

Jiddu Krishnamurti

Six Public Meetings in

Madras - 1983

Table of Contents

<i>What Instrument Will Solve Human Problems?.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>The Mirror of Relationship.</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>First Public Question and Answer Meeting in Madras.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Second Public Question and Answer Meeting in Madras.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Psychological Time Is the Cause of Conflict</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Remaining With the Challenge of Sorrow</i>	<i>39</i>

What Instrument Will Solve Human Problems?

First Public Talk in Madras

Saturday, December 25, 1982

I don't know why you are all here. I wonder why you have gathered. It's a rather important question to ask by each one of us here, with what intention, with what purpose, and at the end of the talk, what you have gathered for yourself. We are going to talk over together a great many things relating to our daily life, relating to all the events that are taking place on this unfortunate earth. And so this is not a lecture. A lecture generally means gathering information, collecting some data with a view to instruction. So, this is not a lecture as it is commonly understood, but this is a conversation between us. A conversation, if you will, between two friends who are concerned not only what is happening in the world externally, environmentally, but also what is happening to the human being.

We are going to talk about it, first: what is happening to our brain, to our conduct, why human beings who have lived on this earth, perhaps a million years or a more recent discovery, between 30,000 and 40,000 years ago, why after all this so-called evolution, passing through so many wars, one religion after another, one government after another, why we human beings throughout the world have so degenerated, without any stamina, without any integrity. And we are, as I said, we are going to talk over together, you are not merely - if I may point out most respectfully - you are not merely listening to a series of ideas or some form of conclusion, or some new principles and values, but together you and the speaker are going to examine closely, hesitantly, carefully, what is happening in the external world, and what is happening to us in our own daily life, the inner life.

So, please, we are having a conversation together about all this. If you hold on to your opinion, however slight, or dogmatic, or stubborn, or obstinate, or come to some definite conclusions, then it will not be possible to have a conversation, or communicate with each other. That must be clearly understood from the very beginning of these talks, that you and the speaker are going to examine, not from any religious point of view, or as a communist, socialist, Marxist, conservative, left and right, or belonging to any nation. We are going to examine. To examine one must have a free mind, not an opinionated mind, not a traditional mind, not belonging to any sect, to any order, to any religious group or to any institution. Then one cannot possibly examine closely what is happening in the world outside of us. There are the threats of war, the nuclear or the conventional war; the decline of all religions; there is no moral activity, but most of us are living superficially, intellectually, never examining, never questioning, doubting all that is going on in the world.

And to examine, to probe, to observe, requires a very clear mind and heart, a brain that is not held by any tradition, a brain that is already conditioned, a brain that has evolved through millennia. And if we are not aware of the activities of our own brain, our own sensory responses, examination and the observation of what is going on in the world, becomes almost impossible. So, please, even for this evening, let us talk together like two human beings, friendly, not imposing any ideas on each other, any dogmatic, argumentative conclusions, but as two friends who have known each other for some time, sitting under a lovely tree in a cool climate and looking at the world.

What is the world? What is it that is happening out there? Who has created it? Why has man become what he is, thoughtless, careless, indifferent, without any love, brutal, violent? Why have we become like this? You might blame: it's our inheritance, you might blame it on the environment, on the culture, on the society.

But who has created this society? Each one of us, the past generation after generation, and the present generation is contributing to it. So we have created this world, and there is no escape from that fact. Each one of us has contributed to that chaos, to the mess that is going on, the disorder, the anarchy.

So, thought has divided the world into nationalities, and nationalities are one of the causes of war. Nationalities devised by thought in its search for security has divided the British, the French, the Indian, the Muslim, the Pakistan, the Russian and so on, and thought has created war through this division. And the preparations of war for killing other human beings, thought has been responsible for this. In its search to be safe, secure, to find somewhere or other a sense of safety, it begins with the family, community, then a large group and a wider group hoping thereby to find some kind of safety, protection, security, and so it begins with the small and ends up in nationalities. And all the governments are supporting this crazy system of dividing people into nationalities, into groups - as the Hindus and the Muslims, the Chinese and the Russians, the Americans of course, and the British, the French, and so on. Then thought has been responsible for the division of religions - the Christian, the Buddhist, the Hindu, the Muslim and so on. Thought has created the marvellous cathedrals, the great mosques and the lovely temples.

And thought has put in these temples, mosques and churches the things that are invented by thought - the rituals, the dogmas, all the ceremonial vesture, thought has been responsible. And thought has created the problems of division, the problems that arise through division, between the Jew, the Arab, between one group against another group. Thought has been responsible for the extraordinary development of technique, technology. Very few of us know what actually is going on in the technological world, the terrible things they are doing biologically, inventing great instruments of destruction of man - vast, unlimited movement of technology. And thought has organised mass killing in the name of peace, in the name of country, in the name of god. So there is great conflict going on for which thought is responsible.

We will presently investigate together what is thinking, what is the nature of thought. But first we must examine the activity and the result of thought, thinking. Thought has brought about great hygienic benefit, communication, rapid transport and all that. The brain is infinitely capable, and that capacity, that energy of thought has created this world of technology, with all the problems it involves, social, environmental. And thought also has created havoc in our daily life, in our relationship with each other, between man and woman. So we are saying that thought is responsible for all the misery it has brought about in the world. Please don't deny or accept what the speaker is saying. He is putting that forward for you to examine, to question, to doubt, not to accept nor agree, but to look, to examine, to care. Thought has also done great things for humanity.

So, we must together examine very carefully what is the source of thought, why thought has created such havoc in the world, whether thought can ever have as its companion love, or love is entirely different from the activities of thought. So, please, together without any sense of authority, without any sense of belonging to any group - either the Marxist, Capitalist or democratic, belonging to no religion, no sects, totally uncommitted. Then only is it possible to examine and to go beyond the present confusion and chaos. So, please, listen, not agree, but listen to find out. We have to be both the teacher and the disciple. The word 'disciple' comes - the meaning of that word disciple means he who learns. And also we must be the teachers. The very act of learning gives us the responsibility to teach. So, we are going together to learn, not hold on to our old traditions, to our old opinions and conclusions, then that prevents you from learning, not from the speaker but learning through observation, learning through the investigation of the nature of thought and the nature of the brain, not the physiological brain but the activities of a brain that is conditioned. So, first of all, we are going to look together, why the brain which has evolved through thousands of years, which has gone through every kind of experience, pleasurable, painful, and every kind of incident, accident - why that brain had become so limited, not limited in one direction, which is in the technological world. It is not limited there at all. It is moving with an extraordinary rapidity. And so in one direction, in the direction of technology, the brain has infinite power. That is obvious.

The brain has put man on the moon, it has invented the terrible things to kill human beings, and also technology has given man great comfort, hygiene, communication, and so on. But the brain is limited because it cannot go in any other direction but that direction. That is, it is incapable at present of going inwardly. And if it can go in one direction with such extraordinary vigour, extraordinary energy that has been put into the technological world, if it can go in the other direction, that is not in the direction of amusement, entertainment, but in the world of the psyche, the psychological world, then it has an extraordinary infinite capacity, both outwardly, that is the technological world, and the inward, the psychological world. But we have not given that same consideration, the same enquiry, the same doubt, scepticism, questioning, demanding, challenging what we are. And so, if you will, we are going to enquire together into the whole psychological world, why after all these thousands of years, why we live in conflict with each other, why man has become so miserable, unhappy, anxious, uncertain, hypocritical, dishonest, corrupt, suffering a great deal. That is our inner world, the world of the psyche, the psychological realm into which very few have investigated deeply, profoundly. And the psychologists, the theoreticians, the analysts, psychotherapists, they have not solved our human problems. They have written vast volumes about it, but we are still what we are.

So, how do we investigate into something that is yourself, that is your consciousness? You are both the unconscious and the conscious, the whole realm of the inward activity which dictates the outer activity. If that inner activity is not in order, then we create a society as we have done, which is totally in disorder. You can... any fool can see this. You cannot create outward order unless there is inward order. We are not going to discuss what is order now. We will, as we go along. But one has to realise this fact, that the outward chaos, war, confusion, the brutality, the violence, the hatreds, is the result of our own life, our own disorder, the conflict in our own consciousness, the disorder of our daily life, the disorder in our relationship with each other, the perpetual row that goes on between human beings. And can all this misery, confusion, conflict, anxiety, and so on, can it ever end? This question is far more serious than the nuclear war, or the neutron war, whatever war that be, whether it is possible to change radically the content of our consciousness. The crisis is there, not in the world. Please understand all this. The crisis is not in the world, not the nuclear war, not the terrible divisions, the brutality that is going on. The crisis is in our consciousness, the crisis is what we are, what we have become. Unless we meet that crisis, that challenge, we are going to perpetuate wars, destruction, and there will be outward chaos. (Sound of crow) Even that crow agrees - those crows are having fun.

I wonder if we realise, when there is great disturbance outwardly, uncertainty, insecurity, we turn to tradition, turn back to tradition, like the Muslim world is doing. They go back to the Koran, and in the Christian world they go back to the Bible. Fortunately in the Hindu world there are so many books they can't go back to the books, but they go back to tradition, to tribalism. They have now got tribal gods at every corner because the world has become uncertain, dangerous. And you are all doing the same. You want to belong to some group, some sect, some local god. The other day we were told by a European who has investigated into the gods of India. He told us there are 330,000 gods in this country - I suppose it's better than having one. Then you can have fun with them all. Now how does one enquire into the psychological world, that is, into the world of consciousness? The content of that consciousness is what you are. That is not a dogmatic statement. That is not a conclusion, but that is a fact. What you are is the content of your consciousness: your beliefs, your opinions, your experiences, your illusions, superstitions, your gods, your fear, your pleasure and the loneliness, the sorrow, and the great grief, and the fear of death. That is what you are. That is, the content of your consciousness is what you are. You can divide that consciousness into various parts, invent a super-consciousness, super-super-super, but it is still the content of your consciousness. You can meditate, sit cross-legged, do all those things, but it is part of your consciousness. And the content of your consciousness is put together by thought. Please examine this. Don't - the speaker asks most respectfully, don't throw it out, don't say I agree, I don't agree with you, or agree with you. Just examine it, find out. Please don't stick to your old opinions, conclusions or what the books have said.

We are saying the content of your consciousness is put together by thought, by thinking, thinking that you are a Hindu or a Christian, Marxist, Maoist or whatever you want to think. Thought which is limited has brought about limitation in consciousness. It can expand consciousness by thinking that it can expand and experiment in expansion. But it is still the activity of thought. Right, sirs? Are we together in this? We are not saying dogmatically. We say please examine it, don't agree, but question it, whether your consciousness which is the activity of the brain, brain with all its sensory responses, brain which is the centre of thought, whether that thought has not brought about fear, whether that thought which is also movement in time, whether that thought is not responsible for the whole content of our consciousness.

And we are saying, thought is limited because it is the outcome of knowledge. It is the result, the end product of experience, knowledge stored in the brain as memory and the response of any challenge is thinking. And knowledge is always limited. There is no complete knowledge about anything. Right? The scientific knowledge is limited. Every kind of knowledge in any field, biological, sociological, technological and the world of religion with all their gods, and all gods in the world are invented by thought. Examine it please. Don't reject it. Don't say he is preaching - whatever he is preaching. He is not. Examine it. All the gods on earth man has invented them, thought has invented, and then thought worships that which it has invented and this you call religion. That word 'religion', when we talk about it, the root meaning of that word is quite difficult and it has not been established what the root is of that word. So, thought is limited and whatever its activity is always limited, and being limited, it must inevitably create problems, not only problems in the technological world but also the problems in human relationship, which is far more important to understand than the technological world because we human beings are perpetually in conflict with each other: agreeing, disagreeing, believing and not believing, one opinion, dogmatic opinion against another opinion, one idea, one ideal against another ideal. This perpetual war between human beings is created by thought. And having created the problems then thought tries to solve them and so increases the problems, which is what is actually happening.

If one sees that, not intellectually, not as an idea or a conclusion but as an actuality, as a fact, then one can ask a totally different question, which is, the only instrument that we have, which is thought - please understand the nature and the content of thought, thought is all sensory responses, all the imagination, all the sexual symbols, the sexual pictures and so on, the feeling of depression, elation, anxiety, all the result of limited thought, because thought is the outcome of limited knowledge. There is no complete knowledge about anything. So then, if thought is not the instrument to solve human problems, then what is the instrument? You understand my question? Are we together, understanding this, or am I just talking to myself, or are you listening to what is being said? It is up to you. Take it or leave it. This is really a very important question to ask, because thought is a worn out instrument, blunt instrument. It may be clever, it may solve certain problems, but the problems it has created in human beings and between human beings, the instrument that we have used to solve our problems in our daily life in relationship, that instrument is blunt, limited, worn out. Unless we find a new instrument, there can be no fundamental, radical change of the human psyche. So, we are together going to enquire into the nature of that instrument, the quality of it, the structure of it, the beauty of it. But before we can enquire, one must be absolutely clear that the instrument which we have now as thought, has reached its tether. It cannot possibly solve our human relationship. And in that human relationship there is conflict and out of that conflict we have created this society through our greed, through our brutality, through our violence.

Unless one is absolutely, irrevocably clear that thought is not the instrument to solve our human problems - we have tried every method of solving our human problems: surrendering ourselves to some ideals, to some guru, to some concept, to some conclusion - we have done all those things, we have followed all kinds of leaders: political, religious, various quacks who are gurus. We have done everything, and we are still what we are, slightly modified, a little more observant, a little more kindly, but basically, after this millennia upon millennia, we are what we have been from the beginning of time. And the instrument that we have had,

which is thought, that instrument can no longer solve our problems. If this is very clear, and that requires great observation, questioning, doubting, asking, never accepting authority: the authority of the books, the hierarchical structure of our society, the authority of institutions, the authority of those who say, I know, you don't know, I will tell you. So a mind which is enquiring into the nature of a new quality and structure of a new instrument must be entirely free from authority; not the authority of the policeman, not the authority of the governments, however rotten they are, however corrupt, thoughtless. So, a mind that is enquiring into something that requires great sensitivity, freedom, that demands a brain that is stable, not wobbly, sloppy.

I don't know if you have not noticed how are our minds are sloppy. We go from one guru to another, especially in this country. We tolerate anything: the dirt, the squalor, the filth, the corruption, the tradition that is dead, and all the temple buildings which are absolutely meaningless, spreading all over the world. I believe they are building temples in America. What a lovely idea. And Europe. One nonsense going to the other kind of nonsense. You watch all this and you absorb all this. And a mind, a brain that enquires must be extraordinarily free, and have great sensitivity. I don't know if you have not noticed how limited our senses are - senses - which is, the observing optically, visually, hearing, to hear another so completely that you understand immediately what is being said, to have sympathy, empathy, the feeling of cooperation, feeling of affection, feeling of love. We haven't got it here. But you love god. You love going to a temple, putting on ashes, belonging to some tribe, tribal god, because you are frightened, and where there is fear there is no freedom of enquiry.

So, please, we are going into this very, very seriously, if you will. This is not an entertainment, this is not something you come for one day and forget the rest of the year. We are concerned, we are talking about our daily life, our conflicts, our loneliness, our despairs, and none of those can be solved by thought. Then what is the instrument that will solve our problems? Don't wait for the speaker to tell you. Then the speaker becomes your guru, your leader, and the speaker doesn't want to be your guru, your authority. But together, as two human beings, concerned, caring, concerned with humanity, because after all you are the rest of humanity, because your consciousness with its content is the rest of humanity. The rest of humanity has also the same consciousness as yours. They suffer. Every human being in the world suffers, is anxious, uncertain, confused, in tears, lonely, like you. Your consciousness is not yours, it is the rest of mankind. So you are mankind. It is not a mere intellectual, logical, analytical conclusion. It is a fact to be felt, realised, lived, that you are not a separate human being, you are not an individual. That is a hard pill to swallow because we all think we are separate individuals with our own little brains. That is our conditioning to think that each one of us is separate, we are not. We are the result of thousands of years of humanity - their suffering, their loneliness, their despair, their excitement, their joy, their sex. What you think, others think. The great scientists think, so does the uneducated villager, poor, hungry, labouring from morning till night, he also thinks. So thinking is not your individual thinking. It is only thinking. You may think in one way, another may think another way, but it is still thinking.

So the thinking, consciousness, is shared by all human beings. And when one really realises that, the fundamental truth of it, then our whole activity changes. Then you are concerned with the whole humanity, which means your son, your neighbour, your wife, your husband, your man who is miles away.

