

Jiddu Krishnamurti

*Two Public Meetings in San
Diego, California - 1972*

Table of Contents

<i>Living without Sorrow</i>	1
<i>What Is the Point of Education?</i>	2

Living without Sorrow

First Conversation with Dr. Allan W. Anderson

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

First Conversation with Dr. Allan W. Anderson

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

What Is the Point of Education?

Second Conversation with Dr. Allan W. Anderson

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

J. Krishnamurti was born in south India and educated in England. For the past 40 years he has been speaking in the United States, Europe, India, Australia, and other parts of the world.

From the outset of his life's work, he repudiated all connections with organised religions and ideologies, and said that his only concern was to set man absolutely, unconditionally free.

He is the author of many books, among them *The Awakening of Intelligence*, *The Urgency of Change*, *Freedom from the Known* and *Flight of the Eagle*.

In dialogue with Krishnamurti is Dr. Allan W. Anderson, Professor of Religious Studies at San Diego State University, where he teaches Indian and Chinese scriptures and the oracular tradition.

Dr. Anderson, a published poet, acquired his degree from Columbia University and the Union Theological Seminary. He has been honoured with a distinguished teaching award from the California State Universities.

A: Mr Krishnamurti, in your book *Education and the Significance of Life*, you write about discipline and I remember, and I hope I've remembered correctly, that you talk about discipline as essentially beginning with the child or the student in the sense that the child must be helped to see the cause of his behaviour. But now the teacher is the one who helps him do this and it seems to be very clear that what you were saying is essentially that discipline rather begins with the teacher, which would require the teacher to be very disciplined himself. And what does it mean not simply to admonish the child, but to try to penetrate into the cause of his misbehaviour?

K: So what do we mean by the word "discipline"? What does that word mean actually, as it is generally accepted?

A: I think it usually means training. It has to do, of course, ethnologically with teaching.

K: Teaching, yes. That what I was going to say it is to do, yes. This disciple, who learns from the master. It is a way of learning, not conforming to a pattern, not subjugating oneself to an ideal, to suppressing oneself in order to be something. The general meaning as it is now used implies conformity, suppression, comparison, drilling oneself in order to be, to fit into a particular...like the military discipline, and so on and so on. All such disciplines must invariably create conflict in the human being.

A: If the child, let us say very small, is taught the alphabet and how to trace a letter, he must make an "A" when he is trying to make an "A" and not a "B".

K: No, no.

A: Now are you suggesting in that trying to make this "A" and holding to the form of "A", that he necessarily will generate conflict?

K: He probably does. But I would rather, if I may suggest, look at it from the point of view of the educator, rather than the child. Shall we?

A: Yes please.

K: What is the function of an educator? Not the educated, not the student, not the child. What is the function of an educated teacher?

A: Well, I had always thought it was twofold. On the one hand to draw from the person some manifestation of his latent capacity, and on the other hand to teach him something different from what he knows now.

K: We are talking about the educator, the teacher.

A: Yes, about the educator.

K: Not the child or the student, the educator.

A: The educator, the one who educates, I had always thought had this twofold responsibility.

K: Which is?

A: On the one hand to draw from the student...

K: Ah no, I'm not talking about the student at all. What is the function of an educator? If I am a teacher, what is my function? What is important?

A: To avail myself to the student in such a way that the student can learn.

K: Which means the educator must establish a relationship with his student which is not hierarchical, authoritarian, "you up there and me below", but a relationship of mutual enquiry, study, sharing, communication, all that's implied in the educated.

A: Uh-huh.

K: If you are a teacher, as you are sir, I am a student. If you are the educator, you must establish a certain relationship with me.

A: Uh-huh.

K: Is that relationship based on giving me information?

A: No, no.

K: Is it based on this sense of "you know, I don't know"?

A: Partly, partly.

K: The meaning, the significance, the authoritarian background of "you know, I don't know". Therefore there is an assumption of authority in that.

A: Do you mind if we go back to the little child?

K: Yes, alright.

A: It is the case that the teacher does know how to make the "A" correctly.

K: But we'll come back to that.

A: Oh, alright.

K: We'll come back to that.

A: Alright.

