comment: I'm used to it; I don't see the dangers of it.

Krishnamurti: You are justifying insensitivity. First, look what has happened. I'm sensitive to the wasp, and I'm insensitive to the most dangerous things in life. I don't even pause to be aware of this fact.

Comment: We make things that are explained to us more absolute than they are.

Krishnamurti: Sir, I don't want any explanations. I'm fed up with explanations. There have been, for five thousand years, umpteen explanations. I see this thing, a fact. I'm terribly sensitive, acutely so, to a wasp, and to nothing else. That means that I am indifferent to everything except immediate pain and immediate pleasure. Oh, sirs, this is so simple! Immediate pleasure and immediate pain are my chief concerns, and so I lead a very superficial life. I am content to live that way. If I saw the danger, not only of the wasp, but ideological danger, the danger of habits, what would happen to me? I'd be thrown out of society. If I'm not a nationalist, not a religious person in the accepted sense of the word, if I don't salute the flag and all that circus that goes on around us all day long, what will happen? Unconsciously I'm very sensitive to the danger of being thrown out without a job, without anyone feeling for me or looking out for me, to the dangers of being alone. So I say, "Please, let's forget it."

Only a man who is completely alone is sensitive, but not alone in the sense of isolation. As most of us are isolating ourselves all the time, we have become insensitive. The moment we see danger in everything that society has built up, obviously we will be alone. Unconsciously there is fear of what's going to happen. When we've gone through all that, then we say, "How is it possible to end pleasure or pain psychologically?" I'm not talking of physical pain; that we can end by seeing a doctor or a dentist, if it is possible. If not, we put up with pain and get on with it; we don't make a lot of hullabaloo about it so as to become a psychological problem.

How are we to end conflict without will? If we have no will, in the sense in which we are using the term - no resistance - is there conflict? Don't agree with me; that is like two children talking together. Because I have built around me resistances - my family, my husband, my God, my society, my culture, I know more and you know less, or you know more and I want to be like you. The very resistance to life is conflict. So we have to inquire what life is. All that I know is to resist life - life being this extraordinary movement. I don't know what that movement is; it's a movement, an endless current. And all that I've learned since I'm a human being, for ten thousand years, is to build walls around myself. The very building of those walls is a resistance and therefore conflict. The explanation is simple, but to see it, to break it down, to see the resistance, to be aware of the heavily guarded resistance, strengthened through centuries, that means

instant action.

You have a resistance naturally because you have an image. You have an image of what you should be, or of what you are; and you have an image about life, which is the other. You have an image about me, and I have an image about you. I haven't actually because I don't make it, but you probably have an image about me. And there's the husband and the wife; they have images between them. The husband has an image about the wife, and the wife has an image about the husband. The two images have relationships, and nothing else. The human beings have no relationship, but the images have relationship, the images that have been created through resistance, through pleasure, and all the rest of it. Each of them says, "I love you; it's my family," and so on.

Comment: We don't want to look.

Krishnamurti: We don't know what life is, and we have built a resistance to life. That's all we know - a resistance based on pleasure and pain. I say to myself, "By Jove, all my life I have done this; how can I drop it instantly, not gradually?" There is in the Hindu mind this whole concept of gradually evolving, and dropping it next life, or ten lives later, but life is too short. Then there is the whole Christian-world idea of original sin, with someone else to save you from it. This is the same thing put in different words.

If the picture, the map over which we have traveled, is very clear, then what is life? Not an ideological life, not a thing of saying, "Life is marvelous, lovely, beautiful, ecstatic; it should be, it should not be" - I don't know anything about all that. I do know what my life is. My world is the world of my wife, my children, my neighbor, my job; and that's all I know. With my image of my boss, the boss having an image of me; my image of my wife, and she having an image about me - we live in an imaginary world.

So, what is my life, actually, day to day, as it is, not as it should be? It's misery, conflict, ambition, and greed; wanting good opinions from others, wanting to be popular. I am an entity who is the result of ten thousand years of propaganda. That's a fact. Critics tell me how lovely a picture is and I say, "What a lovely picture that is!" They tell me that I must read a certain book, that I must see this and that. I am that. For my pleasure, sex, vanity, position, and prestige I'm willing to suffer to maintain this horror. I'm not depicting something which is abnormal; this is our normal state. I look at my life as it is, not ideologically, not critically, not saying, "How terrible!" I see it is that. As I see the bloom of that flower, I see that my life is like that, without any equivocation. I don't want to improve it or change it, because that's my life; and no one is going to save me from it. We have gone through all those tricks, hundreds of times. Seeing that, can I drop it immediately? Can I drop the whole structure immediately? The authorities say, "Meditate; have a mind that is very peaceful; before you can tackle this, have a peaceful mind." How can I have a peaceful mind when I'm eaten up with ambition, greed, envy, fear, and all the rest of it?

As we cannot change this - and apparently we cannot - we invent gods, your God and my God, your savior and my savior, as a complete escape from the fact. I have a twisted mind and therefore my God will always be twisted, obviously. If it isn't God, it is the state, the communist state; if it isn't the state, it's social reform; if it isn't social reform, it is doing good, writing books, painting, and music. Unless we change this completely, we cannot go any further; and to go any further is merely escape. This cannot be changed eventually, slowly. It must change instantly, or not at all. This is logic, isn't it - sane, healthy logic? But logic isn't going to do a thing, so what am I to do? I have to learn something else. Having put the picture in front of myself, I say to myself, "What am I to do?" I know the picture very well. I've lived with it for fifty years, for sixty, eighty, ninety, ten thousand years; I know it very well. Now, what am I to do? First, I'm not going to escape - through music, through sex, through church, through religion, through literature, through anything - I'm not going to escape because escape creates more conflict.

Question: At this point may I ask a question?

Krishnamurti: At any point, madame.

Question: If we consider ourselves free. . . .

Krishnamurti: Ah, free?

Question: Or say, if we consider that we are really experiencing this, seeing the flower, seeing. . . .

Krishnamurti: We can't "consider" it. Either it is a fact or. . . .

Question: But just for saying. . . .

Krishnamurti: Ah, no; don't say it then; not for saying's sake.

Question: But couldn't this state exist for some people some of the time?

Krishnamurti: It's like my saying that I'm happy once a year. I'm free once a year. The rest of the time I live in prison! What's the point of being free once a year? I see the picture; now I have to look. I have to find a different way of looking, thinking, feeling, living - a totally different way. I know the old way, and I won't touch it because the old way keeps me everlastingly in the same cage, running like a squirrel, up and down, up and down. I have to find a way of coming, a way of looking, a way of learning, a way of listening. I have to find a different way altogether.

First I must learn to look - look at that flower, and look at myself. I can't look at that flower if there is any interference of thought or of feeling. If I want to look at you, if I want to understand you, I can't have prejudices about you. I can't have an image about you. In that case the image is looking at your image. You might have insulted me; you might have flattered me; you might have been jealous of me; you might have been kind - all that prevents my looking. I have to learn to look. Ah, no; it's not easy, because looking means having a fresh mind, a fresh eye, a fresh ear each time; otherwise, I can't look. I have to find out what it means to learn. I know what it means to accumulate knowledge, but that's not learning. Please, sirs, this has to be discussed. Don't listen to me all morning. Learning is one of the most extraordinarily interesting things.

Question: Can we learn through discipline?

Krishnamurti: Discipline means resistance.

Comment: It's not in that way.

Krishnamurti: If you have listened this morning to what is being said, the very act of listening is disciplining. You don't have to discipline yourself to listen. It is very simple. Look at that flower. If you want to look at it, you will have to look without thought, without feeling - just look. That's fairly easy, but to look that way implies discipline. You don't have to discipline yourself to look: first discipline, and then look. Then it's finished.

Question: How about after you look?