So sirs, we better stop this evening and continue tomorrow evening in our enquiry, and ask whether there is a different kind of instrument, a different kind of activity which is not the activity of thought. Don't invent. Let us find out. Don't come to any conclusion but enquire, question, doubt. To have a subtle mind, quick mind, a brain that is active, not bogged down by tradition, by conclusions, by ideals, so that you and the speaker can talk about it, enquire, go into it very, very deeply.

Saturday, December 25, 1982

The Mirror of Relationship.

Second Public Talk in Madras

Sunday, December 26, 1982

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday evening. We were saying that this is not a lecture, with a view to conveying information. We are together having a conversation, you as a separate human being, if you are separate at all, with the speaker. We are walking down a lane, wooded, plenty of shadows and birds singing and we sit down together and talk about the whole problem of existence, which is very complex. And as we are friends for a long time we have many days to talk over these things. And we are neither convincing each other about any subject. We are not trying to persuade each other, we are not trying to overcome the other through arguments or sticking dogmatically to one's own opinion, prejudices, but rather together - and I hope you are doing the same with me - together we are going to look at the world as it is and the world that is within us.

Many volumes have been written about the world outside of us: the environment, society, politics, economics, and so on but very few - as far as I know, and one may be mistaken - very few have gone to the very length of discovering what we actually are, why human beings are behaving as they are doing - killing each other, constantly in trouble with each other, following some authority or other - some book, some person, some ideal - and having no right relationship with their friends, with their wives, with their husbands and with their children. Why human beings have become after so many millennia so vulgar, so brutal, utterly lacking care, consideration, attention to others, and denying the whole process of what is considered love, if we at all have that quality.

And outwardly there are wars, which man has lived with wars for thousands and thousands of years. We are trying to stop nuclear war but we have never stopped wars. There has been no demonstration right in the world to stop wars, but they demonstrate against a particular war. And these wars have been going on; people being exploited, oppressed - and the oppressor becoming the oppressor. This is the cycle of human existence with sorrow, loneliness, a great sense of depression, the mounting anxiety, the utter lack of insecurity, and there is no relationship with society or with one's own intimate persons - a relationship in which there is no row, conflict, quarrels, oppression and so on. This is the world we live in - which I am sure we all know; or we are unaware of it, or we don't want to know. Most of us are unaware of what is actually happening. And the scientists, the biologists, the philosophers have their own separate existence apart from the rest of us. And throughout these millennia our brains are conditioned; conditioned by knowledge.

Please as we said yesterday, please don't reject or accept anything that the speaker says. Question it, doubt it, be sceptical and above all don't be influenced by the speaker because we are so easily influenced, we are so gullible. And if we are to have a conversation together and to talk seriously about these matters, one must have a mind or a brain that is free to examine, free from bias, from any conclusion, from any opinion, obstinate, any conclusion that is definite. One must have a brain that is constantly enquiring, questioning, doubting. It is only then perhaps that we can have a relationship with each other and so communicate with each other easily. Words are meant to communicate. You may translate the meaning of the words differently but if you are speaking, as we are, in English, words have a definite meaning.

And together as we said yesterday, look at the activities of thought because we live by thought, all our actions are based on thought, all our contemplated efforts are based on thought - our meditations, our

worships, our prayer. And thought has brought about the division of nationalities which breed wars, the division in religions as the Jew, the Arab, the Muslim, the Christian, the Hindu and the Buddhist, and so on. Thought has divided the world, not only geographically but also psychologically inwardly - man is fragmented. Man is fragmented - when I use 'man', please ladies, you are included - man is fragmented, broken up, not only at the psychological, mechanical level of his existence but also in his occupation. If you are a professor, you have your own small circle and live in that. If you are a businessman, if you have multinational business, you may travel but you are still business, money making. Or if you are a politician, you live within that area. And if you are a religious person, in the accepted sense of that word, doing various forms of puja, rituals, meditations, worshipping some idol and so on. We live a fragmented life. Each fragment has its own energy, has its own capacity, has its own discipline, and each part plays an extraordinary role in contradicting the other part. You must know all this. And this division, both outwardly, geographically, religiously, nationally, and the division that is between oneself and another, is such a waste of energy in their conflict: wasting our energy, quarrelling, dividing, each one pursuing his own thing, each one aspiring, demanding for his own personal security and so on. This contradictory energy, for all action takes energy, all thinking takes energy. This energy which is so constantly being broken up is a wastage of energy. When one energy contradicts another, one action contradicts another action - saying one thing and doing another, which is obviously a hypocritical acceptance of life, all such activities must invariably condition the mind... the brain. We are conditioned as a Hindu, with all the superstitions, beliefs - you know all that - what a Hindu is, what a Roman Catholic is, what a Protestant is, what a Christian is, or the Buddhist and so on, or the Islamic world. We are conditioned and there is no question about it, there is no argument that we are not conditioned - we are, both religiously, politically, geographically. And as we were talking about yesterday, until there is freedom from conditioning, the activities of thought which is creating great problems and those problems thought cannot possibly solve, as we pointed out yesterday. And a new instrument is necessary to solve our human problems and we are going to talk as we go along about it. But as we said, it is not for the speaker to tell you what that new quality of that instrument is; each one has to find for himself. That is why both of us must think together, if we can. That demands that both of us feel, enquire, search out, question, doubt all the things that man has put together, all the things that we have created, the barriers between each other.

So we, as human beings, living on this beautiful earth which is slowly being destroyed, living on this earth which is our earth, not the Indian earth or the British earth or the American earth, it is our earth, to live intelligently, happily. But apparently that is not possible because we are conditioned. This conditioning is like the computer - we are programmed. We are programmed to be Hindus, to be Muslims, to be Christians, Catholics, Protestants. For 2000 years the Christian world has been programmed and the brain has been conditioned through that programme, like the computer. And so our brains are deeply conditioned and we are asking if it is at all possible to be free of that conditioning. Unless we are totally, completely, free from that limitation, mere enquiry or asking what is the new instrument which is not thought has no meaning. First one must begin very near to go very far. But most of us don't want to begin very near because we are all idealistic. We want to go so far without taking the first step, and perhaps the first step may be the last step.

Are we understanding each other? Are we communicating each other, or am I talking to myself? If I am talking to myself, I can do this in my own room. But if we are talking, having a conversation together, that conversation has significance when both of us meet at the same level, with the same intensity at the same time. That is love, that is real deep friendship. So please, this is not a lecture in the ordinary sense of the word. We are together trying to enquire and resolve our human problems. That requires a great deal of enquiry because human problems are very, very complex. One must have the quality of patience which is not of time. You understand? We are all impatient to get on: tell me quickly something or other. But if you have patience, that is, not trying to achieve something, not to arrive at some end, some goal, but step by step enquire into it.

As we said, we are programmed. Our human brain is a mechanical process. Our thought is a materialistic process, and that thought has been conditioned to think as a Buddhist, as a Hindu, Christian and so on. So our brain is conditioned. And whether it is possible to be free from that conditioning. Do you understand my question? There are those who say it is not possible; and they are not stupid people but very intelligent people. They say it is not possible because how can a brain which has been conditioned for so many centuries upon centuries, how can that conditioning be wiped away completely so that the human brain is extraordinarily pristine, original, capable of infinite capacity. Many people assert this, and are merely satisfied in modifying it, modifying the condition.

Isn't this a bit too loud?

But we are saying that this conditioning can be examined, can be observed and there can be total freedom from that conditioning. And to discover for ourselves whether it is not possible or not, we have to enquire into our relationship. Relationship is the mirror in which we see ourselves as we are. All life is a movement in relationship. There is no living thing on earth that is not related to something or other. Even the hermit that abandons the world and goes into some lonely spot is related to the past, is related to those who are around him. There is no escape from relationship. And in that relationship, which is the mirror in which we can see ourselves, in that relationship we can discover what we are: our reactions, our prejudices, our fears, depressions, anxieties, loneliness, sorrow, pain, grief. And we can also discover whether we love, or there is no such thing as love. So we are together, if you will, if you are serious enough to examine this question of relationship, because that is the basis of life. That is the only thing we have with each other. And if we cannot find the right relationship, if we live our own particular narrow life apart from my wife, husband, and so on, that isolated existence brings about its own destruction. So relationship is the most extraordinarily important thing in life. If we do not understand that relationship, we cannot possibly create a new society. You may have physical revolutions - Communist, Mao, or other forms of physical revolution, as has been observed in Russia, where there has been great revolution, the same old cycle is being repeated there are always the elite on top. You know the whole business. So relationship is important.

So we are going to enquire very closely into what is relationship? Why human beings throughout the long existence of their lives have never had a relationship in which there is neither oppression, possessiveness, attachment, contradiction and so on. Why there is always this division - man, woman, we and they. We are going to examine it together. This examination can be intellectual or merely verbal, which is intellectual concept of what relationship is, trying to understand intellectually what that relationship is, but such intellectual comprehension has no value at all. It is just an idea, it is just a concept, but if we can look at our relationship as a whole, then perhaps we can see the depth and the beauty and the quality of relationship. Right sirs? Can we go on?

So we are asking what - actually - the present relationship with each other, not theoretical, not romantic, not idealistic which are all unreal, but the actual, daily relationship of man, woman or with each other. Are we related at all? There is the biological urge as sex - may I use that word without all of you getting excited about it, especially in this country that word is rather doubtful, we never talk about it. It is hidden, but we are going to talk about it. So please forgive if I do. Our relationship is sexual, pleasurable. Our relationship is either possessiveness, attachment, various forms of intrusions upon each other. And if we examine one quality in that relationship, which is attachment, what is attachment, why do we have such tremendous need for attachment? We are either attached to a person, to a belief, to some form of conclusion.

Is that turned down too low? Can you all hear us sir? Yes?

What are the implications of attachment? If one is attached to a person, to one's wife, to one's family, what are they - complication, the extraordinary nature of attachment. Why is one attached?

When you are attached, to anything, there is always fear in it, of losing. There is always a sense of

uncertainty. Please observe it for yourself. There is always a sense of separation: I am attached to my wife - I am not married, but suppose I am - I am married to my wife, married, I am attached to her because she gives me pleasure, sexually, gives me pleasure as a companion, she gives me pleasure as a cook - you know all the rest of it, I don't have to tell you all this. You know all this without my telling you all this. So I am attached to her, which means I am jealous, frightened, and the consequences of attachment is the continuation of fear, of losing, jealousy, anxiety. Where there is jealousy there is hatred. And is attachment love? That is one point, in our relationship.

In our relationship each one has, through the years, put together an image about each other. Those images she and he have created about each other is the actual relationship. Right? They may sleep together, but the fact that you and she have an image about each other, and in that relationship of images, how can there be any actual, factual relationship with another? Right? We have, all of us from childhood, we have built images about ourselves and about others. And we are asking a very, very serious question: in our relationship can one live without a single image? Surely you all have an image about the speaker, haven't you? Obviously you have. Why? You don't know the speaker; actually you don't know him. He sits on the platform, talks - but you have no relationship with him because you have an image about, you have created an image about him, and you have your own personal images about yourself. You have got so many images; about the politicians, about the business man, about the guru, about this and that. You understand my question? Can one live profoundly without a single image? Image may be conclusion about one's wife, an image may be the picture, of sexual pictures, the image may be some form of better relationship, and so on. Why do human beings have images at all? Please, sir, ask this question of yourself: why do you have an image about the speaker? If you can answer that very honestly, go into it, perhaps you may solve the image which you have built about your wife, or your husband, or your children. When you have an image about another, that image gives you a sense of security. Right? Right sir? Please examine what the speaker is saying, because this is very important. Because love is not thought. Love is not desire, love is not pleasure, love is not the movement of images, and as long as you have an image about another there is no love. And one asks, is it possible to live a life without a single image? Then you have a relationship with each other. As it is now, they are like two parallel lines - our relationship - two parallel lines never meeting, except sexually. The man goes off to the office and the modern lady also goes off to an office. The man is ambitious, greedy, envious, trying to achieve a position in the business world, in the religious world, in the professorial world, and the woman goes off too, to earn a livelihood. And they meet in the house to breed children. And then the whole problem of responsibility, problem of education, or total indifference. It doesn't matter what your children are, what happens to them. You want them to be like you: safely married, a house, a job. Right? And the education conditions the poor student, the poor child, as you the parents are conditioned, and this process has been going on for millennia upon millennia. This is our daily life and it is really a sorrowful life.

So one asks why human beings live by images - all your gods are images: the Christian god, the Muslim god and your god, they are created by thought because thought is uncertain, fearful. There is no security in the things that thought has put together, and the thing it has created as an image, that you worship. Such an illusory trick thought plays upon each other.

So is it possible to be free from our conditioning in our relationship? That is, to observe in the mirror of relationship attentively, closely, persistently, what our reactions are; whether they are mechanical, habitual, tradition. And in that mirror you discover actually what you are. So relationship is extraordinarily important.

How do you observe what you are in the mirror of relationship? So we have to enquire into what is to observe? Suppose you are married and you have a wife, and in that relationship that relationship is the mirror in which you see what you are; actually what you are, not theoretically - that you have some special consciousness, that there is something in you which is divine and all that kind of nonsense - actually what

you are. Then how do you observe? You understand? How do you observe yourself, what you are, in the mirror of relationship? What does it mean to observe? This is really another important thing one has to find out. What does it mean to look? When you look at a tree, which is the most beautiful thing on the earth, one of the most lovely things on the earth, when you look at a tree, how do you look at it? Do you ever look at it? Do you ever look at the new moon, the slip of the new moon, so delicate, so fresh, so young. Have you ever looked at it? Can you look at it without using the word 'moon'? Are you following all this? Are you interested in all this? Would you kindly tell me. You are really interested in all this?

I'll go on, like a river that goes on - you are sitting on the banks of the river, looking at the river, but you don't become the river ever, because you never take part of the river, you never join the beauty of a movement that has no beginning and no end.

So please consider what it is to observe. When you observe a tree, or the moon, something outside you, we always use the word - the tree, the moon - and can you look at that moon, that tree, that flower with all the colours of it, can you look at it without naming it, without using a word to identify? You are following all this? Can you look without the word, without the content of that word, without identifying the word with the tree or with anything? Now, can you look at your wife, at your husband, at your children without the word - my wife - without the image? Have you ever tried it? No. When you observe without the word, without the name, without the form you have created about her or him, in that observation there is no centre from which you observe. Are you following all this? Are you following all this?

Questioner: We can't hear this side.

Krishnamurti: Comment?

Q: We can't hear.

K: I don't think you are - that doesn't matter. You never even tried - to look at your pet politician without the word, without the form, without all the associations you have about him - to look at him. Can you look at the speaker, observe without your image, without the name? Then find out what happens.

The word is thought. Thought is born out of memory. So you have the memory, the word, the thought, the image interfering between you and the other. Right? So there is no thought - thought in the sense the word, the content of the word, the significance of the word, to look, to observe. Then in that observation there is no centre as me looking at you. Right? Then only there is a right relationship with another. Then in that, there is a quality of love, a quality of a certain beauty, a certain sensitivity, but if you have constantly an image about another there is no communication, there is no love, there is no depth of that word. So to look at another without the image, and the image is our conditioning. That is, we are conditioned, we are programmed. The Christian world has been programmed for two thousand years, the Muslim world for fourteen hundred years and perhaps the Hindu world five to three thousand years. And during those periods of time, which is called evolution, our brains have been conditioned by immense knowledge, great experience. Time and space has brought about the extraordinary quality of the brain. The speaker is not a brain specialist. The speaker does not want to be a specialist of any kind, even a religious specialist. But if you can observe your own activity of thought, that is, thought to observe itself, not you observe thought. You see the difference? Because you are put together by thought: your form, your name, your qualities, your fears, your anxieties, your nationality, your peculiar tendencies and so on, so on, are put together by thought. That is your consciousness, as we were saying yesterday. Psychologists, we were told this afternoon, they don't believe in consciousness. They only see matter and the reaction to matter, sensation and adjustment; adjustment to the present existence, whether slightly neurotic, and that is the result of various causes, and remove those causes, then you adjust yourself to the present society, to the present misery. And we are saying our conditioning is so deep, and to understand it one must understand the nature of effort.

May we go on? You are not tired? Are you sure you are not tired? You should be, because if you are actively co-operating in this, your brain must be active, questioning, asking, looking, experimenting as you are going on, now, not tomorrow. But all that needs attention, care, watching, and so you must be tired. But I will go on.