K: But I'm just wondering what is the quality of relationship between the teacher and the student. The teacher is more important than the student, for the time being, because we are enquiring into what kind of educator. What is the state of the educator? What is the quality of the educator? We said that he must establish a relationship.

A: Uh-huh

K: A relationship in which the authoritarian spirit completely goes. Otherwise you'd treat me like a servant. Our relationship is entirely different, based on "you know, I don't know", this degree of knowledge. And, you are imparting some information to me. Is that all, or much more involved in it? That the teacher is not only establishing a real relationship, wanting to communicate his information and also he wants, doesn't he, to bring about a quality of intelligence in the student, which is not merely the intelligence of the activity of knowledge, it is much more.

A: Uh-huh.

K: So the educator has to be intelligent in the deep sense of that word, not knowledgeable.

A: No, intelligent.

K: Intelligent. And the teacher wants to convey his information so that the student, in getting the information, is capable, is cultivating or growing in intelligence. I don't know how... Refinement, quality of clarity.

A: Clarity, uh-huh.

K: Clarity. And obviously he wants to establish a relationship of real friendship, real affection, real love between himself and the student.

A: Yes I think that is very very essential, especially that. Especially that.

K: Especially that.

A: One of the things that fascinated me about a hymn in the Rig Veda is that speech, the god of speech, appears among friends.

K: Yes sir.

A: It's as though intelligibility disappears when enemies come together.

K: That's right.

A: Yes, please...please go ahead.

K: So, if where there is that quality of love, affection, relationship, no sense of authority, awakening or cultivating or bringing about that intelligence in the student, then the responsibility of the teacher is enormous.

A: Yes, it is, because the student opens himself.

K: After all, we are creating a new generation.

A: Uh-huh.

K: Which means the teacher cannot belong to the establishment. Establishment in the sense of the orthodox, the social acceptance, he must be rightly different in himself from the rest of the world.

A: He must be himself.

K: Himself. And not himself, that brings in a different thing.

A: Yes, I know what you mean. But he must be authentic.

K: He must be authentic, and... integrity - it's not just "say one thing do another" ...so that when in the presence of the teacher, the student feels completely secure.

A: Uh-huh, uh-huh.

K: Because, with the teacher he's at home. Not with the family. Because the family, they have their own problems, their own ambitions, their own greed. They're fighting. The student with the teacher feels not lost, he is with somebody who really cares.

A: This raises a question I should like very much to ask you, Mr Krishnamurti, about two apparently radically different notions of education. I have always been very impressed with the understanding that I think Indian culture has about the need for the student to abide with the teacher on the basis of...

K: This is true of the old tradition.

A: ...true interpersonal relationship.

K: He lived in the house of the teacher.

A: Yes.

K: He was part of the family of the teacher.

A: Yes.

K: He was brought up with the teacher's children. So that he was the parent.

A: Uh-huh.

K: Not the mother and father, but he was the real parent who cared for him immensely. And when you establish that kind of relationship with a student, I want to learn from you.

A: Uh-huh.

K: I want you to tell me. I'm awfully eager to find out what you know. Then when you write the "A", it has quite a different feeling in it.

A: More than a copy book "A". Yes, I follow you.

K: And then also you don't compare me with another student.

A: Hmm.

K: If you compare me with another student, you are destroying the other student. Because I'm probably dull and you compare me to somebody who is cleverer. There is this conflict in comparison, competition, and all that is breeding.

A: Uh-huh.

K: When if you say, "Look I am teaching you. Don't bother, I'm not comparing you with anyone". But you are. So this sense of extraordinary feeling of intimacy, of love, friendship, without any sense of "you must be this or that". Then my mind wants to learn.

A: In our culture, we think we understand something of that when we refer to what we call the Socratic solution.

K: Socratic, yes.

A: But then of course...

K: But you can't do this with 300 or 40, 50 or 100 students in the class.

A: No, no. So what do you do?

K: That's the point sir, that's just it. Given things as they are, you can't suddenly bring about a revolution and have only 10 students for each professor or teacher, that would be impossible. I should have thought if the teacher, if the educator, had that quality of mind and feeling, he would spot out few of the students say, that boy that girl, half a dozen, and care for them, or give them.

A: Yes.