Krishnamurti: When one looks, what happens? Do you look at that flower, or do you look at the image of that flower? Look at it, please. Experiment with yourself. Look at any flower. First begin with simple things. Can you look at the flower without any interpretation, without any condemnation, acceptance, or denial - just look? If you can do that, can you look at yourself? In any incident, can you look at the feeling that comes up, just looking, without accepting, without denying, without condemning, without justifying - just observing? To do that, in itself is discipline. You don't have to discipline before or after.

Question: Does that flower exist? Maybe it doesn't really exist.

Krishnamurti: It exists, even though you don't look at it. Does your looking at it make it live? Leave that for the moment. You can turn your back on it. You may not see it, but it's there. We won't go into that now. That is a question that we will have to go into at another time. Please, look. Can I look at my husband without the image? Can I look at my wife without the image which I have built about her: pleasure, pain, hurts, flattery, nagging, the whole relationship of man and woman? To look I have to be free of the image; otherwise, I can't look. I don't know what my wife is, or what my husband is. I only know the image which both of us have.

Comment: That's what we invent, the image.

Krishnamurti: Yes, of course.

Comment: When we look with an idea, we see only that.

Krishnamurti: That's all. But if I can look at that flower without the image, I can also look at my wife, at my husband in that way. This doesn't mean that I'm cold, brutal, hard, and all the rest of the business. I look, and then I begin to learn. Don't accept this just because I am saying it. This is most difficult to comprehend.

Comment: I think that to learn I have to use my will power.

Krishnamurti: Ah, no, no! We must understand what we mean by learning. What do we mean by learning? Learning is always in the active present, not having learned or will learn. Learning can only take place in the active moment when we are learning. Having learned, we apply, we act. Having stored up knowledge, having learned, we act. That's not learning. That's what the machines are doing. The electronic brains have learned and give you information from what they have learned; therefore, they are not learning. The human mind can learn.

Comment: Maybe another word would be "experiencing."

Krishnamurti: No.

Question: Identifying?

Krishnamurti: No. Why do you want to translate it into another word and keep on repeating? The moment you say "experience," "identification," you have to inquire into what experience and identification mean.

Comment: Experiencing.

Krishnamurti: Why should you experience? Who is the entity that is experiencing? And also, why should you identify? Why should I identify myself with my wife, with my husband, with my nation?

Question: Can you say, "I hate to do this, but I am being open to whatever the other wishes"?

Krishnamurti: Please let's keep to the word learning; it's simpler. Unless each word is examined very carefully, it will lead us nowhere. I want to learn. What does it mean? I have to learn about life totally differently.

Second Dialogue in Rome

Sunday, April 3, 1966

Third Dialogue in Rome

Third Dialogue in Rome

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Discussion should be an exchange of thought, talking things over together rather than a continuous talk by a speaker. If we could talk things over together, during or after what I have to say, it might be more beneficial and bring greater clarification.

We were saying the other day that pleasure is the very root of our outlook on life, and with it invariably goes pain. Our whole structure, both outwardly and inwardly, is based on conflict. A mind in conflict is a distorted mind, and man has lived for centuries upon centuries in that way. We must obviously bring about a complete revolution, not only outwardly, but also inwardly. The inward revolution is of primary importance because from there a new society can be born, can be brought into being. We must observe and understand the whole structure of society, and therefore ourselves, quite differently. We were also talking about learning and what is meant by that word.

Perhaps we may be able to come upon it from a different point altogether. Man has not been able to free himself from fear. Not being able to understand it, he has built a network of escapes and has never been able to resolve this question of fear. Perhaps we can discuss it and go into it deeply. I can talk about it, but the word is not the thing; the word is never the actuality; the symbol is never the fact, the reality. We must brush aside the word, though realizing its importance, and go behind the word. If we can do that, it may open a door which will help us to put an end to fear.

Most of us are afraid, and we have to learn about it, not resist it, not avoid it, not try to find formulas which will give us comfort, but actually resolve it completely and totally, consciously as well as unconsciously. To do that, we must be able to communicate with each other, and our communication naturally is verbal. Unless we talk it over and not merely listen negatively or attentively, it doesn't lead us very far.

You can see historically that man has in every way avoided this question of fear. It is fear that creates gods, religious institutions, the priests, the various ceremonies, and the whole circus of religion. Not being able to resolve or understand or go above and beyond fear, naturally man has developed a psychological and unconscious resistance. There is the enormous fear of death, which will be discussed a little later. The so-called religious people have invented marvelous theories, hopes, ideas, concepts. Those who, temperamentally or conditionally, are not at all inclined towards religion say, "This is the end of it; one life is good enough; let's go on and make the best of it"; but there is still the fear of death, and also the fear of actual living, the fear of facing life as it actually is and, having faced it, going beyond that. There are innumerable fears, from the most childish to the most complex, conscious as well as unconscious. The conscious ones you can deal with fairly well. For example, who cares about public opinion, what the public says? If you live in a big city, it doesn't very much matter. If you are living in a small village, then it does count a great deal what your neighbor thinks of you. There is the fear of not being able to fulfill, not being able to achieve what you want, not being successful. You know the various types of fear.

Mere resistance to fear is not an end to fear. Verbally, intellectually, you may be clever enough to rationalize fear and build a wall against it; yet behind that wall there is this constant gnawing of fear. Unless you are free from fear, you can't think, feel, or live properly. You are living in darkness. Religions have cultivated that fear through hell and all that business. There is the fear of the state and its tyranny. You must think of

the public, the state, the dictators, the people who know what is good for you, the Big Brother and the Big Father. Is it possible to actually be totally free of fear? If you can discuss it, you can learn about it. If you say, "I can't get rid of it; what am I to do?" there is no problem. Someone will tell you what to do, but you will always be dependent on that person, and you will enter another field of fear.

We can't see very clearly as long as there is any form of fear, both the fears that have been built through thought, through imagination, through experience, through various forms of memory, and also those which come from bodily pain, of which many people are afraid, which interfere with the mind thinking and bring about psychosomatic fear. Unless we are completely free of fear, obviously we can't see anything clearly. Where there is fear, there can't be affection; there can't be sympathy; there can't be generosity; there can't be a sense of love. To be free from fear is a human necessity, as much as food, as much as shelter. Is it possible? When we put that question of the possibility, we put it not as an intellectual problem to be answered by an intellectual concept or by argument, but rather to learn about it. If we can learn about it and know the whole structure of it, then we are not afraid. We should be able to talk this over. If I sit here talking and you listen, that doesn't lead us anywhere. We must go into it together.

Obviously the word is not the fact, but the word creates the fear. The word revolution creates fear. The word, if you are conditioned as a Catholic, or as a member of some other sect, has tremendous meaning; the word stimulates memory, which is associated with certain conditioning, and that reacts. When you see a snake or a wild animal, the immediate reaction is fear - which is a natural self-protective response which must be there, but need there be a psychological response to a word? The word death immediately awakens a whole series of associated memories, false ideas, and the fear of it. The word is not the fact, but the word creates the fear.

Comment: The awareness of our danger and therefore fear might present a certain problem.

Krishnamurti: No, it is a healthy response; otherwise, you'd be killed. When you come to a precipice, and you just are not afraid or don't pay attention, you are in great danger; but that fear, the bodily fear, creates a psychological fear too. It is a very complex problem; it isn't just a matter of saying, "I have fear about something or other, and let me wipe it out." In order to understand it you must first be very clear about words; you must realize that the word is not the fact of fear, but the word engenders fear - unconsciously the whole structure is verbal. The word culture brings a deep response from memory - Italian culture, European culture, Hindu culture, Japanese culture, Chinese culture. It is very interesting to go into it. The unconscious is made up of memories, of experiences, traditions, propaganda, all words. You have an experience, and you react. That reaction is translated into words: "I was happy, I was unhappy, he hurt me," and those words remain. They awaken and strengthen the daily experience.

You have insulted me; it has left a mark, and that mark is strengthened, deepened by the word, by the memory associated with that feeling, which is really a word, a tradition. It is important to understand this. In certain countries in Asia, in India, among certain groups of people, tradition is immense, much stronger than here because they have lived longer; they are an old country, much more deep-rooted, with a tradition of ten thousand years and more. The word brings up memories and associations, which are all part of the unconscious, and it also brings about fear.