Why human beings throughout the world live in perpetual conflict? Please ask that question of yourself. You are in conflict. Your meditation is conflict, your worship is conflict. You have got various gods who are in conflict with each other and with you. Why human beings throughout the world live in constant struggle, pain, conflict. What is conflict? What is the cause of conflict? Where there is a cause, that cause has an end. You understand this? If I have a cause of pain, the doctor examines, if I have cancer he examines the cause and the symptom which is the pain - then that cause may be removed or may be terminal. So where there is a cause or a causation, there must be an ending of that causation. Right? So if you can find out, not be instructed - the speaker is not instructing you - but if you can find out for yourself what is the cause of conflict by which man has lived from time immemorial. What is the cause of it? Don't wait for the speaker to tell you. Go into yourself as we are doing now, find out what is the cause of this conflict outside and inside.

Is there one cause or many causes? If there are many causes, we can examine the many and slowly resolve each cause; or there may be only one cause. So, are there many causes for conflict? Or is there only one cause? One of the causes may be the constant attempt to become something - the becoming. Please, this is very important to understand. The becoming - I am this, I must be that - right? - I am greedy and I hope I will not be greedy. That is, to become something different from what I am. I am not beautiful, but I will become beautiful, I am violent but I will become non-violent. Right? So the becoming is a process of evolution. Right? You understand all this? Don't look so vague sir. All becoming, whether the clerk becoming the manager, and the manager becoming the chairman is a process of time which is evolution, from the low to the high. You plant a sapling which becomes a great tree, which is the evolution of that plant, of that tree. And, please listen if you are interested, is evolution one of the causes of conflict? You understand my question? That is, I am violent - all human beings apparently, most unfortunately are violent - and I am violent and I will become non-violent. The becoming from 'what is' is the process of evolution - right? - which requires time, space. Right? You are following all this? And we are asking, is evolution, this movement from 'what is' to 'what should be', which is a movement of evolution, is that one of the causes of conflict? Right? Is time one of the factors of conflict?

Is duality one of the causes of conflict? That is, there is duality - light and dark, man/woman, you know - duality, you know all that, outward, physical world, in that physical world there is duality - between good cloth and bad cloth, between a nice dress, which is tasteful, good material and bad material, between a good car and a bad car. Obviously, physically, there is difference. There is duality, different. And we are asking, inwardly, psychologically, is there a duality at all? I am violent. When I try to become non-violent there is duality. Right? You follow this? And we are asking does conflict exist as long as duality, and why have we psychologically, inwardly duality? I am violent and I have thought I must not be violent, and so I invent an idea called non-violence, which in this country is fashionable. And this fashion of non-violence is spreading all over the world, which has no meaning of course. Because violence is the fact, is real. Non-violence is fiction. Right? So, there is only 'what is', not 'what should be', so that if one realises that 'what is' is reality and not 'what should be', then you can dispense with 'what should be'. Then there is no duality. You understand this? The moment there is the idea 'I must not' or 'I should', or 'I will', away from 'what is', then there must be conflict. Right? Does one perceive this intellectually or actually, that there is no psychologically, inwardly, the opposite, only 'what is'? When there is only 'what is' you deal with 'what is', not with 'what should be'. Right? I am violent and this idea of non-violence is fictitious, is hypocritical. It has no value because in becoming non-violent I am sowing the seeds of violence all the time. So there is only violence, not...

What is violence? What is the nature and the structure of violence, not only to get angry, to hit somebody, to kill somebody, not only the killing of human beings but killing animals, killing nature. Fifty million whales have been killed by man. Do you understand all this? Violence is also imitation, conformity, trying to be something which you are not. So can one look at that violence with all the content of that word, not just physical anger or physical expression of that anger but to look at the whole content of that word and hold it, not move away from it, just hold that feeling, look at it, and not move away from it, neither suppress it nor escape from it, nor transcend it but just look at it as you would look at a precious jewel. And when you look at it, are you looking at it as something separate from you? Or what you observe is what you are. You understand my question? Please, this is important to understand. If some of you are tired don't listen, just go to sleep, but this is important to understand. We are violent. That violence we have said is different from 'me'. Therefore I try to change it to become something else. Right? That violence is 'me'. I am not different from violence. Greed is part of me, I am not different from violence, from greed, or envy, hate, or jealousy. Suffering is me but we have separated anger, jealousy, loneliness, sorrow as something separate from me. So I can control it, shape it - you follow? - run away from it, but if that is me, I can do nothing about it but just observe it. I wonder if you understand?

So the observer is the observed; the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experience. The two are not separate. So where there is division there must be conflict. If I am separate from my wife - of course physically I am separate - if I am separate psychologically from my wife there is bound to be conflict. So time, evolution, the sense of the opposite are the factors of violence. These are the many, and other factors; all those factors are me. So me, in essence is the cause of conflict. I wonder if you understand this? If one asks, how am I to be free of me, which is a wrong question - but to observe the whole movement of conflict, not translate it, not try to understand it, just to observe like you observe a marvellous movement of the skies, the ocean, then it tells you all its content without your analysing.

So a brain that is in conflict mechanically, psychologically, must inevitably bring about disorder in itself and so outwardly. Conditioning - which we will go into again next weekend - whether it is possible for human beings to be totally, completely be free of it? When there is that freedom, there is order, there is love, compassion, and that compassion is intelligence.

Right, sirs.

Second Public Talk in Madras

Sunday, December 26, 1982

First Public Question and Answer Meeting in Madras

First Public Question and Answer Meeting in Madras

Tuesday, December 28, 1982

There are a lot of questions here, which I haven't seen. It's good to ask questions, and from whom do you expect the answer? Is the answer more important than the question? If the question... and to put the question rightly also requires an art. When you have put the question, are you putting it to somebody, or to yourself? And if the question is important, does the answer lie in the question or away from the question? I hope we are communicating with each other. Does the answer lie or contain or hold in the question itself and not away from it? So in answering some of these questions we are going to examine the question, not try to find the answer to it, because in the examination of that question the answer itself lies or revealed in the examination of that question. I hope this is clear, that you and I are going to examine the question. See the nature of the question, the significance of that question, and in the understanding of that question the answer is revealed in the question. Are we together in this - I hope.

In the first talk you said that thought is responsible for all our problems, and you also said that thought has failed to resolve those problems, and you raised the question: if there is any other instrument resolve our conflicts. Please explain.

Do we all agree, or see the truth that thought throughout the world has brought about a great technological advancement, whose future is incalculable, and that thought has created the wars, the destruction of human beings, thought has created all the religious edifices, and the content of those edifices, thought has created all this. Are we all together on this point? Are we? Would you agree to that? Or you believe that thought is not responsible for the content of your temples, the churches and the mosques. What's your reaction to it? Please, if you will kindly talk it over with the speaker. You understand what I have said? That thought, which is the act of thinking, is responsible for all the wars in the world, for the national divisions of the world, that thought has created the gods which we worship, all the rituals, the whole hierarchical outlook of religious structure. Would you agree to all that? Not just intellectually agree - that has no meaning. Do we see this? What's the difficulty? Would you kindly talk it over with me? Or do you think the gods, the various saviours, are not the result of actual thinking? No?

Questioner: The significance which thought creates is not thought. The significance is not the thought.

Krishnamurti: The gentleman says significance of thought is not thought. When we use the word 'significance' which means the meaning - right, sir? - the meaning which thought conveys. Thought cannot be separated from its significance, can it? Or significance, the meaning, is contained in the thought. I think that - suppose - I think that India is the most spiritual country, and I think about it, surely it is thought that has given the significance that India is the most extraordinarily religious country. Right? What's the difficulty, sirs?

So, I am sure you don't agree with this because for a very obvious reason, that the things that we worship in the temples and so on are some miraculous happening, are something that is brought about through some kind of divine action. That's why we rather hesitate to accept or see the fact that thought has been responsible for all this. Right?

Q: Sir, we don't know of any other response. We do not know of any other response.

K: We are going to find out, but that requires a great deal of enquiry and freedom, otherwise you cannot find out. One has to put aside all that which is false. Right? How can one find anything new if we are attached to old traditions which are dead, to some belief that we hold dear, to some ideal we think is necessary - if we hold on to all those there is no freedom for enquiry. Right? Sir, a good scientist in his research, first he acquires, he has the knowledge of other people who have researched, has accumulated, and then he must set aside all that to find something new, otherwise he is not a top scientist, he is merely a machine repeating. Right? Would you agree to that?

Q: What is it that generates thought?

K: What generates thought. What do you think generates thought?

Q: Experience.

K: What is the beginning of thought?

Q: Thought is the result of something happening.

K: Thought is the result of something happening. The happening is, suppose I have a motor accident and I have broken my leg, and that is an experience which is stored in the brain - right, sir? - an experience stored in the brain, and that experience is knowledge of that accident, and from that accumulated knowledge of that accident, memory, and from that memory there is thought, that I had an accident which was very painful. It is the whole movement of experience, knowledge, memory and thought. That's the origin of thinking. Not the accident and then thought, the whole accident took place because I was driving badly, or somebody ran into me. What's the difficulty in this?

Q: But sir, you said that a good scientist... (inaudible) Would you say that that learning of what the previous scientists have discovered was necessary before he has to... (inaudible)

K: I'm afraid I haven't... (laughs) Has somebody heard? Would you kindly repeat it?

Q: She says, you said the discovery of the findings of the previous scientists had to be set aside for a scientist to discover something new.

K: Obviously.

Q: Or has he to put away as the previous scientists' knowledge and experience... (inaudible) ...to find something new.

K: Of course, sir. If I am a physicist I study from college, from school, college, university, and have accumulated a great deal of knowledge about physics, matter, the enquiry into matter, and if I want to discover something new I must put aside all that which I have known. Sir, have you ever considered how the jet - you know, the jet aeroplane - came into being? It didn't just happen. The previous engineers who constructed the piston engine had gathered a lot of information, and had put that aside, said this isn't good enough, and they were looking, waiting, searching, and suddenly somebody discovered the jet. But we don't want to do that. One wonders whether one likes to live in this conditioned brain with all its problems - you follow? - and accept it and carry on.

So, the speaker said at the first talk that all the activities of thought, both important and unimportant, dangerous and search for safety, security, are all the movements of thought. It's so obvious. I don't know why we hesitate about this matter. Right, sirs? Can we go on from there? No. It is very difficult for us to accept a fact or a truth when we are attached to our own particular concepts. If you would kindly, for this morning at least, put aside all one's conclusions, beliefs and ideals, and look at something different. After all, when you have a refrigerator in your house, if you are rich enough or well-to-do, you have moved away

from the old, haven't you? But in the same way would you kindly move away from the old and see what happens. You may not like it, it may disturb you life, but you can go back to it.

Q: (Inaudible) ...there is fear.

K: Of course, of course there is fear. That's why you are all hesitant. It's so obvious. If you are guaranteed that whatever the new instrument is, and you haven't to do anything, you would grab at it very quickly. But unfortunately we are so frightened of anything new - right? - because it is very disturbing. You have to scrap all the piston engines, you have to invest a great deal of money in something new. And that's what's called material progress - which you are doing. You are not frightened of having a new refrigerator or a new washing machine or a new car, but one is really frightened to let the old go. Which indicates that one's brain is functioning mechanically. Right, sir? I have known this, I am going to stick to it, and prove, guarantee me something, if there is the new, that I will also be safe. When you invest money - perhaps some of you do - when you invest money in a stock there is always fear that it might not succeed, but you invest it - right? - because there is the reward behind it. Here there is no reward. That's what your trouble is. Here there is no reward because it requires clear thinking, clear, objective, non-personal observation. Right, sirs?

Q: Sir, I have the realization that religion is a form of catharsis for those who are psychologically insecure. How would you explain the origin of our first thought?

K: Origin of first thought. Do you want my explanation?

Q: Very much, sir.

K: What for? I'll explain, but what for?

Q: (Inaudible)

Q: For thought to observe itself.

K: Have you ever done that?

Q: I'd like to try it. (Laughter)

K: You are all so crazy. (Laughs) You won't do anything original for yourself. You see, that means we are so authority-bound, so traditional, so mechanical, and you don't see the mechanical process of thought. All right sir, let's go back to it.

The questioner says, thought has created the problems, like war, like various forms of division between people, and thought then, having created the problem, then thought tries to find the answer to the problem. Right, sir? Would you agree to that? Would you agree to that? I have created a problem between myself and my wife, we have constant rows, disputes, quarrels. They arise because I want something and she wants something else, or she tells me what to do which I don't want to do. You understand? This constant division. Now, has thought created the problem between me and my wife? I am not married, fortunately. And I am asking you, has thought created the problem, this quarrel between me and my wife? Would you kindly answer this.

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Obvious, isn't it? No? By golly! You are the most extraordinary people all right. (Laughter) You refuse to see something obvious and acknowledge it. Thought has created the problem, quarrelling with my wife, and then thought says, I am going to try and resolve the problems. Right? First created the problem then it tries to solve the problem. You have it in this country politically, haven't you? It is all such a mess here. No? (Laughs) Even that you won't acknowledge. (Laughter) All right, sir, it's up to you.

Q: Is not a question of collective thought?

K: Yes, sir, it is collective thought. Do you understand when you said, sir, if I may respectfully ask, do you understand when you said, what the implication of that is?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: If thought is collective then your thinking is collective and therefore you are part of the collective. Right? So you are not an individual. (Laughs) You are all... Look sir, thought has created the problem. I am a Jew, you are an Arab. Right? Could you look at that, what is happening in the Middle East? I am a Jew, you are an Arab. I am a Jew because for the last three to four thousand years I have been programmed. Right? I have been told from childhood, and do various activities of childhood, that I am a Jew. Right? That is repeated to me day after day, day after day. So my brain is conditioned to the acceptance that I am a Jew. Right? And the other fellow across the border, which may be very near, he has been also told that he is an Arab, a Palestinian Arab. He's repeated that for the last fourteen hundred years, and he repeats that. Right? Right, sirs? Now, has not thought created the Jew and the Arab? Has not thought created that you are a Hindu? You accept that? If you accept that, then thought is responsible for the division between the Arab and the Jew, between the Hindu and the Muslim. Right? And thought then, because of this division, brings about conflict. Right? Pakistan and Hindu... India. Right, sirs? Which is, that division has brought about war. So thought is responsible for war. Right? And then thought says, I must solve this problem; we must seek peace. But I still remain a Jew and you still remain an Arab. No?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't understand.

Q: A noble thought can... (inaudible)

K: I see. So there is a noble thought and ignoble thought. Right? But it is still thought. Right, sir? It is still thought. You may think what I say may be ignoble and you may be noble, but the division, the division between what is noble and what is ignoble is created by thought. No?

Q: (Inaudible) ...an experience. Cannot thought arise spontaneously?

K: The gentleman asks, cannot thought and experience arise spontaneously. No, he didn't say that - I didn't hear properly.

Q: Besides thought arises out of memory and experience, cannot thought arise spontaneously?

K: Yes, I see. Thought arises from experience, knowledge, memory - right, sir? - and you are asking cannot thought arise spontaneously without knowledge.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, that's right, sir, that's right. Can thought arise spontaneously without knowledge, without experience and memory? That's the question, sir. Now what do you mean by spontaneity?

Q: Spontaneity means without having its base in the past memory...

K: Yes, sir, I am asking, if you will forgive me, I am asking what do you mean by the word 'spontaneous'?

Q: Spontaneity means having its own... (inaudible)

K: Sir - to be spontaneous.

Q: Instantly having... (inaudible)

K: No, sir, the word, the meaning of the word means something you do spontaneously, you do it without thought - right? - which means you do something from freedom. Right? Are you free to do something, freely? If I may ask you a question, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You can't try freedom. Either you are free or not free. You can't say, 'I will try to become free'. You see you are all... If you are really interested in all this would you kindly listen first? (Laughs) The speaker has said over and over again that thought is the result of experience, knowledge, memory stored in the brain, and from that memory thought arises. If I have no knowledge, no experience, no memory, what am I? I am in a state of amnesia. Right? You know that word 'amnesia' means blank. Right, sir? Unless one has an accident or some kind of disease in the brain there is no - human beings are not all... have not all amnesia - that would be terrible, wouldn't it. (Laughs) So please listen, find out, sir, for yourself whether thought is not responsible for all our miseries, and also thought is responsible for this extraordinary free flowing technology. Right? Would you agree to that?

Q: Sir, to find out this shouldn't one think?

K: Yes. Think - all right, let's think. Let's think. Now wait a minute, let's think. Right? Will you think with me? Or...

Q: Using thought as an instrument. It is said that thought is not the instrument to solve our problems.

K: I have said it, the speaker has said it. You may not believe it.