K: Take them home, talk to them, walk with them, play with...you follow sir, this sense of... I did a little bit in various schools but I stopped in each place too short of time. But if there is this feeling of real friendship and affection and love the student feels completely at home. And then you can say that boy, this girl...you follow...you can have half a dozen and really they are your children.

A: Uh-huh, uh-huh.

K: They would be the elite. I know democracy, the word elite is something terrible. But it is the elite. After all, you are the elite of a culture which says give more importance to religion, philosophy - to you that's important.

A: I think we do tend quite badly to get upset about the station of that sort, because after all, in the last analysis, surely what is meant by elite is simply that somebody does what he does well.

K: Yes, and if you are a first class carpenter, you are an elite.

A: That's right.

K: If you love carpentry, not because you are going to get 8 dollars or 10, 15 dollars a day, it... you may get 15 dollars, but the thing in itself...

A: We have generated rather a curious notion, it does seem to me altogether a dysfunctional one.

K: Yes.

A: And I would be very grateful for your light on this. I've never taught in a grade school or high school so I'm only talking about what I've heard and read, but we did begin some time ago, if I'm not mistaken, a tendency to level the performance of students.

K: Oh, of course.

A: So if a student is gifted, bright and devoted to his task, he is naturally going to excel, but we must be careful somehow or other that we don't really encourage him too much in that for fear that the disparity, the comparison will...

K: After all, if I'm the educator, I want you to excel.

A: Of course, of course. Exactly.

K: Not excel and get benefit or exploit others. After all if you excel in something, that is marvellous. But if you use that excellency in order to crush me...

A: It's disastrous.

K: That's what's taking place.

A: Yes. Well I suppose the sentiment that we employed was in itself not much more than sentimental.

K: Yes, yes.

A: And consequently...

K: It becomes cruel.

A: It turns out to be cruel because sentimentality always becomes cruel.

K: Becomes cruel.

A: Yes, yes. I know. It's awfully hard to make that point in a class of 50 or 100 people because we do cherish the things that we hold sentimental.

K: That's why I say I feel the educator is far more important than the student.

A: Yes, I understand. Yes, that's why I wanted to hear what you said about discipline beginning with the educator rather than the other way around, with the student. There's another question I should like to ask you, if I may, about the idea of a child's behaving badly in the sense of becoming a disciplinary problem. On the one hand there's a clinical approach to that in which one might say, well, "now, let's get behind it, let's look into the cause of it".

K: Cause of it, yes a very difficult process, yes.

A: But then is bad behaviour necessarily caused? Would it not be quite possible for somebody just to decide that he's just going to behave badly?

K: And then he becomes a neurotic-al and neurotic is, it is quite a different thing. But why does, in the modern world, children are so violent?

A: Yes.

K: So disorganised, so... You know what they are, you see them all over the world. Why? Is it the society in which they live? Parents who have really no affection for them. Do you follow? They say "I love my children", but... A society, a group of parents who allow their children to be killed in a war? Do you follow sir?

A: Yes, yes, I am following.

K: Though they say "we love our children", they shed tears when they get killed in Vietnam. But it is this sense I feel that of utter lack of love for the children. Where they are concerned about themselves, their look, their hair, their dresses, their...err, you follow, their nails, god look at the commercials and you see a tremendous self concern.

A: Uh-huh. In terms of what we said earlier then, we said that they don't see the child.

K: No they don't, they don't want to see the child. Because if they see the child, if they see what's going to happen to the child, they will, they will be horrified. So they cover it up and send them off to school or, you know, get rid of them, and the home is no longer a real home. And therefore they become delinquent,

naughty and all the rest of it. But if the teacher says, "I am going to give you a home, you're my children", do you follow sir?

A: Yes.

K: Then you create something new. Not all this tremendous technological information, which is necessary but this importance of it, and therefore you turn out people that don't care for anybody.

A: Uh-huh.

K: And you have these perpetual wars. If the mothers in America really say "look, we love our children, I'm not going to allow my children to be killed any more. Doesn't matter what happens to me, I'm not going to allow it", the war would end tomorrow. But they don't care. They care for their security, for their pleasure, for their whole ugliness of self concern.

A: For a long time, we've had the notion in education, that how to teach can be taught. We speak about professional education. And sometimes, the disagreements between the academicians solely on the one hand, and the man in the classroom on the other, become rather severe. But in your view of education, would it be the case that you could really teach someone how to teach?