Take the word cancer. You hear the word and immediately all the ideas and the thoughts about cancer come rushing in - the pain, the agony, the suffering, and the question, "Do I have cancer?" The word is extraordinarily important to us. The word, the sentence, when organized becomes an idea based on a formula, and that holds us.

The word is not the fact; the word microphone is not the microphone, but the word brings fear or pleasure into being through association and remembrance. We are slaves to words and to examine anything fully, to look, we must be free of the word. If I'm a Hindu and a Brahmin, a Catholic, a Protestant, an Anglican, or a

Presbyterian, to look I have to be free of that word with all its associations, and that's extraordinarily difficult. The difficulty disappears when we are passionately inquiring, examining.

The unconscious is stored-up memory; the unconscious, through a word, becomes alive. Through a smell, or through seeing a flower, you associate immediately. The storehouse, the stored-up, is the unconscious, and we make a tremendous lot of ado about it. It is really nothing at all. It is as trivial and superficial as the conscious mind. Both can be healthy, and both can be unhealthy.

The word brings on fear, and the word is not the fact. What is fear? What am I afraid of? Please, we're discussing. Take your own fear. It may be fear of your wife, of losing your job or your fame.

Comment: Yes, yes!

Krishnamurti: Please, you must discuss with me; it's no good saying, "Yes, yes."

What is fear? Let us take a problem like death for the moment. It is a very complex problem. I am afraid of death. How does this fear arise? Obviously it arises through thought. I have seen people die. I also may die, painfully or quietly, and thinking has brought on this fear.

Comment: One of the strongest fears is the fear of the unknown.

Krishnamurti: It is the unknown. I'm taking that as an example. Substitute your own fear - fear of your husband, of your wife, of your neighbor, fear of ill-health, of not being able to fulfill, fear of not loving, of not having enough love, of not having intelligence.

Comment: Surely in some cases it's justified. Take, for instance, if a man is afraid of his wife.

Krishnamurti: All right; he is married and is afraid of his wife.

Comment: Or he's afraid of his boss, or afraid he may lose his job.

Krishnamurti: Wait, sir; why should he be afraid? We are discussing fear, not of the job, of the boss, of the wife. Fear exists always in relation to something; it doesn't exist abstractly. I'm afraid of my boss, my wife, my neighbor, of death. It is in relation to something. I took death as an example. I'm afraid of it. Why? What brings on this fear? Obviously it is thought. Visually I have seen death, people dying. Associated with that, identified with that is the fact that I, myself, will die one of these days. Thought thinks about it; there is a thinking about it. Death is something unavoidable, and something to be pushed as far away as possible. I can't push it far away except with thought. I have a distance, so many years allotted to me. When it comes time for me to go, I'll go; but in the meantime I've kept it away. Thought - through association, through identification, through memory, through the religious or the social environment, through economic conditioning - rationalizes it, accepts it, or invents a hereafter. Can I come into contact with a fact? I'm afraid of my wife. That will be much simpler. She dominates me. I can give a dozen reasons for my fear of her. I see how fear arises. How am I to be free of it? I can ask her; I can walk out, but that doesn't solve the problem. How am I to be free of that fear? Look at it; I am afraid of my wife. She has an image about me, and I have an image about her. There is no actual relationship, except perhaps physically. Otherwise it is purely a relationship between the images. I'm not being cynical, but this is a fact, isn't it? Perhaps those of you who are married know better than I do.

Question: Will she have a picture of you being weak, and will you have a picture of her being tough?

Krishnamurti: Tough and strong. You have dozen of reasons, sir, but there is no actual relationship at all. To be related means to be in contact. How can one image be related to another image? An image is an idea, a memory, a recollection, a remembrance. If I really want to be free of fear, I have to destroy my image about her, and she has to destroy her image about me. I may destroy mine, or she may destroy hers, but one-sided

action doesn't bring about freedom from the relationship which awakens fear. I break my image about you, totally. I look at it, and then I understand what relationship is. I break the image completely. Then I am directly in contact with you, not with your image. But you may not have broken your image because it gives you pleasure.

Comment: That's the rub; I haven't broken my image.

Krishnamurti: So you keep on, and I say, "All right; I have no image of you." I'm not afraid of you. Fear ceases only when there is direct contact. If I have no escapes at any level, I can look at the fact. I can look at the fact that I am going to die in ten years or in twenty years. I have to understand death; I can't come into contact with it physically, organically, because I'm still alive. I have plenty of energy; I'm still active, healthy. Bodily I can't die, but psychologically I can die.

This requires tremendous observation, going into, working. To die means that you have to die every day, not just twenty years from now. You die every day to everything that you know, except technologically. You die to the image of your wife; you die every day to the pleasures you have, to the pains, the memories, the experiences. Otherwise you can't come into contact with them. If you do die to them all, fear comes to an end and there is a renewal.

Question: Is all consciousness, unconscious and conscious, conditioned?

Krishnamurti: It is conditioned in the sense that it is the result of the past acting through the present and creating a future - and all that within a pattern, the pattern of time. Is it possible to totally uncondition it, to be totally free of the past? This means that you must understand time.

Comment: Suppose my wife dominates me?

Krishnamurti: No, no! Don't suppose. Then you're merely entering theory. You can speculate until doomsday. Man has been speculating for ages as to whether there is or is not a God.

Question: Can I end my fear of my wife?

Krishnamurti: Of course you can, and not only of her. Sir, if you and I are in conflict, you have an image about me and I have an image about you. If you can, you split your image about me; you break it. You have no conflict. You're meeting me every day factually without the reaction of your memory about me. That is dying to your memories each day.

Comment: Yes, but since my wife hasn't broken her image, she still tries to dominate me.

Krishnamurti: Of course. So you tell her, "Look, you can't dominate me; that game is over; I'm not afraid. If you want me to go and sweep the floor, I will, but psychologically your domination has come to an end." That's very difficult because with a woman and a man it's a relationship not only of pleasure, sexually and all the rest of it, but also for economic reasons. She keeps the house, takes care of the children and many other things. I become dependent, not only physically, but also psychologically, because I have identified myself with my family. If I break the image, the family is not important.

Comment: Then you become psychologically independent.

Krishnamurti: Psychologically you're free, and therefore there is no fear. The word is the response of memory. The thought is the word. You can't think without words, without an image, without a symbol. So thought breeds fear. Like the word communist, or a dozen others.

Comment: Like the word earthquake.

Krishnamurti: If there's an earthquake, there's an earthquake. I face it. But there is this whole mechanism. I

see that there is no end to fear as long as time exists between the fact and me, as long as there is the division created by thought between the fact and the observer.

There is the fear of death. I take that as an example. I know I'll die, but thought has pushed it far away in the distance. Whether it comes tomorrow or in ten years, it's the same. Thought creates the time interval. If there is no thinking in regard to death, there is no time at all. It is a fact. That means that I have to learn, understand, observe, listen to the fact, whatever it is - the fact that I'm afraid of death, of my wife, of losing my job, of my wife not loving me, of darkness, and of all the things of which I'm afraid. I never come in contact with the fact because thought again has created this division between the observer and the observed. There is an interval of space between them. I am afraid; fear is something outside of me and I resist it. I am going to overcome it or escape from it. There is this division between the fact and the observer. The moment I say, "I am going to overcome fear," which means resist fear, I need time. Thought has created time, and thought has created fear; they are interrelated. The questions then arise: What is thought; what is time; and is it possible to look without thought? This doesn't mean that I become vague, abstract, woolly, blank, and all that silly stuff; but I look actively, passionately, fully, without thought, and therefore without the observer and the observed.