Q: Yes, I may not believe it, but then to find out the alternative instrument shouldn't I think what alternative instrument...

K: I am going to point out, lady, I am going to do it presently. But first if you don't mind my telling most respectfully that we must think first. Right? Right? Do we think? Or repeat, repeat, repeat. Is repetition thinking? Right? I have been trained as an engineer and I repeat. Right? So are we aware that our brains are mechanical now? You see now there comes our difficulty. Right? Would you agree to that? That our brains now, the educated brains and the uneducated brains have become mechanical. Would you agree to that? Are we aware that your brain, your actions are mechanical? If you admit our brains are mechanical then your life is mechanical. No? Right? You are unwilling to admit that. Yes, that's just it. (Laughs)

Q: Sir, when you come to the conclusion that thought is responsible for all of our misery...

K: It's not a conclusion, it is a fact.

Q: Whether it is a fact... (inaudible) ...the knowledge is limited, so it is also a kind of knowledge.

K: Sir, the speaker has said knowledge is limited. Right?

Q: Yes, limited.

K: Are you aware the knowledge is limited?

Q: No, according to you. (Laughter) You say...

K: Sir, sir, sir, sir, just a minute if you don't mind. Are you merely accepting what the speaker says or have you investigated for yourself that knowledge, all knowledge - right? - not a particular subject, all knowledge, the scientific knowledge, the technological knowledge, the knowledge of books, the knowledge of your experience, all knowledge is limited.

Q: If it is limited it means it is also a kind of knowledge which is limited. So we can't say.

K: I don't quite understand this.

Q: Well we accept that knowledge is limited.

K: Don't accept it, sir, it's a fact.

Q: OK, it's a fact.

K: Not OK, it's a fact. (Laughter) Really most extraordinary. Sir, when you have pain - I hope you haven't - when you have pain you don't acknowledge that you have pain, you have pain. Right, sir? Right, sir? Now do you, do we see the fact that thought born of knowledge is always limited? Right, sir? Can we go on from there? That knowledge is limited, otherwise there would be no technological advancement - if it is limited you stop, but they are breaking through - you understand? - trying to find more and more and more. But whatever they find is always limited because there is something more. Right? Technologically. Agree to that, sir? So, as knowledge is limited, thinking which is born of knowledge must always be limited. Right? Would you agree to that? This is logical, sir, what are you... So what is limited must inevitably create problems. Right? Would you agree to that? Look sir, I am a Jew, you are a Hindu or a Muslim or Arab - the same thing, Islamic world. The division has taken place by thought. Right, sir? Thought has brought this division because thought itself is limited. Right? So, where there is division there is bound to be limitation. Right? Where there is limitation there must be conflict - I am a Jew, you are an Arab. Right? This is difficult. All right, sir? I am saying - put it differently - where there is division - Jew, Hindu, Arab - where there is a division there must be conflict.

Q: There can be without conflict... (inaudible)

K: Oh, can there be?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just a minute, sir, look into it. The Arab and the Jew; the Arab says, 'God is with me', and a different kind of god is with the Jew - which is created by thought. Right? (Laughs) My golly. Let's go into it again. Would you acknowledge, or see the fact for yourself without my... without the speaker influencing you, that thought is limited. It can imagine the limitless but it is still born of thought. Right? Now, thought has divided the world into Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim - right? - so where there is division there must be conflict. Wait a minute, I'll bring it much nearer. Is there not division between you and your wife, or your husband? Right? Would you acknowledge? There is, sir? So where there is division there must be conflict, isn't there? Between you and - perhaps not you sir, I hope - but isn't there conflict between you and your wife? That is, if there was no division would there be conflict? No, obviously. So conflict arises always where there is a division - the poor and the rich, the communist and the non-communist, the Marxist and the capitalist and so on. Right? So where there is division, there must be conflict, it's law. Right? It's a law, it's an eternal law. Agree? Where there is division of any kind there must be struggle, conflict, problems.

Q: You cannot do without thought.

K: We are going to find out, sir. You are saying that we cannot do without thought. Now, where are the limits of thought? You understand my question? That is, where do you draw the line? Thought has its place - right? - which is going to the office, going to do... speaking a language, driving a car, the whole world of technology - thought is necessary. Right? Now, where is thought not necessary? Find out, sir, come together, let's find out. Do you understand my question, sir? Thought is necessary. Thought is necessary to go from here to your house - right? - you take the road, the car, all the rest of it. And we also see that thought has created division; where there is division there must be conflict, that's a law. So where do you draw the line? Say thought is necessary, and thought is not necessary. I wonder if you understand this. Is thought necessary - just a minute, listen please, sirs - is thought necessary in relationship? Now you are

stuck!

Q: The physical needs creates the division, my hunger and your hunger.

K: Hunger is hunger. It's not my - no, sir - it's not your hunger or my hunger, it's hunger.

Q: It's a fight for food. Survival creates the division.

K: Which is what?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Don't say you don't know, let's look at it. Survival. I seek...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand, sir. I need food and you need food. Now, in India there is overpopulation, multiplying every year by ten million or more. You understand the danger of all this, sir? And government is trying to solve the problem, I don't know if they are, but perhaps you know better. Now can they ever solve it? You want food and I want my - right? - hunger is both... is your - to survive we must be fed. Now if the population is increasing every year by fifteen million - I wonder if you realise what that means. Every year the population of Holland is added to this country. You understand, sir? Now how are you going to solve the problem? By being India? Which means what? A global relationship. Right? Would you agree to that? Global relationship which means no nationalities. Right?

Q: My physical needs creates a division - I become self-centred.

K: Yes, sir, I am saying that. Because your hunger, my hunger must be fed. And there are thousands of people in this unfortunate country not being fed. Right? One meal a day or less than that. And how is this multiplying population going to be fed? Either India has a great deal of rain, no failure of monsoons and so on, even then it will not be enough. Right? Therefore logically, humanly, sanely, there must be no division between people - America and - which means global interrelationship. Right? And no governments want to do that, because you elect them, because you still feel you are an Indian, he still feels a Pakistani. This is all so simple, sir. Can you drop your nationalism?

Q: The government encourages nationalism.

K: Of course, government encourages you to be nationalistic.

Q: You have competition between...

K: Yes, sir, yes, sir, I know all that. And you fall into the trap, and you like that.

Sir, let's come back. Would you, do you see the fact, if I may ask, that where there is division between my wife and myself there must be conflict? Right, sir? Now how will you get over that conflict?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, sir, look at it carefully. I am married, I have a wife, she thinks one way and I think another way. She wants babies and I don't want babies. She wants to be popular, belonging to some select group, and I say, silly, I just, I don't want that. You follow? There is constant division. Right? Isn't your problem this? No? Gosh, ashamed, we don't even face this fact. Right. Now how am I to get over this division, which thought has created, you understand? Right? I am ambitious, I am greedy, I am envious, I want to become the executive or the chief foreman in a factory, and she has her ambitions and so on. Right? So what shall I do? Both are created by thought. Right? So what shall I do? Advise me please.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Drown my wife, are you saying? (Laughter)

Q: The moment I am aware... (inaudible)

K: Sir, just stick to one simple thing, sir. There is division between me and my wife, and that division must inevitably create conflict. Right? How am I to get over this division?

Q: Compromise.

K: Compromise. That's - all right, compromise. What am I compromising?

Q: The moment I want something and she wants something...

K: Sir, are you being factual or just imagining? How do I compromise with my wife? I don't want to go out at night to parties and all that, she does. Wait, sir, listen to this, sir. And what am I to compromise with? I don't want to go out at night to parties. I think parties are disgusting. Personally I do. (Laughs) I don't want to go out. And my wife who has been brought up differently because her father is rich and all that nonsense, and she says, 'I want to go out' - where is the compromise?

Q: Very simple - you allow her to go and you don't go.

K: So she goes and I stay at home. (Laughter) And you call that compromise? (Laughs) You are all rather funny, sir. Do look at it, please, stick to one thing.

Q: You can't do anything about it, you just think about it.

K: No, sir. If there are a whole group of us, not just you and I, but the whole group of us, saying, look, nationalism is a disease - right? - 'nationalism divides people, nationalism creates - one of the reasons for war is nationalism - economic war - you follow? - all that. So, I have thought about it and you have thought about it. As long as there is nationalistic division there must be starvation. Right? So the solution to that is no nationalism - right? - a global relationship. Now, people - it is now becoming more and more strong, nationalism - right? - British, British, British; French - you follow? - so one has to show to all the people logically, sanely, that nationalism is a disease. Then we might have food for all people. Right, sir?

Q: In Russia there is no starvation... (inaudible)

K: What are you talking about, sir? They are buying grain from all over the world. You people! No, sir, don't... You see you don't - sir, you always go back to something, explain something else. Please, just give this one thought, think about this, that where there is division there must be conflict. My wife and I quarrel, have rows every day. You understand what happens when I have a quarrel between my wife, and every day what is happening to me and to her? You aren't even aware of it. What is happening to her? Sir, we are destroying each other, aren't we? No? Now, if you see the fact, not theories about it, not intellectual comprehension, it is a fact that where there is division there must be destruction. Right? Destruction is quarrels, rows, each wanting his way. Right? So what shall I do? Thought cannot solve this problem. Right? Are you quite sure? Then what is the... what will you do? Thought is not the answer to our quarrels, to our divisions, then what shall I do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Do you see nationalism as a danger?

Q: Somewhat.

K: Not somewhat, sir. Cancer is danger, isn't it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, cancer. If I have cancer, I say, well, it is partly dangerous. (Laughs)

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I say nationalism is a cancer, is cancerous. Right?

Q: How is the family unit different from nationalism, sir?

K: Sir, you jump from one thing to another. You haven't given up your nationalism - you won't, I know you won't - but you have now turned to the family unit. What is a family unit? Me, my wife, or my wife and me, and my children. Right? I educate them, if I can, send them a good school if I can, and I am concerned. As the world is now overpopulated, my son goes off to Bombay or to Delhi or to America, and my family is in some village or in some town, the family is broken up. Right? There is no family unit. Even in India that is gradually being broken up. It has broken up in Europe and in America. And that's one of the calamities. You understand? Oh, you people don't even think about all this. Right, sir?

So is there another instrument which will solve this problem? You understand, sir? You understand my question? Thought has not solved it by yielding to her, or surrendering to her, or she surrendering to me - which is a terrible thing, isn't it? Why should she surrender to me, or I to her? When you surrender you are still what you are. So, what shall I do? Knowing that thought will not solve this problem, what shall I do?

Q: End my 'me'.

K: Now, how do you end the 'me'?

Q: By being aware.

K: Don't use just words, sir, don't play with me seriously. This is a serious talk, don't just play with words. Are you aware of your selfish attitudes? Are you aware that your wife is selfish and you are selfish? Are you aware that your children are also selfish? And this selfishness is increased by becoming an engineer, a physicist - they may be marvellous physicists, great scientists, but their life is mediocre. No? No? So what shall I do?

Q: Sir, awareness doesn't remove the division.

K: I am going to show you something sir, you don't... I know you are aware. You are aware of the division. Right, sir? And what havoc it is creating in the world. Agree? Sir, this is not an agreement, you have to feel this, you have to... it must be in your blood, that wherever there is division there must be conflict. That's a law, like gravity is a law. Right?

Q: Don't be a part of division.

K: You hear that statement, sir? Don't be part of division. He is just throwing words. You are not serious when you just say, don't be... drop your division. You can't. You people! Sir, just let's stick to it. We are divided - right? - my name, my form, my desires, my reactions, my education has helped me to keep divided. Right? And that division is creating great danger outwardly as war, and also with my wife and children. What shall I do? Pray to god? Run off? Leave, abandon my wife? Or she runs away. What shall I do? Don't go to sleep, please, find out what to do.

So I have to enquire something... I have to enquire, haven't I? Right, sir? What does enquiry mean? To

enquire into something I must be free to enquire - there must be freedom to enquire. Right? I mustn't say, this is the way to solve it, this is the way to solve it, I must surrender, I must do this. Right? I must be free from all that to enquire. Right? Like a scientist, he is free to enquire. Right, sir? So are you free to enquire? Or in your enquiry there is a motive. You understand what I am saying, sir? If there is a motive, that motive is going to dictate your enquiry. Right, sir? So can you enquire without a motive, without an end, just to have the capacity, the intelligence to enquire. You understand, sir?

That is, I have a tremendous problem between me and my wife - which is the same problem in the world - you understand? This problem cannot be solved by thought. So what shall I do? I must find a new instrument which is not thought. Right, sir? Now, I have to enquire into it, I can't say, 'Tell what is the new instrument'. Right? I have to enquire. Right, sir? Now, to enquire there must be freedom - from my tradition, from my conclusions, from my opinions. Right? I can't say I'll stick to my opinion, my conclusion, my tradition, and enquire, that is not possible. You understand? It is like a boat in a harbour which has dropped its anchorage, and says, 'I must sail' - it must remove the anchor and then move. Right? Right, sir? The anchorage that you have dropped is your tradition, is your belief, is your condition, is your conclusions - drop them, otherwise you can't find the new. Right, sir? Right? Would you agree even logically to that? Can you drop your conclusion - that there is god, there is no god, that this system is better - conclusion. Do you know the meaning of that word 'conclusion' means? To end all further discussion. I conclude you are great and I stop there. But if I don't conclude I have freedom to enquire. You follow, sir? Most of us have conclusions. Right? Now to enquire I must drop my conclusion. Right? Which means what? The brain then is becoming free. Right, sir? Conclusion now is conditioning the brain, is limiting the activity of brain. Right, sir? So if I drop my conclusions about politics, about god, about anything, drop it, then the brain becomes extraordinarily alive. Right? Right, sir?

Sir, look, some Indians are going abroad, aren't they? Here they feel there is no opportunity for them. They go abroad and do extraordinarily well - extraordinarily well in the sense of having a great deal of money. Right? Right, sir? They are doing very well, joining big companies, inventing new things. And here they say there is no opportunity. I heard an Indian, who is fairly well known on television in England, he was being interviewed, he said, the interviewer asked him, 'Are you going back to India?', he said, and the Indian said, 'No, there is no opportunity there'. Right? Opportunity being more selfish advancement. (Laughs) Right, sir? More money. Yes, sir.

So, will you give up your conclusion to investigate? Right, sir? Will you? To find out how to end this terrible destruction between me and my wife, between wife and me. You understand, sir? Can't we give up a conclusion to settle this? How tragic it all is, isn't it, sir? I can't give up a conclusion, or several conclusions, to end the battle between me and my wife. Right, sir? Which means what? We are so damn selfish. Right, sir? Unless you drop, understand naturally, logically, sanely, that any form of conclusion - the word 'conclusion' means to end: I conclude a treaty, that means I conclude a marriage, I conclude that god exists, then I can't enquire. If I keep on repeating, 'I believe in god, god, god', it just a repetitive conclusion. But if I really want to find out if there is god then I have to drop my conclusion and enquire. Which means I must be fearless to find out. Right, sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Because - why am I clinging to my conclusions - because you think in conclusions there is safety, there is security. You don't know what will happen if you give up your conclusions and therefore you are frightened, therefore you hold on to your conclusions.

Q: How to break it?

K: It is not how to break it - see the fact. I have got cancer. That's a fact. I don't say, 'How to break it?', it's a fact. So I go to the doctor and the doctor says, 'My friend, come immediately you have to be operated'. And I,

if he is a good doctor and trust him and all the rest of it, I am operated. I may die but I am operated. Right, sir? But I may die. And if I don't, say, 'I may die', therefore I am frightened, I don't get operated but I stand with pain. Right, sir? It's all so logical.

So I am concerned to end my division, quarrel with my wife. I am concerned. I really want to end this division between me and my wife, between me and the world. You understand, all the rest of it. And for that I have to give up - I see I cannot conclude, if I do there must be division, and the quarrel will continue. That's all. If you like quarrels, if you like rows endlessly until you die, it's your life. If you like to live that way, live that way. Don't talk about god and puja and all that kind of - that leads to hypocrisy. The rich man doing puja - right, sir? You see the cynicism of it? Right, sir?

Q: The trouble is the extent to which I am prepared to go to give up my selfishness.

K: I didn't say that. Give up your conclusion.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, but I don't want to include that - selfishness is such a complex, subtle process. Take one thing, which is conclusion, and find out if you can end it. I conclude I must be something, and my poor wife doesn't want any conclusion, she wants to be treated kindly, gently, affectionately. My conclusion is preventing that. Right? Will you give up your conclusion? I know you won't sir, you just nod your head but you won't.