K: I think so. Sir, what is the point of education? Why do I want to be educated? Why should I be educated? To fit into this thing? To be killed? To fight for the rest of my life? Die fighting and die with endless problems in myself? What's the point of education? I know of several people who are taught mathematically, philosophically, technically, and their life is so shoddy, meaningless.

A: Hmmm.

K: They know it. And they say, "my god, why did I ever even go to a college, to end up like this?". Unless, I mean, one understands the total meaning of living, merely to be educated to be a first class engineer, what the heck are they taught?

A: Uh-huh. So some people have written rather cogently and persuasively that Plato's Republic is not really a political treatise but, after all, really a philosophy of education. And in terms of what you have said, some of what Socrates has remarked in that dialogue which seem to relate, firstly in Socrates's idea that justice is the internal order of the soul and all the weight is brought to bear upon ordering oneself interiorly so that the work of justice which is ordered to external things is done well. This must have something to do with, if I have understood you correctly, with your requiring that the teacher first of all be able to himself to see.

K: Obviously, I mean...

A: Right, I see.

K: If the student is like those people who say "don't smoke" and smoke. You follow? There is no meaning.

A: Hmmm.

K: So, and also sir in this question of educating, comparison is destructive, obviously, between two students. And also this whole idea of concentration. They must learn to concentrate to study.

A: Uh-huh, uh-huh.

K: And therefore there is this tremendous effort made to concentrate. Isn't there a different way of doing this? Instead of forcing a child or a student to learn concentration, do you understand?

A: Yes.

K: Is there not a different approach to this problem altogether? I think there is because I've talked a little bit about it in schools, various schools I go to in India.

A: I think there is too. But perhaps if we look at it in the round, what is very difficult is to bring together, integrally, on the one hand the activity of education, which has its end in itself, not outside itself

K: Quite, quite.

A: But training always has its end outside itself. So for instance, the athlete. He practices to run, not simply to be running, but to improve his running. Now he tries...

K: And the improvement in comparison with somebody who can run faster.

A: No, just the record.

K: That's a record, the same thing.

A: Yes. But not in comparison with that person.

K: No, with the record.

A: With the record, yes.

K: The other person is forgotten.

A: Right, right. It has to do with the idea that I must take pains to do better than I'm doing now.

K: So...

A: No, please go ahead.

K: I mean, I love what I'm doing all my life, I really love what I'm doing.

A: Oh, I believe that.

K: I wouldn't do anything else. I couldn't. For money, for nothing. I really...this is for me, breath. I don't want to excel in it. I don't want to beat the record.

A: Hmm.

K: Established by Buddha, Jesus or XYZ. I don't want to become somebody popular, unpopular or all this, that doesn't really interest me, because I really love what I'm doing. The love of what I am doing excludes everything else. And that very love is the most highest form of excellence.

A: Yes. Yes, it just occurs to me it's a loving thing to see you loving. Yes, yes. I do understand.

K: And that if the educator can convey this feeling. Not to the 300 students, but to the 10 who he feels are very...can do something. They, do you follow, they all excel. Without competing, without saying "I must beat the record".

A: Uh-huh.

K: Love makes one tremendously efficient.

A: I think that a good deal of the objection that students make to the grades, those who don't like to receive grades, is based largely upon this notion of a personal comparison between themselves and another. Now there are other objections to grades that seem to me really without any foundation. But, there is a psychological point here.

K: Alright.

A: That if the grade is used as a sledgehammer...

K: Oh, right.

A: ...then, of course, it becomes altogether dysfunctional and destructive. Still, I would not go so far as to say that grades as such are useless since, if the teacher relates to them adequately, he is telling something to the student about the student's own performance with respect to a given task.

K: Sir, I understand that. But if you, you as a teacher, had 5 students or 10 students in the real sense, you would help those 10 to love the thing he's doing, whatever it is. Gardening, or whatever it is.

A: Yes.

K: And there is no grade in that. The more I learn, the more I love. I don't say "well I must, you must have a grade in your mind about me". You watch me.

A: Uh-huh.

K: You say "well that's not quite right, this is right, let's talk it over". You follow? There's that relationship in which all sense of making me conform to your ideal disappears. Therefore there is a relationship of real affection and that is enough. It's like a sunshine and a flower.