I'm afraid of being ill. I have known illness; I know all the unpleasantness of it; the memories are stored up in my unconscious. They are there. Each time I get some pain, I'm stirred by the fact, by something which I have remembered. The entity that remembers separates himself from the fact of remembrance and says, "I am going to be ill." Thought remembers the past illness; the thinker says, "By Jove, I'm going to be ill again; be careful," because he has had memories of it. He is afraid, and he keeps this battle going on because of fear. But this is all right. Let it come; I'll meet it, which means dying to the past. It's fairly easy to put away the pain, but to put away pleasure also is more difficult. I have to learn about it. It's not a case of my having learned and then I approach the fact. Then of course we would be back again in the same old position. Learning is a constant moving, a movement.

Can I observe the fear that I have, whatever it is, and come directly in contact with it, not identifying myself with it? That's another trick of thought, but actually I can only come into contact directly with the fact, any fact, as long as thought with its memories doesn't divide the observer and the observed.

Krishnamurti: Yes, perceive, if you like to put it that way. You must be very careful here because the word perceive, if you analyze it. . . .

Comment: If you don't stop analyzing. . .

Krishnamurti: You have analyzed it, but the analysis hasn't brought you to the fact. What brings you to face the fact is the act of listening. You say, "By Jove, I understand now what creates fear: thought" - which doesn't mean that you become thoughtless.

Question: Analysis uses thought and memory, doesn't it?

Krishnamurti: Of course. Why should we analyze? When we are faced with physical danger, we don't analyze; we act. It is only when we do not face danger directly that we have the time to analyze, play around, get unhealthy, go to the analyst, and play all the tricks.

Comment: If you're faced with a situation, experience will help you. The memory of the previous experience being unpleasant, it may help you to avoid the next one.

Krishnamurti: It may help you to avoid, but it will not help you to learn. I've had an experience about you. You've insulted me, flattered me, or whatever it is. I have that in my memory. The next time I meet you, that memory responds.

Comment: You avoid me.

Krishnamurti: Wait; you might have changed.

Comment: Perceiving without an end to it.

Comment: Yes.

Krishnamurti: I can't say that you have not changed. I can only say that yesterday at such and such a time you insulted me. When I meet you the next day, in that interval you may have changed completely, or you may not. But I must meet you, and I can't meet you if I have my memory of your insult. Therefore I can never say to another, "I know you." I can never say that I know the Germans, the Russians, my wife, or my husband. It's absurd. I can only say that I know a person as he was at the time the incident happened. In the interval he may have changed, and I may have changed.

Question: Instead of the example that you are using, let's take the position of a debtor and a creditor. It's not just once. If you are the debtor, each time that you encounter the creditor, he is going to remind you, and that creates unpleasantness. You know that he was a friend when he lent you the money, but circumstances change, and now every day he reminds you, which is an unpleasantness. Is the thing to do to avoid him?

Krishnamurti: You can say, "Sorry, I can't pay you." The moment you say, "Avoid him," you have the beginning of fear.

Comment: Right.

Krishnamurti: You don't want to have fear, at any cost.

Question: At the expense of the unpleasantness each time?

Krishnamurti: At any time. If you can't pay, you have to find out why you can't pay. You'll try to pay. If you are double-crossing him, there's no end to it. The question is really whether it is possible to be free of fear, completely. Meet life as it arises, not with fear and not with all the structures which you have built within yourself, which are your image.

Comment: Then the thing to do is to forget your experiences.

Krishnamurti: No, sir. Wait a minute. What is experience? I can't forget my experience of living in a certain house. If I forget, each time I go out I am lost. I don't know where I am. I can't be in a state of amnesia. I must know where I live. I must know my name. I must have my passport and my technological knowledge, but what do we mean by experience, apart from all that? What value has experience? Man has lived for over two million years, and he has battled. There have been wars, wars, wars, and he is still going on. What has it taught him? Nothing!

Comment: He has improved at it.

Krishnamurti: It used to cost twenty-five cents to kill a Roman soldier; now it costs thirty thousand dollars to kill a soldier. It's too absurd. Has experience any value, psychologically?

Comment: None at all.

Krishnamurti: That means that I live in a state where experience has no value at all, that I am a light to myself, completely. If I had no experience, psychologically, I would go to sleep. If you didn't push me, if you didn't kill me, if you didn't challenge me, I'd soon fall asleep psychologically. This takes place all the time. When I am completely secure psychologically, something takes place to disturb that state. To keep me awake, I depend on challenge and response, on experience. Otherwise I would soon go off to sleep,

comfortably, within the wall which I have built around myself. It is very difficult to break down such a wall because that wall is built of ideas, and to break an idea is much more difficult than to break anything else. I depend on experience to keep me awake. If I see the absurdity of being awake through a drug, through an experience, through something, I have to be awake outside of experience.

Comment: I must experience without reference to memory.

Krishnamurti: Wait, wait! I needn't. Why shouldn't I have memory? The electronic brains have memories, banks of memories. Through association they give responses, and we function in the same way. The memory that we have built up is a form of resistance against society, against everyone.

There is the obvious physical danger against which there must be protection; I protect myself. When I see a precipice, a bus coming towards me, or a snake, there is a normal, healthy response. If I'm not very careful, that is translated into a psychosomatic affair. What we are talking about is a psychological fear. I have to learn anew about this fear. I must come directly into contact with it and find out if there is such a thing as fear.

Suppose I have lied. I say, "All right; why should I be afraid of it? It's a fact and I know; the next time I might lie or I might not." But I don't want you to discover that I have lied. Therefore I am afraid of you. I avoid you. The fact is that there is fear, and it cannot be proved that it is possible to be totally free psychologically from any fear. I don't want to prove it to anyone. We are all so eager to prove that we are free from fear. It is possible to be free if we can go at it with tremendous alertness, and that very alertness is a process of disciplining.

Life disciplines you - life being society. You have to get up at a certain time to go to the office. Society disciplines you brutally, makes you conform, and you accept such brutality, such discipline. There is constant imitation, constant standardization, constant forcing yourself to conform, to adjust, to comply, to obey. To see all that is discipline. To look at a flower, to actually look and not have thought between you and the flower is an intense discipline, nonconforming.

Comment: It means to look at it without naming it.

Krishnamurti: Naming, thought, and all that.

Comment: It is difficult to look at a thing without naming it.

Krishnamurti: Yes, sir. It is very difficult to see that flower near you and look at it without naming it.

Comment: Without knowing it is a flower.

Krishnamurti: Ah, no. You see, you have already stipulated what it is. Your thought has already interfered. Sir, please try; sit near a tree and look at it. Look at the tree, without naming, without thought. Not that you're asleep, not that you become blank; you are intensely aware, but without verbalization.

Comment: Without saying to yourself, "That's a tree."

Krishnamurti: Of course. Comment: Without thinking.

Krishnamurti: Yes. Then you will find out whether there is an observer and the observed. As long as there is an observer, there is the thinker.

Comment: Yes.

Krishnamurti: The thinker with his thoughts, and therefore you never come into contact with the tree.

Comment: Only the observed remains.

Krishnamurti: Of course. It is fairly easy with a tree, a flower, something objective. It is much more difficult to look at yourself inwardly, or to look at your wife, without all the responses. Learning implies a movement in which there is no accumulation, which becomes knowledge, and from which you act. Learn as you are moving, doing. You have to be tremendously alive, alert, to learn. What you have learned becomes an experience, but learning is not an experience; it is a movement.

That brings up the problem of what is new. Is there anything new? Man has been seeking in different ways, according to his culture and his conditioning, according to his tendency. He has given different names at different times to "God." He has done that for millions of years, believing or denying, but without knowing. If you want to find out, you can learn. You have to discover everything man has said about God. This doesn't mean that you become an atheist or a theist. You say, "This is all out; I want to find out." You must be completely free - free from fear, free from what people have said, free from knowledge. Whether you believe in God or not, it is all the same - who cares? You are conditioned one way, and the communists are conditioned the other way. To both the believer and the nonbeliever, God is dead. The word has no meaning.

We were saying the other day that freedom is essential, psychological freedom, not freedom from anything. Where there is freedom there is peace. The two must exist; otherwise, there will be disorder. Unless freedom and peace exist, unless that really is a fact - not an idea, a theory, a hope, a utopia - mind cannot go any further. It can go sideways; it can go any other way, but it can't go straight.