Q: Sir, we have come to you as a patient to a doctor.

K: No. I have made it very clear. I have made it very clear, sir, if you don't mind my repeating it. We are together investigating, together thinking, to find out a way of living in which there is no conflict. We are thinking together. I am not your guru, I am not your doctor. I don't want to be your doctor, or your guru. Perhaps because you aren't worth it. Or you are not the right patient.

So, sirs, to end division you must have love. Right, sir? And you don't know what that word means in this country or in Europe. Right, sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, did you hear what I said? I'll repeat it, sir, if you don't mind. Where there is division there is no love. Right? Agree? Not agree - see the fact. See it, sir?

Q: Where there is division, only there can be love and harmony.

K: What?

Q: How can there be love and harmony if there is no division at all?

Q: If there is no division there cannot be love, the opposite.

K: Sir, have you been listening to what we have been talking about for nearly an hour and a half? Sir, apparently from this question of this morning, we have come to a certain point from which you can go further, which is, where there is division there cannot be the end of conflict. Right? Conflict will continue as long as there is division - between peoples, between nationalities, between people who are rich and poor. You follow, sir? As long as there is division there must be conflict. And between my wife and me there is conflict. And I want to end that conflict because I don't want to destroy her or destroy myself. Right, sir? The way we live is destroying us, so I want to end the conflict. And to enquire into how to end that conflict I must be free from my conclusions. Just one conclusion, or half a dozen conclusions - end them. Sir, see the fact. Conclusions divide. You understand, sir? You have concluded that you are a Hindu, I have concluded that I am a Muslim. Right? It is a conclusion. I hold to that conclusion, which means I won't think any more

about it, it is so, I am a Muslim. I have concluded. You understand, sir? And you have concluded as an Indian. So can't you give up that conclusion? One conclusion. Can you? Because if you can't I am going to destroy her, and she is going to destroy me. Right, sir? So I say, 'For god's sake, I'll give it up'. That has no value. Right? Because my urge is to live peacefully with her, to have affection for her, not treat her like a breeding instrument, to treat her as a human being. That means I must consider her, I must care for her, I must look after her, I must have sympathy, affection, love for her. But all this is meaningless to you because you have never enquired into the nature of love. Right, sirs?

So we have answered the question, that there is a new instrument, which is not thought. We can go - I'll go into it much more, but you must leave your position to understand what the speaker is saying. Right, sir? Not always repeat the old, say how to get rid... Enquiry means moving together. Right, sir? Will you do that? Because the world is in a tremendous danger, sir. Right? As long as I am quarrelling with my wife I'll quarrel with the rest of the world. If there is no order in my house I create disorder in the world. Right, sir?

First Public Question and Answer Meeting in Madras

Tuesday, December 28, 1982

Second Public Question and Answer Meeting in Madras

Second Public Question and Answer Meeting in Madras

Thursday, December 30, 1982

I hope this meeting is not merely an amusement or entertainment. There are several questions here which I have not seen, and we will talk over together. I wonder if one participates or shares in what we are discussing - we are going to answer these questions - do we share or do you merely listen to the speaker? Do you understand the difference? Say for instance, I would like to share with you certain thoughts, certain attitudes, certain qualities of the mind. And to investigate that, the quality of one's brain and the mind requires a great deal of patient direct investigation, not through some theories, not through any form of concepts and principles, but putting all that aside to find out why we think certain things, why we believe, what is the cause of our anxiety, our lack of relationship, our lack of communication and so on. Are we aware of the activities of our brain with all its extraordinary capacities? Are we aware of our senses, the senses that are really part of our life? Are we aware of this extraordinary complex movement of life, not only as one lives but the life of humanity which has such varieties, such great aptitudes and capacities. Are we aware of all this, or are we merely aware of one's own little problems, one's own dejections and impressions, and so on? It is really quite an interesting question to ask of ourselves, whether we are aware, actually not theoretically, of what is going on in the world and in ourselves. Or are we so conditioned, so neglectful, not diligent that we really are totally unaware of the beauty of these trees, the quality of the air, the dirt, the squalor, the ever restless seas, are we aware of all this, or only very limited life?

So, we will answer some of these questions.

Shall we talk over this together? Because for the last - the speaker has been every winter for the last 50 years coming to this country, travelling abroad, going all over the place, and one sees the decline not only in Europe and America but also especially, obviously, palpably, the decline in this country. The speaker has been asking various scholars, politicians, some scientists and so on, what has happened, or what is the quality of Indian mind? Of course, it is a vast generalisation to say what is the Indian mind, because the Indian mind varies from north, south, east and west, but assuming that it is inaccurate to put such a generalised question, but knowing that and probably it is incorrect to say what is the Indian mind - you are following me? What is the Indian mind? And the questioner says, the ancient people of this country. This country has exploded all over Asia at one time, historically - as Greece, ancient Greece, exploded, waves all over the west. Right? We are following each other? And the questioner asks what has happened to the Indian mind. So, we are going to, if you will, going to enquire what is the Indian mind today. Is that all right? Are you interested in it?

What actually is the Indian mind, today, not go back to the ancient world and be proud about it, or that we are a very ancient race and all that kind of business, but actually when you begin to investigate what is the Indian mind, knowing a generalisation is always inaccurate because you cannot generalise the whole - what is the European mind or the American mind or the British mind - but if you begin to enquire into what is the - not only the human mind, the mind of humanity, but also to particularise that mind, geographically as India - what is our mind? I wonder if you have ever asked that question. I doubt it. If you do ask that question - what is our mind? Is it materialistic? Drawn towards technology? Following the western world of vast movement in the technique, with the computers. Computers are taking over the world. They out-think, out-solve all the technological problems, think much faster, has infinite memory. Right? Your computer is taking over the world. The speaker saw on a television in California where the Japanese car makers Honda -

probably you have heard of that car - the workers were in white gloves, white apron, spotless, and there was a computer and the robot. The computer was telling the robot how to build a car and the robot was screwing the nuts and polishing, doing everything that human beings generally do in building a car.

Is our brain computerised? You understand my question? That is, we have been programmed as the computer is programmed. But our brains are much slower, not tremendously active. We only use a very, very, very small part of the brain. So are we, is the Indian mind materialistic, which is seeking - you know what materialism is, I don't have to tell you. And is the Indian mind - knowing always generalisation is not correct - is the Indian mind - may I talk about it frankly? You don't mind? Sure you don't mind? Can you stand it? Right, here goes! Because the speaker would like to be as polite as possible, most respectful, but when we are investigating into a thing like this we must be totally unbiased, totally impersonal, completely unidentified.

The Indian mind as one observes is authoritarian-bound. Right? It functions in a hierarchical movement. Right? It follows, it accepts authority, ancient tradition, the authority of some ancient books, the authority of the guru, the authority of someone who says he knows, he is illumined, blah blah, and you follow him. Right? Would this be correct? Which means, where there is authority there is fear. Have you ever watched a higher politician meet you, how you grovel, almost double up with false respect. This is one of the conditions of the Indian mind - following authority, sycophanticism, fear and therefore totally disorder. Right? No? Disorder in the streets, disorder in one's life, disorder in society and each one out for himself. Not that it does not happen or take place in Europe or America or even Russia, but it is more obvious in this country - utter carelessness, total disregard, lack of consideration. Right? Would you accept all this? And the Indian mind is capable of absorbing everything; different kinds of philosophies, however much contradictory they are. It is so tolerant; it will accept everything. Right? Contradictory philosophies, contradictory gurus, contradictory concepts. So, when your brain is capable of such absorption, it becomes rather sloppy. Right?

Sorry, sir, you can't see my face, but you can hear my voice. Come and sit in front. Come and sit in front, sir - plenty of room here. Have some fun sitting. Come in please sir, please come and look - you don't have to look round the corner. (Laughs) I hope you understand English.

So, when such a mind, such brain is capable of absorbing, tolerant of dirt, squalor, disorder, lack of beauty - probably you never look at a tree, never look at the open skies with all the brilliant stars. Put up with anything. So, such a mind is a very sloppy mind. It is not a mind that is active, alive, seeing everything. So it is tradition-bound and very theoretical, very clever in analysis. That is why they are doing such excellent work in Europe and America; they are capable of great analysis, more subtle than the Western world, but it is all theoretical, problematical, hypothetical, quoting the Gita, the Upanishads, and then trying to relate what has been said to your life. Obviously you don't, so essentially the brain has become sloppy. Therefore, it is capable of becoming materialistic - money, money, money. Isn't that so? Do look at it all sirs. Don't accept the speaker's word and then refute it, or argue against it, split hair about it, which you are doing now. But if you really want to try and utterly change such a quality of the brain, which has become so dead, but technologically you have become extraordinarily alive. But in the psychological world, which is much more interesting, there there is not activity at all. You will talk about the self, the cosmos, discuss very clearly, and cleverly - a sophisticated brain which has lived in theories. But when you come down to your relationship with other human beings, there is nothing at all.

And one asks - may I go on? You don't mind? I don't care if you mind or don't mind, these are facts - and one asks: is there love at all? Love. Not attachment, not personal pleasure in sex and so on, but is there love in this country? That is, generous, kind, considerate, having great sympathy - that is only the outward symbols, the outward activity - but the depth of love, compassion. Have you? If you have such love, would there be war, would you allow the government to accumulate armaments to kill other human beings?

Enquire into all this sir. Or we don't care what happens, how we treat our women, your women, your wives. Have you ever gone into all this? The husband walks in front, the wife follows behind.

And is the Indian mind, apart from the technological inventions, is the Indian mind capable of creation? You understand by the word 'creation'? To live a creative life, not a life of pattern - you understand? - following pattern after pattern, system after system, and therefore gradually the brain withers through constant conflict. Is this the Indian mind? Please ask it of yourself. I am not asking you, I am not telling you. Is this the Indian mind that is so chaotic, so disorderly, irresponsible?

Somebody the other day wanted to telephone to Europe and nobody cared to answer, to get the number requested. Waited two or three hours to get it until somebody appealed to a higher authority, and immediately there was action. Right? What do you think of all this? Do please see the tragedy of all this. You may read the Gita, Upanishads - totally unrelated to daily life. There is no application of what you read to daily life. You hear this, and if one may point out - just words. You don't say: look, am I like that? Is my life disorderly? Is my life, my way of thinking hierarchical? One has to have authority of law - naturally - the policeman and so on. But there too there is such vast corruption. You know all this. So, what is the Indian mind? What is the French mind, the British mind? If you live there long enough, one begins to find out. I won't discuss the French mind or the English mind. That is an easy escape from facing these facts.

So, what shall we do when an ancient race, three to five thousand years of a certain culture wiped out overnight. Right? The Brahmanic culture - don't get upset about using that word. You are all probably anti-Brahmin, pro-Brahmin, or whatever it is. The Brahmanical culture, however bad or good, for five to three thousand years has put a strong imprint on the Indian brain - their culture, their books and everything, and overnight it is gone. You understand? It is gone. Why? You understand all this, what I am talking about? Are you interested in all this? You must ask this very serious question: why a certain culture lasting for thousands of years, which has had such strong imprint, strong impression on the human brain, why there is this anti-Brahminism, pro-Brahminism. You follow? Why has it been wiped out? Now it is the fashion in this country to smoke, to drink, to eat meat. Right, sir? I am not pro- or anti-Brahmin, but I am saying that these are the facts. And what has happened to that culture, whether it is good or bad? Was it just a veneer, surface, like a coat that you put on and throw off? The tradition which is dead, is this the Indian mind? And if it is - we are not dogmatic about it, that is why I am saying if it is - if it is, what shall we do? Come on sirs. Answer this question. Just carry on sloppily, indifferent, sluggish? Have you ever noticed that whenever you go to a meeting, somebody is telling you what to do - the politicians, the gurus, the philosophers, who are translating or interpreting the everlasting Gita. You know all this, don't you? Commentaries on Gita - if you have nothing to do, you make commentaries. You live on commentaries. You understand, sir?

So, realising all this, what shall we do? Don't go to sleep. This is a question that you must answer. This is the crisis, not wars or nuclear bombs, this is our crisis. That means one has to observe very carefully, become aware of ourselves because we are the history of mankind. We are the story of mankind. And if we don't know how to read that book with clarity, without any interpretation, then we are going to destroy ourselves. But you don't care, do you? You'll have clever arguments against all the speaker has said and thereby prevent yourself from doing anything. That is what I call a sloppy mind, a brain that is analytical, clever, very subtle, and in their analysis they remain at that superficial, theoretical level, which has nothing whatsoever to do with our daily life. I hope you see the tragedy of this. So is it possible to change radically, break through our condition and be free human beings?

Is that enough? Please, there is no sense of scolding about this, no sense of being superior or inferior. I am not your guru. I am not a philosopher. Each one of us has to be both the teacher and the disciple. The teacher who teaches and the disciple who is learning, learning from life, not from books. There is no end to the making of books. But each one of us, if we see what we are and learn from what we are, move, change,

then we become both the guru and the disciple.

The body ages, grows old, but is the ageing of the brain inevitable. You understand - not the mind for the moment. As the questioner says, it is inevitable for the body to age, grow old and die through accident, disease or constant usage, malnutrition, wrong food, the battle that goes on in our heart and mind, all that psychosomatic activity affects the body. Right? Over-drinking, over-sex, overeating, without exercise - look at you all. So, the body inevitably ages. And the questioner wants to know is it inevitable for the brain to age and decay. You understand the question?

What makes a machine, an internal combustion machine, what makes it age? Any kind of friction in the machine makes the machine grow old. Right? This is obvious. Our brain is a kind of machine and it grows old because we live with friction, we live with conflict, struggle, perpetual battle with ourselves, and with the rest of the world. Right, sirs? I am not saying anything new. This is a fact, that as long as there is friction, conflict, battle, rows with one's wife, husband, quarrelling, abusing each other, hurting each other, the brain must inevitably decay. Right?

And also the computer is coming into being now. Please listen to this. We have been talking over with experts about this, top people. The computer can do almost anything that the human brain can do. Right? Almost. It can out-think, out-plan, remember vast information - a little chip contains million memories. And if the computer can do anything, almost anything that human beings can do - of course it cannot look at the stars and see the beauty of the stars, it cannot watch the movement of the wind among the leaves - right? - but each generation of computers is better than the other generation. You understand all this? So what is going to happen to the human brain? You are following all this? Sir, do ask these questions for god's sake. This question is not being asked by the professionals, by the top people. They are only concerned with building better computers, more advanced, ultra mechanical intelligence as they call it. If the computer can do everything, almost, then what is going to happen to the human brain? You understand my question, sir? Are you interested in all this? Or are you just listening for the fun of listening? What is going to happen to your brain if the computer does almost everything? The brain has lived because it has to struggle, it has to work, go to the office, you know, it has to be active, active in its friction. But when that friction, that activity is gradually transferred to the computer, what is going to happen to your brain? The computer can invent a new god. Right? Super-god, better than your gods. It can have marvellous theories. It can invent. You understand, sir? A mathematical professor can program a computer, most complex mathematical problems, and the computer comes out with its own new theorems. So go into it all, sir, you don't know what is happening in the world.

So, what is going to happen to your brain? Either it is going to pursue entertainment - right? - religious entertainment, football, cinema, the puja, it is all entertainment - aren't they - to pass the time, in the name of god, in the name of some kind of silly affair, because we all want to be entertained. You are following all this, sirs? See the seriousness of all this, sir, for god's sake. And the industry, the entertainment industry is already so active: television, football, cricket. I do not know if you have not noticed the world of sport is becoming more and more. Right? So the human brain demands entertainment because it cannot face itself - the troubles, the anxieties, the sorrow, the pain - so it wants to escape into all that. Either you escape through all that and therefore the brain becomes inactive, being entertained from the outside, or you go inward. There are only two possibilities. Are you getting all tired? You understand, sirs, all this? Either you are being entertained, as you are now, becoming more and more caught in the world of entertainment, going to the temples and making more... Or you go inward: the whole exploration of the whole psyche. Not according to books and philosophers and psychologists, but for yourself, enquire into yourself.

Sir they are enquiring into astrophysics, that is, into the heavens. There they are discovering all kinds of things - black holes - you must have read some of them. But nobody except very, very, very few have gone into the whole inward world. That inward world is vast, immense, incalculably deep. Don't accept my words

for it. Don't say it is what our ancients said. Throw the ancients out. You are all too clever, but you have never gone inward and discover for yourself the great beauty, a perception that is logical, sane, healthy, a world that is immeasurable, which has nothing whatsoever to do with entertainment. That requires great care, hesitant observation, step by step. That brings about order in one's life. And when there is order in your house, there is order in society. But now we want order in society, in environment while we are disorderly. That is what the Communists try to do - establish order outside with laws, tremendous suppression and all the rest of it, hoping to change man. It is the same pattern being repeated in a different strata. Right?