Question: When you speak of conditioning, do you refer only to outside conditioning, or do we already have some conditioning when we are born?

Krishnamurti: Obviously.

Comment: The conditioning we are given when we come into the world is a religion, a nationality, and social surroundings.

Krishnamurti: Yes, and a family environment.

Comment: That comes afterwards.

Krishnamurti: The authorities say that it is already there prenatally; it is already in the germ; the genes are already conditioned.

Comment: We are already partly conditioned.

Krishnamurti: Partly, but whether we are conditioned from the beginning, or whether we are conditioned as we go along, the fact is that we are conditioned now.

Comment: Yes.

Krishnamurti: Is it possible to be free? Otherwise, for ever and ever we are but slaves, although we can decorate the prison more and more. If we really want to be free, we have to be tremendously active about it and not just theorize. This brings in the whole problem of time. Does it take time to uncondition, or is it a matter of instant perception?

Comment: If it takes time, it is not deconditioning.

Krishnamurti: If it takes time to uncondition myself, there is an interval between now and then. In that interval there are a great many incidents, accidents, strains, stresses which are going to alter the fact. It is like a man who is violent and angry trying to be nonviolent, trying to reach a lovely, Utopian, nonviolent, idealistic state. He is violent, and at a distance is the nonviolence. To achieve nonviolence, he allows himself time. In the meantime he is sowing violence. We must see the violence, and not through an ideal, not

through comparison.

We function in a habitual way. We have been taught to live with fear, to comply, to resist, to escape. Society has conditioned us; we have conditioned society; we have made society; we are caught in that. Unless we are tremendously aware of this fact, we keep on going round and round in circles.

Third Dialogue in Rome

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Fourth Dialogue in Rome

Fourth Dialogue in Rome

Sunday, April 10, 1966

We are not here discussing as children. We are trying to talk over together the serious problems in our lives. The last few times that we met here we said that it is absolutely necessary that there should be a radical revolution psychologically in consciousness itself. We said that as long as there is conflict of any kind - conscious or unconscious, at any level, whether we are aware of it or not - the mind, which is the totality of our being, cannot function clearly, harmoniously, cannot see without distortion what actually is. This conflict exists because man has always sought pleasure in which there is psychological security, pleasure of many different kinds - moral, ethical, spiritual, economic. Where there is pleasure there is inevitably pain, and a conflict between pleasure and pain. What gives sustenance to pleasure is desire, and desire is strengthened by thought. Intellectual argumentation, intellectual verbal exchange and theories have no value at all. All the theologians and the priests throughout the world have indulged in endless theories about God, about how to live and what to do, but that has not brought about a fundamental, radical revolution in man.

The last time we met we were talking about fear, and how man has lived for centuries upon centuries with fear, outwardly, and especially inwardly. Having this unresolved, deep-rooted fear, he has built a network of escapes - gods, priests, religions, amusements of every form - in order to escape from it. We went into whether it is possible to radically eradicate fear. If we live with fear, however trivial or however deep it may be, we always have a dual hypocritical activity in life. A mind that is afraid lives in darkness and strain. It is therefore necessary to be completely free from fear.

Question: Could we speak about clarity in observation? Could we go into it first regarding oneself in conflict with another?

Krishnamurti: If we go into this question theoretically, intellectually, verbally, superficially, it will lead us nowhere. If we are merely discussing a different formula from that which we already have, again that will not lead us anywhere. We can invent innumerable formulas, concepts of what God is and what He is not. The modern theologians are trying to do this because they see that the whole concept of God has to be changed completely. They are still dealing with concepts, and a stupid concept is as good as a clever one. It is still a concept. Let us be clear about what we are discussing. This demands clarity. This demands the perception and rejection of theories, concepts, formulas, beliefs, and dogmas. That demands enormous, intelligent awareness into ourselves. Otherwise we indulge in superficial, intellectual, verbal explanations and dialectical exchange, all of which are of no value.

Ever since man has been, he has been seeking the extraordinary thing which he calls God. He has given it different names. Life is so superficial, so meaningless, so boring - earning a livelihood for forty years, breeding a lot of children, having a family; he says, "Is that all?" Caught in that routine, he has to invent something. In the most ancient Hindu thought, there was no concept of God at all. There was just direct communication with nature. God got more and more important as people got further and further away from nature, from feeling, from direct communication. That was of course utilized by clever people, who became priests, to interpret reality. The whole game of exploitation and vested interest of priests came into being. This is what has happened historically throughout the ages. To examine the question, "Is there such a thing as God?" one must be free of dogmas, beliefs, theories, and concepts; otherwise, one's conditioned thinking

will determine the direction in which one is going to think and feel.

If one wants to discover what that reality is, there must be complete freedom from the conditioning which man lives in, which is propaganda. Every day, from childhood, one is told what God is, what He is not, how to find Him through the Savior, through the priest, through rituals. Unless one can really, seriously be aware of one's conditioning and throw it off, not eventually, but immediately, there is no way out. As far as one understands, there has always been this idea that God is outside and God is within. I don't personally like to use the word God because it is so heavily burdened. One must find out whether there is such a thing, such a truth, whether there is a reality, a something which is unimaginable, unthinkable, unconditioned. How do we find out? That's the question, isn't it? The only instrument we have is the brain, thought. Let's talk it over together as two friends who are investigating something, not just one man talking, and you all listening. That really leads us nowhere.

Comment: There must be complete freedom from dogmas in order to reach this unimaginable thing.

Krishnamurti: We must investigate what freedom is, what there is to be free from, who the seeker is and what there is to be sought. Is freedom merely a reaction? If I'm in prison, I want to be free. That's a reaction. I'm always contrasting freedom and slavery. The opposite of slavery is not freedom. If freedom is the opposite of slavery, then it still contains slavery. If freedom is a reaction, if it contains that which has been, it is not freedom at all.

Is there any other kind of freedom? Is there freedom which is not a reaction? There can be if one is aware of the process of reaction. Freedom is not from something; freedom is per se, in itself. If I am bound by certain family ties and break away from them, it is a reaction. That reaction will make me act again, will produce a new standard from which I will again try to escape. Freedom also is not the result of time. Freedom is something immediate. I cannot say to myself, "I will be free day after tomorrow"; because if it is a gradual achievement, if freedom is at a distance, something to be achieved, there is a time interval between the present and 'what should be'. In that time interval there are all kinds of strains and pressures, and there is never complete freedom. If I am frightened, if I am caught and want to be free, the wanting to be free is an activity of the will, and therefore is not freedom.

How does this freedom which is not a reaction come about? It cannot be the result of desire, of will; it cannot be an aim which I must achieve, an ideological goal which I must pursue. When there is an awareness of this process of reaction from what is to 'what should be', then there is freedom.

Awareness implies observation without criticism, without evaluation, without justification, without condemnation. To be aware of that plant, those flowers, without identifying the species by name, just to observe without your information or your knowledge, which is thought, coming into it is extraordinarily difficult. The thought which observes has an image of that flower identified with the name; therefore, the image is looking. That's fairly easy because it's outside, objective. It is much more difficult to observe inwardly. If you are aware of what is, a desire to change the fact into 'what should be' is a denial of the fact. The moment you say, "This should be that," this is denied. If I say to a boy, "You must be like your uncle, who is so clever," I have denied the boy. When I compare the boy with someone who is very clever, I have denied the integrity of the boy.

If you are aware of what is, without condemning, without justifying, without any choice - just watching inwardly as it takes place - there is something else, which has nothing to do with voluntary, spontaneous will. Because you have understood what is, you are free of it and there is this other thing.

That brings in a tremendous problem of what beauty is. The quality of beauty has to be understood, not intellectually but nonverbally. We only know beauty through comparison, or through the thing which has been created by, put together by man, or created by nature. We see a picture and say, "That's beautiful." We

see an attractive woman or a tree and say, "How lovely!" There are certain standards, and there is the mixing up of good taste with beauty, but is there beauty without the object? Is there space without the object? That plant exists in space and creates space around it. This room has space because of the walls. The walls exist in space, outside. We only know space in relation to a center.

Comment: There is space outside and space inside the house.

Krishnamurti: Yes, I took that as an example. The house exists in space; it creates space. Because of the house you know space. You can't think of space without a thinker, and you have to find out if there is a space without the object.

Again, take love. The word is heavily loaded, but we are not using it sentimentally, emotionally, or devotionally. We are using it nonsentimentally. When we say, "I love my country, my wife, my family, my God," or anything else, there is an object to be loved, whether the object is an idea or an entity. When the object moves, love becomes entangled, jealous. We want to know if there is love without the object. Neither beauty, nor space, nor love is the result of an object. This is an enormous investigation. To pursue that subject we must have order - order being freedom in which there is no envy, ambition, greed, or worship of success; otherwise, there is disorder, and a disordered mind cannot discover anything.

Order is virtue. You must be virtuous, but not virtuous according to the pattern of society because society is not virtuous. Only a mind free from conflict and therefore completely free has the energy to pursue. You must have passion; otherwise, you can't proceed. You must have energy, tremendous energy. Energy is being dissipated now in conflict, in adjustment, in imitation, in following authority. When you look at a flower, if you say, "I like, I don't like; this is a beautiful flower, this is not a beautiful flower; I wish I had it," all that is a dissipation of energy and prevents your looking.

If you merely suppress or isolate yourself as an escape, it is a form of self-delusion, self-hypnosis. This is what the monks and all the Hindus in India do. There must be no motive for order, for love. It must be involuntary, not purposeful. If I love you because you give me pleasure or money, or because I'm frightened or want security, it is no longer love.

We must next go into the question of seeking. Why do we seek at all? We seek because we are lost, we are confused, we are messy, disorderly; we have contradictory beliefs, ideas, desires; there is a whirlpool of contentious demands. We either turn to a dogma, to a belief, to a priest, or we turn to someone who says, "I know," and follow him. Human beings are dreadfully confused. Whatever takes place out of that confusion is still confused. We say, "Well, there are moments of clarity; in that clarity I act." But that action of clarity is negated, set aside, contradicted by the action of confusion. If we are confused, we should not do a thing because whatever we do out of confusion is still confusion.

When the mind is confused, it seeks something which it hopes is not confused, but the clarity it finds is the result of confusion, and that clarity is still confusion. I see that, and I don't act. This doesn't mean that I live in a vacuum, in a blank state. I see that any action born of confusion is furthering confusion. Therefore I stop, naturally, not because I want to seek and find, but because I am confused. That's a completely negative state. The action of confusion, which is to seek, appears to be positive. We like that; we feel that it is right, but to seek, to endeavor, to pursue, to make effort, to determine, to pray - all those are the result of confusion. If I'm not confused, I won't pray; I won't ask; I won't look. The denial of action is total negation of the positive.

The mind now is not seeking; the mind is not wanting more experience. A confused mind says, "I want more experience." It will have more experience, but always in terms of confusion. To find that thing which we call God, seeking must come to an end, which means complete negation of the positive or the negative of the world. The world is caught in the positive and the negative - obey, disobey, trying to be free of both, out

of which comes confusion. The total negation of this is necessary so that the mind is no longer seeking, struggling, wanting. It is completely still, but not through discipline, through control, through suppression, through going into a monastery, shutting oneself in a cell and trying to be quiet. When this negation takes place, the mind is naturally quiet. It is empty, and therefore full of space; something new can take place.

What one does matters tremendously - what one thinks, what one feels, what one is. One has to put aside vanity, greed, ambition, the desire to be someone. This doesn't mean that one must leave society, but one is no longer caught psychologically in its structure.

Question: You say we should not act. Does that mean we should just sit and watch people murder someone?

Krishnamurti: Ah, no; quite the contrary. Look, madame. What I am saying implies a total revolution in education, a different educational system altogether, one in which the whole field of living will not be neglected. Because we are now being trained only to be technicians, in mathematics, in engineering, we escape into all kinds of brutalities. Common murder is on the increase; violence is multiplying; the authorities don't know what to do. In America, in England, everywhere, even in the so-called marvelous society of Russia, there is violence.

One has to do something about the problem of starvation in Asia. To feed all the people, there must be no nationalities, no sovereign states, no Italian government, Indian government, American government. Science has enough creative knowledge to give food, shelter, and clothing to all the people in the world, if there were no armaments, no nationalities, no division into Christians, Hindus, Buddhists. But we don't want to think in those large terms. We say, "Someone is wronging me; I must immediately do something about that." Of course we must, but the issue is larger than that.

Comment: I still think that murdering is bad.

Krishnamurti: So do the judges. They send murderers to prison, hang them, shoot them, or electrocute them. No matter what they do, murder still goes on.

Comment: But they have to judge and then declare what is good and what is bad.

Krishnamurti: Good and bad in what sense?

Comment: In terms of my personal choice. KRISHNAMURTI: Your personal choice is based upon your conditioning.

Question: But if I try to free myself from conditioning?

Krishnamurti: There is a great deal of mischief, misery, ugliness, brutality in the world; there is tremendous violence. That we all know. What are we to do? We stop immediate violence, don't we? If we see someone being violent, we interfere or do something about it. But the issue of violence is much greater than that because in all of us there is violence. We want to hurt people, and there is violence when we are ambitious, competitive. We have to tackle not only the little violence which we come upon every day but also the great violence of man. There have been about fifteen thousand wars in the last five thousand five hundred years, and yet we are still going on. To stop war, we must do away with nationalities, religious divisions, the vested interests of the politicians and the military. It is a tremendous problem; we can't just join peace movements and hope peace will come; it won't. Peace is something which is both outward and inward. We cannot have peace outwardly if there is no inward peace. That means there must be no ambition, no greed, no envy.

Question: Should we just live peacefully, and not join these peace movements?

Krishnamurti: Madame, I don't advise you. I am just saying that if you want peace in the world, you must

live peacefully; and to live peacefully is one of the most difficult things. They have been preaching nonviolence in India a great deal for the last thirty years, and before that for thousands of years. The nonviolent violence has become an ideal. The fact is that we are violent. What's the point of having an ideal? You have to change violence - not in terms of the ideal. To change it you have to face it; you have to be aware of it in your daily life, in what you do, in what you say, in what and how you think. All ideals are always a curse because they take you away from the facts, and it is only when you face the facts that you can do anything.

Question: You said there is no love when pleasure is the object. Isn't there always pleasure, even if you do achieve this?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by pleasure? There's a great deal of pleasure in owning a house, in possessions. It gives immense pleasure, and it doesn't matter if it's a house, a shirt, or a coat. To see that you have everything you want - a house, a wife, children, position, prestige, power, dominance - all that gives great pleasure outwardly and also inwardly. It gives pleasure if you are rich, if you are an important man, if you are capable, if you have fulfilled, if you can do things. Sex also gives great pleasure. We live in that cocoon. But in pleasure there is always pain.

I want to be a great man. This concept gives me pleasure because I see people going about who are called great. I wish I could be treated like they are. That idea gives me pleasure. To succeed I may have to cheat, do a dozen things; I may even have to kill people. In doing all that, I find there is pain, frustration.

Comment: Yes, but you also get pleasure in the happiness.

Krishnamurti: I understand that, but what is pleasure, and what gives duration to pleasure, lends it continuity? If you simply say, "That's beautiful," it is finished, but if you say, "I must have it," there is continuity.

Question: Why?

Krishnamurti: We don't say why; we want it.

Comment: There is a pleasure in looking at people, and smiling at people.

Krishnamurti: Of course. You smile at me. I like it, and I want more of it.

Comment: Yes, but you are the other person. I am talking of me.

Krishnamurti: But I want more of it.

Comment: I want to give you something of myself.