So, the brain can remain without ageing if there is no friction, if there is no strain, no conflict, but as long as there is the self - me and you, we and they - as long as there is this idea of the individual opposed to the whole, there must be conflict, and that is what is happened to all human beings. To have a brain that is untouched by memory. You won't understand all this. You understand, sir? Our brain - oh, I can go on into it, what's the point of it? - our brain is trodden down by tradition, our brain is caught in past memories, remembrances. There is no pristine, a brain that is completely free. Then that brain is ageless, and yet got extraordinary vitality, passion behind it. Right sir? Will you do something about it? Or just listen to a talk and say yes, that's good, but, but, but...

Very good question sir, if you are willing to listen. Not the others were not interesting too.

All religions have suppressed the senses. Right? Face the fact, sirs - control your senses, don't yield to them. The speaker was walking behind a group of sannyasis in Kashmir at one time. There was marvellous blue sky, clean air, lots of wild flowers - air was scented with them, the smell of the hills and the groves and the valleys, the smell of the earth, the dew upon the earth. And these sannyasis in front, about a dozen of them, never looked at the trees. They had their head bent, chanting something or other, muttering, and never took notice of the beauty of the earth. Right? You have seen them haven't you? Which you are doing too - it is not reserved to the sannyasis, it is not their special privilege. And they never, never for mile upon mile, never looked at the trees. You understand? There was a stream flowing by. That stream was chattering, making music. The flow of that stream was the clear, unpolluted water, and the sannyasis never looked at that water, nor the trees, nor the blue sky, nor the mountains covered with snow, because sensory responses might lead to sex, might lead to all kinds of desires. Right? Therefore, don't look. This happens also, sir, in the west, the monks. Right? You are following all this? Right, sirs? Am I telling a strange story? So, the religions throughout the world have said if you want to serve god you must suppress your senses, you must control it, shape them according to a precept or to a pattern laid down by the abbots and the priests and the sannyasis and the books, so that your senses are completely numbed, completely destroyed. Right? Look what has happened to you sirs. You never look at the skies do you? The beauty of a tree, the light on a cloud, the new moon, just a slip of light, you never look at all that, do you.

So, we are going to find out what is the relationship between thought and the responses of the senses. Right? What are the senses? Now, please, I'm going to talk about it... we are going to talk about it, just follow it because it is important to understand this. Through tradition, through so-called scriptures, through authority, we have suppressed all our senses, the sensory perceptions, seeing something beautiful whether it be a man or a woman, whether it be the stream or the cloud full of light, we never look at them because there is the fear that if we do it might lead us astray; astray in one direction, sexual, pleasurable, and the senses might betray our purpose, our goal, which is to reach god, or whatever you call it. Therefore suppress it, control it, don't yield to them. So that is our conditioning, because sex - there you have all that you want. That is one sensory reaction that you have which is free. You understand all this? There you do what you like, but you must not see anything.

So we look at life with one or two senses that are awakened. And you eat good food, the taste, and you become slave to the taste. So, the question is not to suppress any sense, any of the senses. Please listen

carefully, this requires a great deal of understanding. It is not control of senses, it is the awakening of all the senses. Have you ever done that? Have you ever looked at the sea, which is nearby, with all that vast movement, the tremendous waves, the energy, potential, the extraordinary depth of it, the blue of the evening, with the full moon. Now when you look at that with all your senses - the seeing, hearing, the smelling, the feeling, the depth of the feeling - you understand? - looking at that vast movement. Wait, listen to it quietly. Then thought comes along and says: how nice that is, I'll come back next evening and have the same sensory response. Right? You are following this? Thought interferes with the senses. Thought is also a sensory response. So thought controls the senses. Thought then says this sense is right, this sense is wrong, this sense is beautiful, this sense is ugly, and so on. Right? So where there is the interference of thought with the senses, though thought is part of the senses, when one of the senses which is thought controls the other senses, shapes the other senses, then there is the beginning of the self, beginning of the ego, beginning of the 'me'. I wonder if you understand all this. No you...

To look at something sir, with all your senses, that means to pay attention to what you are looking. When you pay such tremendous attention to what you are looking, there is no self. It is only when thought says, 'I must pay attention', it is only when thought says 'Those senses are good, those senses are bad', then begins the psychosomatic self and then you battle with the self - I must not be selfish, I must be this, I must be that. So, to be attentive to all the senses and to see when thought begins to interfere with the senses, that requires a great attention, you understand, sir. It is not control of the senses. It is thought that makes the senses to distort. Sex, when thought creates the image, the pleasure, the remembrance, all that, then sex is merely a mental activity. That is what you are all doing. And then you take a vow not to have sex and go through all the torture of it. You follow how thought is operating? Or indulge in it. So whereas if you are really aware of the whole senses, it's like being aware of the earth, sir, the fertility of the senses, like the fertility of the earth, virgin earth, earth which has never been trodden on by man. And to have these fertile senses which have not been touched by thought, then out of that comes great extraordinary sense of beauty and life and love. Right, sirs?

Now what have you got out of it, and what are you going to do with it? You understand my question, sir? What has the speaker been talking to? A sloppy brain, a brain that is so heavily conditioned that it won't receive anything new - except in the technological world - there is money, position, power. Where there is power, there is evil. Right, sirs? Look at the local politicians, how much power they have and what evil thing it is. And absolute power is absolute evil. You all know this, but each one wants power. Power means position, prestige. You tell the people what to do and get away with it. So one asks - I must stop now - one asks what is one talking to? You understand my question? How do you receive all this? You understand my question, sir? Is it just another talk, another chapter? Or you have no book, no chapters, you are living.

May I go now?

Second Public Question and Answer Meeting in Madras

Thursday, December 30, 1982

Psychological Time Is the Cause of Conflict

Third Public Talk in Madras

Saturday, January 1, 1983

May I wish you all a happy New Year. I hope you will have a happy New Year.

We have been talking over together our daily problems, not theories, not speculative philosophy or some romantic, imaginative life. We have been talking about, together, as a conversation between two people, the very complex process of our living from the time we are born till we die. We went into several things in the last two talks, or two conversations, and perhaps it will be right to remind you if I may that this is not a lecture as it is commonly understood, to inform and to instruct on a particular subject, but it is a conversation between two people, between you and the speaker, about the life they live, their pleasures, their fears, their sorrows, and the perpetual conflict between human beings. We talked about whether it is possible at all to live a life without a single conflict - conflict in our relationship with each other, however intimate or far away. We went into that question very carefully, whether it is possible in the modern world with all its terrible things that are happening, for a human being in relationship with another to live a life without a single shadow of conflict. Conflict we said brings about disorder and as long as we live each one of us in disorder we cannot possibly bring about a radical psychological revolution in the structure of our society. We went into that too.

I think this evening we ought to talk over the nature of time, desire, fear, and whether sorrow, which man has lived with, can ever end. So we will talk over together as two friends, not a speaker sitting on a platform - that is only for convenience - two people talking over this very complex problem of time, desire, fear, pleasure, and whether sorrow, which happens to be the lot of man throughout the world, whether it has an end to it. So please, the speaker is not directing you what to think, or agree with what he is saying, but we are together going into this problem. Together, not you listen to the speaker or agree or disagree, but together you and the speaker investigate the nature of time, because that's very important to understand, the nature of time. And also we ought to explore desire which is very complex, and we ought to talk over together too, whether there is an end to sorrow, because where there is sorrow there cannot be love, there can be no compassion, there can be no intelligence.

So it is important that you and the speaker meet at the same level at the same time with the same intensity, otherwise there will be no possibility of communication. I hope this is clear. That to understand another, to understand another with your heart, not with one's intellect, which is necessary, but to meet another, like the speaker, there must be a communication, not merely verbal but a communication of the mind in the heart, intelligence in the heart. The word 'heart' is not merely a physical organ but the whole nature of that word, to have the mind, which is an extraordinary affair, in the heart. But most of us listen to words, to ideas, agree or disagree, analyse, speculate and so on, but we never meet at the same time at the same level with the same intensity. Then there is really deep profound communication; then words become rather meaningless, though they have to be used and the words have definite meaning. The construction of a phrase, of a sentence, must be naturally grammatical, but to meet another in communication there must be no barrier. That means you or the speaker must have no prejudice, no bias, not committed to any philosophy, to any conclusion, but meet in freedom. And to meet in freedom requires a great deal of intelligence, a great deal of enquiry.

And one hopes this evening we will meet on the same level because the speaker has no authority, he is not

telling you what to do or what you should do with your life, but when we are together, discussing, having a dialogue over a problem, that problem is the concern of both the speaker and you, or you and the speaker. It is your concern as well as that of the speaker. And merely meet at a verbal level, as most of us do, has very little significance because we are concerned with psychological revolution not physical revolution, psychological, inward, radical, fundamental change. We have lived for millennia upon millennia, thousands of years with sorrow, pain, anxiety, loneliness, despair, fear, and the pursuit of wandering desire, and man has always asked if there is a stop to time. And we are going to talk over together the nature of time.

What is time? Time fundamentally means division, distribution, evolution, achievement, moving from here to there - that is, this constant division as of yesterday, today and tomorrow, sun rising, sun setting, the full moon of a lovely evening, and time, meeting your friend, time is hope. Time is a very, very complex affair and that requires a patient - patience is timeless. You understand what we are talking about? It is only impatience that has time. Are we meeting each other somewhere? So, to enquire into the nature of time one must have a great deal of patience; not impatience, not say, 'Get on with it. I understand what you are talking about, let us get on'. Because we live by time. We have divided our life in a time movement. Movement is time. To go from here to there requires time. To learn a language requires time. To accumulate knowledge, to experience, to have pleasure, looking forward to something as fear or as pleasure, the memories of yesterday, or thousand yesterdays, meeting the present, modified and moving towards the future. This is all time. Time for a clerk to become the manager. To acquire any skill. All this requires time. And the desire to experience something other than the usual experience; the pursuit of that is also time. And whether there is psychological time at all. That is, being violent, to become non-violent, that requires time. The pursuit of an ideal requires time. Time means evolution, both physical as well as one imagines or one has the fallacy that one will evolve into something totally different from 'what is'. All this implies time. Time to realise, to become illumined, which the speaker is questioning.

So we must together understand, not verbally, but the feeling of time, the sense of time. Time is memory - the past as the observer, the observer observing what is happening, translating what is happening to his own condition, to his own experience, and so on. So, we need time, bearing in mind that time essentially means division. Division implies distribution, and time you need to learn a skill. The scientist needs a great deal of time to enquire into matter, into astrophysics. So outwardly to change we imagine time is necessary. Eventually man who is divided, who has divided himself into nationalities, will eventually become international and gradually drop all nationality and have a global relationship. We think all that requires time: we must evolve towards that. I hope this is being made clear. So time which is fundamentally a process of division, outwardly, physically it is necessary - like the seed growing into a great tree - that requires time, years. There is a tree in California which is over 5,000 years old. To come to that age, many, many rains and storms and fires and lightening, which is all the growth in time.

Are we together in all this? Do we... are we following each other, sharing with each other? If we are, we see that outwardly, physically, we need time - time to acquire knowledge, the accumulating process of learning mathematics, physics or how to fly one of these jets - all that requires time. One cannot possibly escape from that time or try to find a stop to that kind of time. That would be utterly meaningless and foolish. But if you could enquire into the nature of time to become something inwardly. You can become through diligent work, a clerk or a worker becoming a foreman or a manager. There all that is time - go from here to there. For a plant to grow into a great magnificent tree, the season of winter, spring, summer, autumn is the division of time. Now we are together going to enquire if there is psychological time at all. You understand my question? The time that we think is necessary to change from one psychological or sensory responses to another. We think time is necessary to be free of violence. Time is necessary to be free of envy: I am envious but give me time to be free of that particular pain or pleasure.

So, we are questioning whether there is time at all psychologically. You understand my question? Right, sirs? Are we meeting each other? Otherwise my talking and your sitting here has no meaning. Right? So we

are not discussing or having a conversation about the necessity of physical time. To build a house you need time. To be educated, if you must be educated, needs time. But we are enquiring into something much more important, much more essential, because we are conditioned to the idea or to the concept or to the illusion that time is necessary - from 'what is', to 'what should be'. We are, the speaker and you, are questioning that, whether time at all is necessary for a radical change. You understand? Have I stated the question clearly so we all meet it? We said time is division, time is distribution; division as 'I am', 'I should be'. That is a division, and 'I should be' requires time. Right? We are questioning that. We said is there such thing as becoming something, or experiencing something? Enlightenment, of which many people talk about, does that demand time? We are questioning a most fundamental thing - you understand, sirs? - because all our philosophy, our life, all the books that you read - so-called sacred books are no more sacred than any other book - they have all said time is necessary; you must go through various disciplines, various practices in order to come near whatever you like to call it - god, an experience which is beyond all measure, a state of mind that has not been touched by time.

So, we must go into this question very closely whether there is psychological time at all. The moment you admit that there is psychological time, time being division, there must be conflict. Right? I have divided violence, which I am, which all human beings apparently are, and to achieve non-violence there is a division immediately taking place. You understand, sirs? I am violent, we are violent and we must be the opposite. Where there is the opposite there must be division and therefore there must be conflict. And time is the element, is the cause of conflict. I wonder if you understand all this. Don't look so vague, please. Don't be so puzzled. Look at it very simply. I am greedy - which you perhaps are not - I am greedy and to be non-greedy takes time. We said time is division. Of course. You understand that? So where time comes into being, there must be conflict, and the becoming something is endless. You understand? Now we are asking, is there an end to violence in which there is no time at all? You understand my question? Do you understand, sir? Come on, somebody say yes. Don't say yes for the fun of it. Gosh! It is a very, very serious problem. We have accepted time, division, as a means of ending conflict. We are saying quite the contrary. Where there is division as me becoming something, the becoming something is noble, whatever it is, that very division is the process of time; and that division, does it exist at all? That is, I am greedy. That is the only fact I have - the other, non-greed, non-violence has no reality. It is just a concept, a structure of thought which cannot understand or end violence. It is an escaping process - the ideal. All right?

Are we together in this? I am afraid we are not. You are full of ideals, a bag full of them, and you never under any circumstances achieve the ideal because they are still the invention of thought. Right? As we went into the nature of thought which is limited because all knowledge is limited. We talked about it considerably. And it's also... I don't want to make it... one doesn't make it too complex. Greed, measurement, comparison - 'I am this, I will be that', which is measurement - all that implies psychological time. That is the illusion in which we live. We are questioning the reality of that. There is only 'what is'. There is only greed, there is only violence, there is only war. And can war end? - killing each other in the name of god, in the name of ideals, in the name of countries, god and all the rest of it.

Now we will go into it very carefully. I am violent. When I say 'I', I mean all humanity. You are violent. Human beings are violent. Isn't it important to find out whether it can end immediately? Isn't it important? Not say, 'I must become non-violent'. When you become non-violent that means a period of time. During that period you are sowing the seeds of violence, which is so obvious. Like man saying, 'I am trying to be non-violent'. You understand all this? I will go on.

So, is it possible to end violence or greed, whatever you will, anger, immediately - the whole entirety of violence? So what is violence? Not merely anger, to injure another, to hate, to criticise, to wound another both physically and psychologically, to imitate, to conform, not merely physical aggression but the whole movement of violence, can that movement totally end? And to find that out one must understand time as division. I have divided, thought has divided 'what is' into 'what should be'. I am ignorant - not in the

scholastic sense - I am ignorant but I will be enlightened some day. So we are now asking whether it is possible to end violence, greed, what you will, immediately, so that it never comes up again. Aren't you interested in that to find out? Are you really? Ah, come on. If you are interested what do you give? If you buy something, you must give something. Right? You must give money, you must make a gesture, you must do something - not say 'Yes, I want to end it', which means, to end it you have to think, you have to work, you have to be passionate about it, not just casual, saying yes. That is why I said in the beginning, the speaker said at the beginning we must meet at the same level at the same time with the same intensity. Then we can communicate profoundly. Not verbally, but with the mind in the heart, which means intelligence operating with love.