Krishnamurti: But I want it. You may not want to give it; you gave me a first smile, which was a delight both to you and to me. That delight I want to perpetuate. So I say, "Please do this thing. I like your smile; I must have it." And you say, "Sorry, I smiled at you as a friend, but later on it has become a nuisance." There is pain; I suffer. Through life we do many, many, many things hoping to find a continuous pleasure; and at the end we say, "What a bore it all is; there is no pleasure."

Question: Do you think everyone seeks pleasure?

Krishnamurti: Don't we all seek pleasure? Don't you?

Comment: It is a pleasure to give.

Krishnamurti: You give out of your goodness; you say, "By Jove, it's like the sunshine."

Comment: That's a pleasure, a great pleasure.

Krishnamurti: All right, have it! But what happens to me? It has given me delight to receive it.

Comment: When a person takes pleasure in giving, it is always an egotistical thing; he only gives because he gets pleasure out of it.

Krishnamurti: Of course.

Comment: I believe in generosity.

Krishnamurti: If you say, "I believe in generosity, and therefore I must be generous," it is not being generous. It is just an idea. But if you are generous, that's a different thing. If you derive something from your generosity, as pleasure, then you're really not generous. It is like giving your love to your wife or your children; it's giving because you enjoy it.

All we have discussed this morning makes the mind not isolated but very sharply alone. One must be alone, not in the isolated sense of the monk, however. To be truly alone implies freedom. It's not the aloneness of self-pity and loneliness; it is a marvelous thing to see clearly that you are alone. When everyone around you shouts nationalistic slogans and waves the flag, and you think it's all nonsense, you're alone.

Fourth Dialogue in Rome

Sunday, April 10, 1966

Fifth Dialogue in Rome

Fifth Dialogue in Rome

Thursday, April 14, 1966

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk about this evening?

Question: May we discuss the matter of emotional dependence?

Krishnamurti: Shall we go into the question of emotional dependence and the conflict that arises from it, or would you like to discuss something else?

Question: May we discuss silence?

Krishnamurti: I wonder why we ask questions. Someone has asked why there is conflict both in dependence and in freeing oneself from that dependence. Another has asked what silence is. I'm just asking myself why we ask any questions at all. Are we asking for some kind of easy explanation, or are we asking as a means of exploration? The latter means that there is no answer; you and I both are working together to discover the facts involved in that question. If we merely wait for an answer from someone, there is dependence; if the answer depends on another, we are caught in agreement and disagreement. We think we have worked very hard in agreeing and disagreeing, but that doesn't lead us anywhere. Perhaps the question has significance only when the questioner discovers for himself at what depth, or from what depth, the question is put.

We must be clear from the very beginning about these two questions, or any other questions. We must understand why we put them, and at what level or from what depth the questions come out. We must also realize that there is no answer. The understanding of the question itself, the solution, is in the question. It is not that you tell me, I listen, agree or disagree, and then comes the answer. In examining the question itself, we will come to some factual understanding.

If you are following all this intellectually, it has no meaning. If you say, "I agree with you; these are logical steps that you are taking bit by bit," we don't meet; we have lost each other long ago. I hope that we are taking a journey together. It's not that I'm superior and you're inferior, that I'm the authority and you're mere followers - all that would be too silly. Why do we depend on another emotionally? Since we are dependent, how are we to free ourselves from the dependence, and from the pain of freeing ourselves without hurting another?

Question: May we also discuss the issues involved in attachment and detachment?

Krishnamurti: Physically we depend on the postman, on the milkman, on the supermarket. When we talk about dependence, what do we mean by that word? Is all relationship dependent? I depend on you and you depend on me emotionally - as a wife, a husband, a neighbor. Is all relationship, both intimate and superficial, dependent?

Analytically one can discover clearly why one depends. One is empty, insufficient within oneself; one does not have sufficient energy, drive, capacity, clarity; one depends upon another to satisfy that insufficiency, that lack of perception, the sense of not being able to stand by oneself morally, intellectually, emotionally, physically. One also depends because one wants to be secure. The first thing a child demands is security. Most people want security, in which is implied comfort. All these things are involved when one tries to find out why one depends emotionally, intellectually, and spiritually.

I depend on you because you give me pleasure, you give me comfort, you give me satisfaction, you give me a sense of security, a balance, a harmony, a companionship, a togetherness. We are going to examine presently whether it's real or unreal. I cling to you emotionally, physically, intellectually, or in some other way. In myself I'm isolated; I feel separate from everyone else. That separation is very painful. The demand to identify with another springs from that sense of isolation. Please don't accept what I am saying; we are examining, analyzing, going into it together.

Being isolated, we try to reach out for a companion, for friendship, for something that we can cling to. This is going on all around us, intellectually, emotionally, physically, in the deeper levels of consciousness - a constant demand to find someone, some idea, some hope, some kind of thing that will give a tremendous sense of being, a sense of identification with another or with ourselves. We do it because there is a sense of emptiness, of loneliness, of insufficiency in the ever self-centered activities. We identify with our state, with our religion, with our God, with our leader. Having hooked on to someone or to some idea, in that very process there is an uncertainty, there is a fear that the thing we are attached to may be rather pliable, insecure. We become jealous, aggressive, demanding, possessive, dominating, and the battle begins.

You want to be free, and I can't let you be free. You want to look at someone else, and instantly I'm confused, lost, jealous, anxious. This process is called relationship. To be in contact with another is relationship, but I'm not in contact with anyone because out of my fear, out of my loneliness, out of my anxiety, out of all my self-centered activities, I hold on. How can I be sure of another? Even though all marriages are made in heaven, how can I be sure of anything in life, including my own ideas, my own feelings? I can't be sure of anything, but I want to be completely grounded in my security with another. We know all this intellectually. We can analyze this verbally for ourselves without going to an analyst. The pattern is very familiar. I see all this and yet I can't break through, I can't release, I can't let go. What's the next step?

Comment: Conflict immediately comes in. There is also the point of letting go.

Krishnamurti: You can't let go. What is important is not letting go but finding out why you are dependent. If that is clear, then it's finished. Otherwise you may let one person go, but you will cling to someone else.

Question: How about a mother and her child?

Krishnamurti: That's a quite different relationship, isn't it?

Comment: There is an emotional dependence of the mother on the child.

Krishnamurti: The child is dependent on the mother, truly dependent, but is the mother dependent on the child? Of course she is.

Comment: She shouldn't be.

Krishnamurti: It isn't a question of should be or should not be; the facts are that way. We are not approaching the problem directly if we say, "How am I to be free from dependence?" - whether we are dependent on a child or on another adult human being. We must go into the question of why we depend at all. Why do we depend, and is dependence relationship? Comment: There should be independence if we want relationship.

Krishnamurti: Is there relationship if there is dependence? I depend on you; is it a relationship?

Comment: It is not a relationship.

Krishnamurti: Yet that is what we call relationship.

Comment: We call it love, too.

Krishnamurti: We call it love; we call it protection; we give dozens of absurd words to it, but we have never really inquired into what relationship is. We are related because of inner uncertainty, the demand for security, the demand to be assured that we are related. It is a deeper, much more subtle dependence than the physical. If we did not depend, what would happen? We'd be lost; we'd have no anchorage; there would be no port where we could say, "Here I'm at home." I battle all day with my boss in the office, and when I go home, there at least I'm completely secure.

We have all had the experience of tremendous loneliness, where books, religion, everything is gone and we are tremendously, inwardly lonely, empty. Most of us can't face that emptiness, that loneliness, and we run away from it. Dependence is one of the things we run to, depend on, because we can't stand being alone with ourselves. We must have the radio or books or talking, incessant chatter about this and that, about art and culture. So we come to that point when we know there is this extraordinary sense of self-isolation. We may have a very good job, work furiously, write books, but inwardly there is this tremendous vacuum. We want to fill that and dependence is one of the ways. We use dependence, amusement, church work, religions, drink, women, a dozen things to fill it up, cover it up. If we see that it is absolutely futile to try to cover it up, completely futile - not verbally, not a conviction and therefore agreement and determination - but if we see the total absurdity of it, that it is impossible to escape from it, whether through marriage, through drink, through God, through churches, through literature, through painting, through music, through husbands, through children, then we are faced with a fact. It is not a question of how to be free from dependence; that's not a fact; that's only a reaction to a fact.

Can I face this emptiness, this sense of isolation, the sense of not belonging to anything? It is something I've never faced before. I don't even know what it means because I have so carefully, so cleverly cultivated escapes from it. Though I know it is a fact, I am unwilling to face it. I know nothing can fill it, no words, no books, no literature, no art, nothing. Why don't I face the fact and see what happens?

The problem now arises of the observer and the observed. The observer says, "I am empty; I don't like it," and runs away from it. The observer says, "I am different from that emptiness." But the observer is the emptiness; it is not emptiness seen by an observer. The observer is the observed. There is a tremendous revolution in thinking, in feeling, when that takes place. It's not anger, and me separate from the anger, or me separate from jealousy, me separate from nationalism, and so on.

Question: Isn't the whole mental process, and all desire as well, image-making?

Krishnamurti: Of course it's image-making. All our relationship is image-making. You have an image about me, and I have an image about you; the images have relationship, not you and I. The two images have a battle about everything. Idealists and people with Utopias have images of what should be, and they try to force everyone, the whole community, to that state. One of the most difficult things is to be free of forming images. I want to go a little beyond that into the whole question of experience, the storing of memory, and the reaction of memory with regard to another with whom I have had an experience.

Can we be free of experience? Most of us crave experiences of pleasure and pain, which again is dependence. The more we demand a pleasurable experience - which is what most people want, whether it is God, sex or any of a hundred things - the more is involved this question of pain. I said at the beginning that if we are asking these questions purely intellectually, it has no value at all. If the asking is intense, it is possible to explore. We can't examine without passion, without vitality; and we can't have that vitality if it is a superficial question.

Can I face a fact without interpreting it? If I separate the fact from me, if I am lonely, I am the observer, and the loneliness is the thing observed. Then the actor comes into being, the actor being me. I can do something about it. I can replace it, cut it out, suppress it, resist it, justify it, struggle against it, run away from it, adjust myself to it, deny it or rationalize it, but if I see that anger is me, that loneliness is me - the rationalizer, the

thinker, the actor - if I see that the observer is the observed, then there is no experience, then action becomes impossible in the ways I am used to as action.

When this takes place, contradiction and effort cease. If there is no contradiction, there is no effort. This doesn't mean that my mind is asleep. In the very effort to get rid of my dependence, my anger, my passion, my lust, in that very process of conflict the mind is breaking itself up. Conflict in any form, at any level, physical or psychological, breeds further conflict, and therefore the organism as well as the psyche is wearing itself out.

Action with regard to the fact of emptiness is not possible. The observer now is the observed, and action with regard to any fact doesn't exist. From that arises the negation of action. Inaction is the most tremendous action. The positive action that we know is reaction. The observer denies the fact. He denies that the fact belongs to him, and therefore he can act. When the observer is the observed, which is the fact, action becomes impossible. The mind which has previously divided itself into the observer and the observed has no division. There is no conflict between the observer and the observed. When this takes place, there is silence. Contradiction ceases. In silence there is tremendous attention.

From that silence we can ask a question: "What is creation?" Creation for most of us is doing, creating, painting, writing, expressing. An architect must express. If a woman is to fulfill, she must give birth to a child. Man is trying to fulfill, fulfill, fulfill, all the time, and is frustrated all the time. When the observer is the observed and the experiencer is the experience, then the search comes to an end. Then what is man to do? We demand experience, and we demand it because experience keeps us awake. Life is challenge and response. This challenge and response keeps us awake. There is tremendous doubt now about God. A few centuries ago that doubt didn't exist. Now everything is being questioned and we have to respond. There is outward challenge. Society is undergoing a tremendous change, and it is a challenge to man. The challenge keeps him moving, keeps him awake, driving, pushing. We depend on outward challenges, outward questions, outward urges, compulsions, incidents. If we see that, we put it away because it has no meaning any more. Then we have to keep awake, keep moving, keep active without experience, without being driven, without being pushed. When we reject the outer, we also have to reject the inner. The outer challenge is the same as the inward challenge. It's a tide, which ebbs and flows, goes out and comes in. We may say it's absurd to be influenced by people, by churches, by society, but the tide comes in, and we depend on it to keep us awake. But if we see the movement and no longer depend on it, then we have to be extraordinarily alert and awake.

Comment: Just to see; not to reject.

Krishnamurti: Yes, of course. How can I reject? The problem is arising in a different way with computers and automation taking over the world. Man is going to have much more leisure. Four days of it a week is coming. Three days a week is already here, from Friday afternoon to Monday morning. Social reform and all that will disappear because it will all be so beautifully organized. What will we do with this leisure? We may get lost in amusement, going to football games or to church, because that is what we want. But if we reject all that, if we see the absurdity of everlastingly chasing something, then we have true leisure. Then we look at things differently; the observer is the observed, and the action is inaction. That's a marvelous discovery.

To look at a tree completely, the mind must be totally silent. Have you ever observed a tree without the observer? Have you ever looked at another without memory, without the image, without the observer thinking, judging, evaluating, condemning, justifying? If you can do that, there is relationship with the person; otherwise, there is no relationship, and only your images, your words have relationship. "I love you" and "You love me" are but images speaking to each other endlessly. If right from the beginning we see that the observer is the observed, there is no effort or contradiction, and therefore no demand. Then we will know what creation is.

Comment: It is being.

Krishnamurti: We should never take anything for granted. Always doubt, but don't close any door. Silence is the observer, not the observer is silent. We only know the beauty of light because it is on the building, on the leaf, or in the shadow, in the movement of leaves. It is the observer observing the light and the breeze, and the movement of the leaf, who says, "How lovely!"

Comment: But that light actually is lovely.

Krishnamurti: The moment you say the light is lovely, you're lost. When the observer separates himself from the fact of loneliness or anger, then there is action. When the observer says, "I am not it," or "I am it"; when there is the light on that building, on that leaf, and the wind, the breeze, is among those leaves, and you see it and say, "How beautiful," you know beauty because of the movement of the light, because of that coloring, of that shape. But is it really beauty? The observer looking at it says it's beautiful. You see a painting; you say it's beautiful, or modern, subjective art. When you look at it, you are looking from a center, which is the observer who says that it is beautiful or ugly, in good taste or in poor taste, that a room is well proportioned, or that the movement a tree has in the breeze is lovely. You only know beauty because of an object, but is there beauty without the object? It is the same question as whether there is space without an object. If there is no space without an object, then there is never any freedom at all. If I only know I'm a prisoner because of the walls, these concrete walls, or walls that I have created around myself through resistance, if I only know space that way, in that space there can never be freedom. If there is no observer, no center from which I'm looking, then beauty has a quite different meaning. Then everything is beautiful. This isn't a concept; it is a fact.

Silence takes place in total inaction, which is positive action. Silence is emptiness. A silence in which there is the experiencer is no longer a silence. Then it's put together, and it can be un-put together. It's like love. I love you because you give me satisfaction. If love has a motive, it's no longer love. There is a center.

To come to this silence, as we have done, we have to be tremendously quiet. To see your wife, with whom you've lived for forty years, quarreled, and everything else; to look at her and see something new, there must be silence. The new is the creation of silence, not you creating silence, creating the new. That is creation.

Question: How can we have creation in an insane world?

Krishnamurti: The world is not sane because we are not sane. The world is not different from me. To have real peace, not the peace between two wars, two arguments, or two battles, we must live peacefully. There must be no anger, no jealousy, no ambition, no greed, no prestige. Because we can't live peacefully, we join peaceful organizations and function completely in the field of time. The new is never in the field of time. The thing which is timeless is God, or any name you like to give to it; the name doesn't matter.

Fifth Dialogue in Rome

Thursday, April 14, 1966