How do you observe violence? Violence is a sensory response. Right? You have hurt me, I am wounded; my image about myself has been hurt. You might not physically hurt me but you have wounded me inwardly because I have an image about myself as a great man or some professor or some idiotic person, and that image has been hurt. And to get over that hurt give me time. Right? I work not to be hurt, I'll be aware, I will be careful, listen carefully and so on. You see, all that is effort, which is brought about by the division of time. Clear? So, is it possible to end violence so completely it never comes back? That is why you are asking how do you look, how do you perceive violence? How do you look at a tree, the moon, the stars, the heavens and the beauty of a night, how do you look at it? How do you look at your wife or your husband, your friend? Do you look at your wife or your husband or the tree or the moon or the rivers with the memories that you have had, with the accumulated hurts, accumulated pleasures, companionship, stored in the brain as memory? Do you look at your wife and your husband with those memories? So memory is time. Right? I wonder if you understand. So where there is time there must be division. Right? And hence you have row after row, quarrels and all the rest of it in your relationship with another. Right, sirs?

So, it is of the highest importance to find out how to observe. How to observe a tree, which is one of the most beautiful things on earth. How do you look at it? The moment you use... when you use the word 'tree', or the species of tree, you are not looking. Right? The word, the remembrance prevents you from looking. I want to look at my wife. Probably you have never looked at her. I have looked at her as my wife, my possession, my pleasure, sexual and otherwise. I have looked at her with all the memories of the last ten days or ten years or fifty years. And those memories come between her and me, and she has also her memories. So it is very important to find out whether one can look at a wife or a husband or the tree or the moon or the flowing waters of a great river without the word, without the name, which is the past. You understand all this? So can you look at violence or greed, whatever you will, without the word? The moment you use the word 'violence' you have already put it in time. You understand this? My god! The moment you use the word, which we have used a thousand times before, as violence, that very word is the factor of time. Right? Do you see this? And therefore you have already brought about a division. Now can you observe your wife, your friend - all right - or the speaker now? Can you observe him without his reputation, without his - nothing - without any image look at him - can you? Or the image that you have built about the poor chap is so strong that you cannot possibly see him as he is, or you see him impudently - say, 'Who are you to tell us?'

So, can you look at your wife, at the tree, at a flower without the movement of thought? The movement of thought is time. Thought divides as time divides. When you look, you are looking without the observer who is the past, who is the word, who is the memory. That past divides; the past is time. To look at yourself as you look in the mirror to look at yourself, and that mirror which is physical, the mirror in which you look is the mirror of relationship. There you can perceive every movement of thought, every movement of reaction. So the perceiver is the perceived - you understand? - the analyser is the analysed. Right? Do you understand this? I want to experience something extraordinary. I am bored with all the experience I have had - sex and pleasure - I want to experience something ultra, ultra, something beyond all thought, and the experiencer has projected what he wants to experience, and therefore the experiencer is the experience. I wonder if you

understand all this. A mind that does not demand experience is totally different. Therefore we have to learn how to listen, how to observe. Not accumulate how to listen, just listen, just observe with all the memories. Then you will see that which you observe, which is violence, there is no division between the observer and the observed. The observer is the violence. Right? I wonder if you see that. And so when you are so alert, watch, observe, it is like putting a great light on the thing which you observe. Then it disappears totally, never to return.

And now we ought to talk over what is desire. Because time and desire and thought are the major factors of fear. Time as tomorrow, what might happen to me, time as not achieving, not becoming. We went into that. And we are saying time, desire, thought, are the major factors of fear. So we ought to talk over together, as a dialogue between two friends who have known each other for some time, happily, easily without trying to convince one or the other, what is desire, the wandering nature of desire, desire which is never content, the desire that all religions have said suppress it. Right? So we are going to examine together the nature of that desire. Why have religious leaders, which are really phoney leaders, why have religious leaders all over the world and all the books and all the rest of it, why have they said you must suppress or desire for god? That is all right to desire for god, for illumination, that is perfectly all right; but to desire a woman, desire a house, desire the lovely things of the earth, the beauty of a painting, the beauty of a statue, a poem of Keats, you mustn't desire, it will lead you astray, it will lead you to temptation, and we have learnt through the ages the art of suppressing desire or yielding to desire. So we are together, if you are not tired, we will go into this question of desire.

What is desire? Not the object it desires or the object creating the desire. You understand? You understand this, what I said? The object creating the desire or the desire exists and the object varies. You understand? You must be clear on this point. Gosh, there is so much to talk about in all this, aren't you tired? You are a rummy crowd. You see a nice car, nice shirt, a lovely house, a beautiful painting. That painting, house, the car, the woman, the man - the object - does the object create the desire or the desire exists and the objects don't matter? If the object creates desire then it is a totally different investigation, but if desire exists and the wandering nature of desire from one thing to another. So, we have to examine together what is desire. What is the origin, the beginning of desire? Not how to control desire, not suppress it, transcend and all that kind of stuff, but the beginning. If one can understand the origin, the source of desire, then you can deal with it. But if we don't ask the origin, the beginning, then we are merely trimming the branches of desire. Is this clear? So together we are going to examine what is desire.

We live by sensation. Our sensory responses, their reaction is the activity of sensation. Right? I see you - well dressed, clean, healthy, beautiful or whatever you are - I see you. The seeing is the beginning of sensory responses. Right? You are following this - obviously, it is not complicated. So, the seeing, observing, contact and sensation, which are the responses of the senses. Right? Is this clear? Right, sir? Then what happens? You understand? I see a beautiful house, a lovely chalet in the mountains, beautifully built, strong; see it, contact, touch it, touch it actually, and the sensation from it. Then what happens? This is really important to understand. I see you, a beautiful woman - I am not tempted so don't bother - I see a beautiful woman or a beautiful man if you are a woman. The very seeing of that beauty - nice, clear, intelligent face, it's a sensation, isn't it? Then what is the next step that takes place? Think with me for god's sake, move. I'll show you. You see, I have to tell you, which is a pity. That is why - please - you become second-hand human beings. But if you saw it for yourself you are completely out of that mediocrity. You see a beautiful something, a statue which has been created by love and skill and matter. Then as you see it sensations arise, you touch it. Then what happens? Please listen, listen, find out for yourself. Listen, sir. Please listen, find out. Then thought comes in and says how beautiful, I wish I had that statue in my room, I wish I was in that car, I wish I had that house. Right? At that moment when thought takes charge of sensation, at that precise moment desire is born. Have you understood this? You people... Do you understand this, sirs?

Questioner: Yes.

Krishnamurti: No. We will go into it a little more. Sensation, which is normal, healthy, vital - otherwise you are dead. To suppress sensation means you are dead and probably that is what happened here in this country. You read Gita and Upanishads and all the sacred books and you follow guru after guru, discipline your desires, control, suppress, escape and so on. Whereas we are saying something entirely different, if you can follow this a little bit. Sensation, then immediate association of thought with the object. Right? That is, sensation, seeing the car, thought then says, how nice it would be if I sat in there, it is a beautiful car with tremendous power behind it - not the Indian cars - and beautifully made - then begins desire. Right? You understand this? Now, is it possible for thought not to intervene? You understand my question? Not immediately thought saying, I must... See itself in the car. You understand? Is there a hiatus, an interval between sensation and thought not immediately taking charge? You understand this? Have I made this question... So that there is an interval, a gap. If there is a gap, what happens? That requires extraordinary skill and attention. Right, sirs?

To see where sensations are important, because if your senses are not alive you cannot see the beauty of the earth, the movement of the sea. So, sensations, the sensory responses are essential for life, but when thought controls, shapes, gives identity to sensation, then at that precise moment desire is born. Right? Can we find out, without control, without suppression, just to see how thought is acting upon sensation. Just to see it, even verbally, even intellectually, but to go into it very deeply, to have such alertness, such care, such attention, such love to see the nature - how desire is born. Then you have to see what thought is, how thought makes all life a problem, which we went into the other days.

And also thought is a movement, material movement. Right? Perhaps you haven't enquired or you haven't gone into it - not gone into it in the sense read about it, by professionals who have written books about it, but you can watch yourself, which is far more exciting, far more real, then you are dealing with something actual. Thought, as we said, is limited because all knowledge, all experience is limited, and thought springs from knowledge, experience - or experience, knowledge, memory, and thought. And this whole process is limited. There is no complete knowledge about anything, can never be. Science, technology is always adding more, more, more, more. So, time, desire, thought, are the factors of fear. Right? Are we meeting? I am afraid what might happen to me because I have had an accident a couple of days ago or a year ago and I am afraid it might happen again. I am watchful. There is fear. I am afraid of the dark. I am afraid of the wife, and the husband, I am afraid of my boss. Aren't you all afraid? Aren't you? Don't be ashamed, it is the common lot of man. You may not want to acknowledge it, you may not want to face it, but you are frightened, and fear does terrible things to human beings - mentally, psychologically, it narrows down, it curtails, it makes human beings so bound to authority, to some ideas. They have become so dependent, so attached, so inhuman. So we are not talking about the many factors or many expressions of desire... of fear, but fear itself. You understand? Not afraid of your wife or husband, afraid of losing a job, afraid of past pains, hoping that they will never occur again - we are not talking various aspects of fear but the root of it.

What is the root of fear? Isn't it time and thought? That is, I am a clerk, I may never become a manager. I am a disciple, I can never become a guru if I want to be. I am ignorant - in the deep sense of that word, not ignorance of the books, I am not talking about that - deep ignorance, which is not knowing myself wholly. That is ignorance - the movement that is me, that has no beginning, perhaps no end. And to understand that deep ignorance I not only need time - I imagine I need time and also I need experience, accumulation, reincarnation and all the rest of the blah blah. So there is fear. So we are asking each other what is the root of it all. Why has man, throughout the ages, past timeless beginning, why has he carried this burden of fear? He hasn't been able to resolve it. He may go to all the temples, to all the churches, to all the gurus, various... try various systems of meditation but fear is always there. You may be blind to it, you may want to evade it but it is always there in one form or another. So we are asking what is the root of it. The root of it is time and thought. Of course. Is that clear? Must I go into it?

I have had pain a couple of weeks ago and I fear that it might return again, which is time. Right? You

understand that is time, isn't it? Which is, the remembrance of that pain and it might happen again, and the fear is hoping it will not happen again. My wife - I am not married - my wife has hurt me, as I have hurt her, not physically, inwardly, and I hope she won't hurt me more, by word or gesture or by a tear. And I am afraid she might hurt me - fear. So fear is time and thought. If one understands the nature of time and thought, and the movement and the wandering of desire - understand in the sense, see the truth of it instantly - as we went into it: time; we went into in desire - see the actual truth of it, not the verbal conclusion of it, the fact of it, the reality of it, the depth of it, the intensity of it. If you do see it so clearly then you will never ask how is fear to end, nor ask, can I control thought - you understand? - or say, 'How am I to stop thought?' - which are the causes of fear. Right? You will never ask that question, because you can't ask a question about what you actually see - the truth. It is there - you understand? - it is there for you to see, not to accept, argue, analyse, discuss, take sides - you can't. It is like seeing a most beautiful thing on earth - it is there. An excellency, an excellent mind - it is there. A heart that is overflowing - it is there. If you see it, then fear ends. And where there is the ending of fear, there is no god. You understand? It is out of our fear, out of our desire, we invent the gods. When a man for him, in whom there is no fear, completely no fear, then he is totally a different human being and he needs no god.

And sirs and ladies, give your heart to consider all this. Not your mind, not your intellect. Intellect has its place, but when we are examining something very, very seriously, the heart must enter into its consideration. When the heart enters, that is when there is love to observe, love of watching, seeing, then when you see the truth of desire, time and thought, then there is no fear whatsoever. Then only there can be love. Fear and love cannot go together. Fear and pleasure go together but not love and fear.

Right, sirs.

Third Public Talk in Madras

Saturday, January 1, 1983

Remaining With the Challenge of Sorrow

Fourth Public Talk in Madras

Sunday, January 2, 1983

Why are there so many people here?

This is the last talk. Yesterday evening we talked about fear, the nature of fear and what brings about fear. We said, time, desire, thought are the contributory causes of fear. And man has lived with fear. And we live with fear now: fear of the future, the past, fear of the future of man, what is going to happen to man. Surely the future of man is what he is now. It is so obvious. If he does not radically change, not society, not the various forms of governments, but if he doesn't radically change psychologically, inwardly, the future is what he is now. That is guaranteed because there will be more wars, more instruments of war, more destruction, more violence, more fragmentation of human beings into nationalities and so on. Because the future is what we are now. And we said during all these talks, that it is so urgently necessary to bring about this psychological revolution, what it is to bring about a change, not move from one form, one system, one idea to another but whether it is possible for human beings who have lived on this lovely earth for so many millennia, whether it is possible for them to change.

And this evening I think we ought to talk over together whether sorrow can ever end, the sorrow of man. And what is love, what is compassion, and what is intelligence. We ought to talk over together also the significance of death. And if we have time, we ought to talk over the whole question of meditation.

We have lived with sorrow generation upon generation: the grief, the sorrow of loneliness, the sorrow of great anxiety, the sorrow of having no proper relationship with another, the sorrow of a mother, a father, a wife whose husband has been killed in war, decorated as a hero with lots of medals on his chest. And also there is the sorrow of ignorance. Sorrow has many forms. It isn't just one incident called death, it isn't just one happening in one's life, but a series of incidents, a series of accidents and experiences which both contain pleasure and pain, the sorrow of this movement of reward and punishment, the sorrow of old age, the sorrow of illness, blindness, deformed children. Man has carried a great weight of sorrow and we try to escape from it. We invent all kinds of theories, all kinds of possibilities, romantic concepts, and flowering in ideations. But sorrow remains with man. I wonder if one has looked at what wars have done to man. How many women, fathers, brothers, sisters have shed tears because one holds on to nationalism, racial prejudices, linguistic differences. And all this is causing enormous sorrow in the world. There is not only personal sorrow, the loss of something, the loss of someone whom you loved - if you love at all - the loss of never having a single, happy, original day, the pain of seeing poverty in this land and people doing nothing about it. So man has carried this sorrow from time beyond measure. And we still are burdened, tearful, anxious, lonely, aching with deep inward pain, of lack of success, lack of opportunity, lack of the things we all want.

So we ought to together this evening consider whether it is possible to end this enormous burden carried by humanity and by those who are still in sorrow. What is sorrow? As we said yesterday, what is the cause of sorrow? Where there is a cause, there is an end. If I have cancer, the cause, the pain, then perhaps the cause can be removed. So where there is a cause for anything, there is an end to that. A causation is a movement, it is not a fixed point. And if you can understand and discover the cause of this burden of sorrow, then perhaps we shall understand the nature of love; not love of god, not the love of the guru, not the love of some book or a poem, but the love of human beings, the love of your wife, the husband, your children. To

find that extraordinary perfume that is really the light of the world, one must understand the nature of suffering, the structure of suffering.

I hope we are together, you and the speaker, going into this. Please, together we are investigating, not the speaker investigates and you listen, agree or disagree, accept or deny, but together to explore a very, very profound problem of humanity. One requires an unemotional approach to it, not sentiment, not a conclusion that sorrow will end, or that sorrow will always remain with mankind. So we must together, if you will, consider this question deeply. You can only consider this question when the mind is in the heart. We use our intellect to comprehend, to discern, to argue. We use the intellect to choose, to measure. And so intellect is one of the faculties of the brain. And if we are going to examine this extraordinary, profound problem, mere intellection has very little place, and most of us are highly intellectual, highly educated, have extraordinary - especially in India - have extraordinary quality of analysis. You can analyse anything on earth. You have got fairly subtle minds - not all, naturally. And to comprehend sorrow, mere intellection has very little... cannot go very far. You understand sirs, what we are saying? That all of us have the capacity to use our intellect, which is to understand, to discern, to argue, to choose, to weigh one against the other. This is the function of the intellect. And most of us have that capacity. And if you are merely approaching this question of sorrow, then your mind, your intellect dominates the process of investigation, therefore it distorts. Whereas is it possible to approach it with a holistic movement? You understand?

We never approach anything as a whole. We never look at life as a whole. We have fragmented life, broken up as the intellect, the emotions, love and so on, broken it up, and so we can never look at a problem wholly. The word 'whole' means not only complete, not only the feeling that parts are included in it, but the parts don't make the whole. 'Whole' also means healthy, a healthy mind, not a crippled mind, not a stagnant mind, a mind which is whole, a sense of covering the earth and the skies and the beauty of all that. And also the word 'whole' means also 'holy' - H.O.L.Y. So we never approach with that quality of mind. And in investigating, exploring this question, one needs to have that quality of a mind in the heart, which is not romantic, idealistic, imaginative, but a very factual mind, tempered with the quality of love. When we use the word 'heart' we mean by that - mind in the heart, mind in the quality of love, which has nothing whatsoever to do with any ideas, with any ideals, with any obedience. There is no guru. There must be freedom to observe.

So together, let us look at this question. Together. What is sorrow, and why has man put up with sorrow, why has he accepted it as he has accepted fear, as he has accepted pleasure, desire, all the things that man is surrounded with, both outwardly and inwardly. We are not talking over together, not having a dialogue about the various types of sorrow. I might have lost my son and you might have lost your bank account, suddenly discover that all your belief in god has no meaning, all the temples contain nothing but words and stones, and probably dirty. So you have to have a very clear, direct, uncluttered observation of this. Are we together in this? If we are, which I am rather sceptical about, I hope you don't mind, if we are, then what is sorrow? What is the nature of it? In that thing called sorrow there is pain, there is grief, there is a sense of isolation, a sense of loneliness in which there is no relationship. It is not only a physical shock but it is a great crisis in the consciousness, in the psyche. I have lost my son. I am only taking that example. I have lost my son to whom I am attached. And I wanted him to grow up into some beastly business man - right? - to have some kind of good substantial income, a house and so on. In him I have immolated myself - you understand this word? You are following what I am saying? - and suddenly he is gone. What is that quality of suddenness? The sudden ending of something which has given me great joy, great pain, great anxiety, concern about his future. And all that movement: my affection, my concern, my care, my sense of helping him to have good taste, to live aesthetically because where there is deep aesthetic sensitivity, that is the highest moral, highest ethics, and suddenly he is gone. Don't you know all these feelings? I hope not your son, or your wife or your father or your mother dead, but in every house there is this shadow of sorrow. There is sudden ending, sudden ending of my attachment - you are following all this? - a sudden ending of

all my hope, which I have invested in him, a sudden sense of not only deep shock. And life becomes empty, either become very cynical or find a rational explanation, or plunge myself into some form of entertainment, drugs, drinks and all the rest of it, or believe in some future life. This is the lot of all human beings.

So what is this ending? You are following this? Are we together in this a little bit? What does it mean to end? Have we ever ended something without a motive, without a reward or punishment - to end? Because where there is an ending there is a totally new beginning. But we never end. We end things if it is profitable or painful. Our life is based on reward and punishment, both outwardly and much more inwardly, but we never end something without a cause.

So grief, loneliness and a sense of separation, which is essentially time, which we went into yesterday: time, identification, investment, and all the things one has cultivated in another, all that ends and there is a shock, and that shock I call sorrow. Now can one remain with that, not escape, not seek comfort, because that is the most silliest thing to do, not go off to a temple or run off to some guru, but to remain with that tremendous challenge without a single movement of thought? Because sorrow is perhaps one of the greatest challenges, greatest demand on the human mind, on the human quality, and if you merely escape from it, run away, rationalize, then that which has a tremendous depth to it... then sorrow is your shadow. But with the ending of that there is passion, not lust but the passion that is the very essence of energy. But very few of us have that passion, very few of us have that passion which is living, not occasionally, but that passion which moves the universe.

So we ought to look into what is love. That word has been so spoilt. A romantic woman calls the love of god, the love of my guru, the love of my painting, my book. You understand? We have given to that word such shallow meaning. You may say, 'I love my wife'. One questions that love. That love is... may be attachment, that love may be seeking comfort, pleasure sexually, pleasure of companionship and so on. So we are going to consider what is love. Because in trying to see the depth of it, the beauty and the extraordinary quality of it, love may be related to death. So we are going together to look at it. Please, this is not a lecture in view of instruction, but it's together, as two human beings facing a world which is becoming so dangerous, one must ask this question.

Surely to find something true, one must negate that which is not true - right? - negate the false. You might then say, to each person the false is different. To each person that which is illusory, that is which is not objective, rational, sane. So to discover what is false and what is true, and what is true in the false, one requires not the capacity to think clearly only, but the demand, the asking, questioning. So what is love? Would you say, love is desire? Would you say love is pleasure? Don't shake your heads, it's meaningless. Would you say love is attachment? Please, the speaker is asking these questions for you to answer to yourself, answer it, not deceive yourself. It is so easy to deceive oneself. You may think you are a marvellous human being, you are out of all this. But to find out that which is not love, that is, negation is the most positive action.

We are asking is desire love? Is it? We went into the question of desire yesterday. We won't go into it again now, if you don't mind. Is desire love? Desire is a wandering movement, and is love wandering, unstable, weak, or is it something as strong, as vital as death? Is love pleasure? Sexual pleasure, the pleasure of owning, dominating, possessing a person. Is that love? Is attachment to the person - my wife, my husband, my family - attached, which means, Latin 'attacher', which means to hold on, cling to. Is that love? Or in attachment there is fear, jealousy, anxiety, hate. Where there is jealousy, there is hate. Is that love? Has hate any relationship with love? Is love the opposite of hate? Is the good the opposite of that which is not good? Ask these questions, sir, don't... When an opposite like hate... if hate is the opposite of love, then hate has its root in love. All opposites have their root in their own opposites.

Are you getting tired? God, what a crowd. So please examine your own life, not listen to what the speaker is

saying. Examine, each one of you, your own life honestly and ask these questions. Desire, pleasure, attachment, jealousy, anxiety, fear of losing, is all that love? So can you be free of attachment, not at the last moment when death is there? Can you end attachment to another? See the implications of attachment, the consequences of attachment. Fear, anxiety, jealousy - where there is jealousy there is hate, anger, and more, when there is attachment, and is all that love? And what is compassion? Not the definition, you can look it up in a dictionary. What is compassion? What is the relationship between love and compassion, or they are the same movement? When we use the word 'relationship', it implies a duality, a separation, but we are asking what place has love in compassion, or love is the highest expression of compassion.

How can one be compassionate if you belong to any religion, follow any guru, believe in something, believe in your scriptures, in your guru and so on, attached to a conclusion? When you accept your guru, you have come to a conclusion, or when you strongly believe in god or in a saviour or in this or that, can there be compassion? You may do social work, help the poor, out of pity, out of sympathy, out of charity, but is all that love and compassion? So in understanding the nature of love, having that quality - you understand? - which is mind in the heart. That is, intelligence, which is a very complex question, intelligence is the understanding or the discovering of what love is. Intelligence has nothing whatsoever to do with thought, with cleverness, with knowledge. You may be very clever in your studies, in your job, in being able to argue very cleverly, intelligently... very cleverly, reasonably, but that is not intelligence. Intelligence goes with love and compassion. And with that intelligence, if there is, if you have come upon it, and you cannot come upon it as an individual; compassion is not yours or mine, like thought is not yours or mine. Where there is intelligence, there is no me and you. And intelligence doesn't abide in your heart or in your mind. That intelligence, which is supreme is everywhere. It is that intelligence that moves the earth and the heavens and the stars, because that is compassion.

We ought to talk over together what is death. Are you interested in all this? - not interested, that is a stupid word. Are you concerned about all this, or you have grown too old? The young are already old, some of them. And hearing all this, what will you do with it? Just as you leave forget all this and fall back to your daily monotonous, mediocre life? Ask these questions, sirs and ladies.

And also we are going to talk over together this question of death - death being the ending: the ending of our memories, of our attachments, your bank account if you have one. You can't carry it with you but you like to have it till the last moment. Right? So what is death, and who is it that dies? And what is life? You understand? Life: who is it that dies, and what does it mean to die. We are not talking of the ending of the physical organism, but we are enquiring into life, the ending of life, and the great significance of what death means. What is life which we have separated from death? There is a gap of forty, fifty or a hundred years. We want to prolong our lives as long as possible. Modern medicine, surgery, health and all that helps to prolong one's life. I don't know for what, but one wants to prolong it.

So what is life; your life or the life of the universe, life of the earth, life of nature, life which is the vast movement without a beginning and without an end? This is not... please, don't fall back into the trap of your tradition. That is dead, as dead as a door nail. And when you follow tradition you are already dying, or perhaps you are already dead. So we must examine when we talk about living, life, what does that mean? The life of a tree, the life of the fish in the water, the life of the beauty of a tiger, the life of the universe, this life that is... seems so extraordinarily vast, immense, without measureless depth. Are we talking about that or your life, yours? If we are talking about your life, what is that life? Going to the office from morning till night for fifty, sixty years, breeding children - your life, belonging to some sect, following some guru? And of course, you believe in that guru so tremendously, you follow him. And conflict from morning till night: conflict as pleasure, conflict as fear and the pursuit of pleasure and desire. This is your life. Is that what we are talking about, the ending of that life? What is important: what lies beyond death, or long incidents of life in your life? You understand my question? What is important: before or after death? If living, life, the beauty of it, the energy of it, the passion of it, the immensity of it, which you have reduced to such a

shallow little 'me'. Are we concerned about that, the 'me' that is going to die? I would like to prolong this living. One would like, and this living, we never look, question, ask, doubt, find out, but we mechanically carry on and we are concerned about that 'me', you, dying.

What is the 'me', what is the 'you'? Is it a series of words? Examine it, sir, for god's sake, look at it! Is it your name, your form, how you look, your bank account, your ideas, your beliefs, your experiences? You believe in god, and that belief is you, who have created god. So what are you? Please look, question it, doubt it, ask it! Is that what you are frightened of - dying? Knowing your body which is the most extraordinary instrument, badly treated, tortured, drugged, unhealthy - that body, that organism is going to die. You may prolong it for a long time but it is going to come to an end. Or you can say if you are very successful in any field, you can say, I have had a jolly good life, I don't mind dying. So we are asking what is it that dies, and what is it that clings to life? By life, I mean office, sex, pain, pleasure, fighting each other, quarrelling, destroying each other. This is your life, whether you are young or old. Is that what you are afraid of ending? Or are you considering life as a whole, life of the universe, which is so immense, so vast, so incalculable? That is, that life is there, as well as here, as well as this little life you have - this torture, this anxiety, this conflict, this misery, occasional spurts of joy and clarity.

So please, enquire what you are, to which thought clings, to the image you have built about yourself. You see, sirs, it is not the immortality of one's soul, of yourself. 'Yourself' is built through time. You have evolved as 'me' from the moment you are born till now. And you accept that 'me' as a reality, and is it real at all, or is it a series of words, a series of memories, accident and experiences which are all put together by thought, and is that 'me' holding on to all this travail of life? If you are not holding it, then life has something totally different: it is a vast incalculable movement. But that can only be seen when the self is not.

Now we ought to turn to, to ask the question, what is meditation. May we go on? You are not too tired? If you are tired just get up, please, and go quietly, without disturbing others, because we are going to enquire into something that demands all your attention, that demands your care, your profound consideration. So we are together going to examine what is meditation, not how to meditate, that is the most silliest question, but what is the nature, the quality, the structure, and the beauty of meditation. The word 'meditation' means to ponder over, to think over, to consider, to probe, to investigate, to look - according to the dictionary. And the word 'meditation' also means measurement, to measure. I believe in Sanskrit, 'm?' is to measure. And also it has another meaning, that's not my business. So meditation, as it is said in the dictionary, a good dictionary, is to ponder over, think over, consider, weigh, look, observe, feel, move, and also it means to measure. Measurement means comparison. Have you ever considered that Greece, the ancient Greece 450 BC exploded all over Europe. Greece was responsible for measurement. It's not my... I do not know history but you can observe. They invented measurement. And without measurement there can be no technology. And the western world is par excellence, highest, capable of great technology, which has moved to Japan.

India, the ancient Indians said that measurement is illusion because - this is now, I am saying, is the speaker is saying - all measurement is limited. Right? If there was complete measurement, then there would be instant perfection of all technology. You understand what I am saying? So India exploded all over Asia. Don't be proud of it, it is all gone. You have lost the one thing that was so precious. You have lost the greatest jewel that you ever had.

So meditation means to think, to ponder, to weigh, and also it means to measure. That is, measurement: I am this, I must be that. I am comparing myself with you, who are clever, beautiful, lovely, and I am not, that is measurement. Following an example is a measurement. Following the ideal is a measurement. Wherever there is comparison psychologically, meditation cannot be. You understand all this? Where there is no comparison, where there is no measurement, that I will achieve one day peace or god or illumination or all that stuff - the word you use here is self-realization. I do not know what it means, whatever that may mean: realizing the self - you invent a lot of words and stick to it. So where there is measurement, comparison,

there cannot be meditation. You can compare between two cars, between two materials, of cloth, better paper, better house, better food, but where the mind thinks in terms psychologically of better, meditation is not possible. You can sit cross-legged, do all kinds of yoga, all kinds of control, where there is control there is measurement. Right? I wonder if you see all this.

Are you getting tired? Sorry, allow me another five minutes, it's all over for you then.

So to meditate: in meditation there must be no effort. What you call meditation is to repeat some words, repeat a mantra. I have been told the meaning of that word is to ponder over not becoming, which is, not measuring. And also it means to absolutely deny all self-centred activity. I believe that is the root meaning of that word: not becoming, and totally not living in a self-centred way. You can repeat all the words, mantras, breathe properly, you know, follow system after system, if one system does not suit you, take another system, methods, go off to Japan to learn Zen - right? - or the latest guru who will tell you how to meditate. All that implies control. Where there is control, there must be conflict and there must be measurement and that is not meditation. We are going to go into it a little bit.

Meditation is to live a diligent life. Meditation is not separate from daily living, going off into a little corner, meditating for twenty minutes every day or every afternoon, every evening; that is just going to sleep, having a siesta - you know what a siesta is? Having a sleep in the afternoon. So there is no system. System implies practice. Practice means measurement from what you are to what you want to be. And you may be practising the wrong note. And probably you are. And you call that meditation. And that meditation is so totally separate from your daily living. So find out whether it is possible to live a daily life of meditation, which means no measurement at any time. You know, this is a dangerous... what the speaker is saying, so please understand it very carefully. In meditation there is no control, because the controller is the controlled. I went into it the other day, I won't go into it again now. In meditation there is no will because will is desire. The essence of desire is will - 'I will meditate, I will practice this day after day' - discipline. In meditation there is no effort at all because there is no controller. No, you don't know anything.

And meditation implies awareness: awareness of the earth, the beauty of the earth, the dead leaf, the dying dog, the dog that is diseased, not just awareness of something or the other, to be aware of your environment; to be aware of your neighbour; to be aware of the colours you carry, wear, why you wear that colour and those beads, to be aware of that; to be aware of the beauty of the wind among the leaves; to be aware of your thoughts, your feelings. That means to be aware without choice - just to observe, just to be aware. That heightens your sensitivity. To observe diligently everything. When you say, I will do something, do it, never forgetting what you have said. Don't say something you don't mean. That is part of meditation. That is, to be aware of your feelings, your conditioning, your opinions, judgments, and your beliefs, so that in that awareness, there is no choice - just to be aware of the beauty of the earth, the skies and the lovely waters. And when you are so aware, then there is attention. To attend: to attend to what the speaker is saying - not only to the speaker, to attend to what your wife is telling you, or your husband is telling you or your children are telling you, what the politicians are telling you - their trickery, their search for power, position; to attend. When you so profoundly attend, there is no centre as the 'me' to attend. That is also meditation.

Then if you have gone that far, if your mind - not your mind - if you have moved that far, if the mind has moved that far, then what is religion? Religion is none of these things that you have: the temples, and the content of the temples, the puja, the tirupatis, the churches, and all that is not religion. The rituals, the beliefs that are put together by thought, which is a material process and you worship that which thought has created, which is what you have created. Have you ever realized, all the gods, you have created them out of your fear, out of your wanting security, and the rituals, day after day, puja, the mass is another form of entertainment. I know you don't agree, but listen to it. You will go on doing it because your mind is conditioned, afraid, wants some kind of security, it's not here but perhaps somewhere else. So a religious

man doesn't belong to any group, to any religion, has no belief, because his mind is free, unafraid, because intelligence is the highest supreme form of ultimate security, not the intelligence of cunning thought. Intelligence of compassion. And that intelligence has no doubt, no uncertainty, no fear, which is something immense and universal.

And where there is attention there is silence - if you attend. If you attend now to what the speaker is saying, attend with your ears, with your eyes, with your nerves, with your whole body attend, then in that quality of attention there is great silence, unfathomable silence. That silence has never been touched by thought. And only then, for which man has searched from time immemorial, something sacred, something nameless, supreme. It is only that mind that is so utterly free from all the travails of life, it is only such a mind that can find the supreme. That means meditation, which is the expression of daily activity.

Fourth Public Talk in Madras

Sunday, January 2, 1983