A: Isn't it the case that a person could indeed love flowers, love his garden, love gardening, as an appreciator, but might not be gifted as a grower?

K: No, then I study. And I find out.

A: But..

K: I may have, you may not have the green thumb and you say "well I'll find out".

A: He turns around and he says after he's planted this flower, "well how am I doing?". And he means to ask you whether he has done well or ill in the way he has planted the flower.

K: Therefore, the way you tell him how he has done, that is important, not how better grades or this or that. The way you convey to me that I've done isn't quite right or that it's done marvellously. Your very look is sufficient.

A: Uh-huh.

K: That means you have to be extraordinarily sensitive.

A: Yes, yes. Yes, I know how very true that is. Because often times one has the feeling that a student who might not be too gifted none the less does have a capacity which still stands to be reached and actuated.

K: Yes sir, but you see the difficulty? All religions are based on this comparison. Eventually reach the foot of god, or sit next to god. There are all the priestly hierarchical methods. The bishop, the priest, the bishop, the archbishop, the cardinal.

A: Uh-huh.

K: This whole hierarchical sense is a competitive sense. And religion, business, family, the whole structure is based on that. And you bring up a child to fit into that. Where if you say, "look, you're my child, I'm going to look after you, I'm going to see that you're the most marvellous human being on earth". Totally, not just technologically, but psychologically, spiritually and, you know, and you produce quite a different entity.

A: Uh-huh. Do you think perhaps this notion of hierarchy has been badly applied because we tend to believe that hierarchy is static rather than functional.

K: Functional, yes. It is functional, but don't bring status into it.

A: The parent, this teacher who loves his family of students is still the parent and in that sense a functional hierarchy persists, would that be natural?

K: Yes, but after all, you can...may...be a first class engineer...maybe a cook, but see what takes place, you are a top engineer and I am a top cook!

A: Yes, yes. Yes, well that's what I meant by functional...

K: Don't let us introduce status into it.

A: No, no. I quite follow.

K: You the Cadillac, and I the Jeep.

A: No, no. I quite follow.

K: So that brings up really quite a different thing which is, is there psychologically progress at all? Because that's what is behind this.

A: Uh -huh, uh-huh.

K: That psychologically, inwardly, you will grow better and better and better and better. Which is self improvement, all that's implied it. After all, that is the basis of so-called religious hierarchy - you are gradually getting nearer and nearer god. The whole brahmanical system is based on that.

A: Uh -huh.

K: The lowest born will gradually evolve until he becomes brahmin and then go on, great. And, whether there is such a thing as a permanent entity in you which gradually evolves, or this whole thing is totally wrong.

A: Uh-huh. It's a very difficult thing in our culture to get across the notion that there is no such thing as essential progress.

K: So you can see it in oneself, it doesn't exist!

A: Oh I fully believe you, but I...

K: Ah what people say! But say for instance, if one is...if there is sorrow, is it to be gradually wiped out, or is it to be wiped out instantly?

A: I understand. Would you mind if I asked you a question about meditation, since you...?

K: Anything.

A: ...since you've brought this question of sorrow back. Meditation, in the last 10 years especially, has had a rather remarkable press, and...

K: Brought over from the east, mostly.

A: Yes, yes. I'm concerned to know, for instance, about how I might reply to a student if a student said to me "well, what does Mr Krishnamurti mean when he uses the word meditate?". What should I say?

K: I'll tell you. It's very simple I think. As it is generally understood, meditation is an escape from life.

A: Uh-huh.

K: They will deny this.

A: Oh yes, yes. Vigorously.

K: Vigorously. But the fact is, an avoidance, an escape, overcoming the miseries of life. Not looking from below, but imposing something.

A: Uh-huh.

K: And meditation is implied also that you must seek god, that you must experience transcendental states that you must get through various practices and all that business.

A: Something that you must progress through.

K: Progress, that's right.

A: Uh-huh. Yes, no, that is the common notion.

K: Of course it is. And it is so utterly false. You'll become my guru, who says "well I have transcendental experience", whatever that may mean. And you form a system. And because of your beard and your reputation and circles round it, frills, and all this, I say "he's right" and I follow. I don't understand what it is that is implied in all of this...

A: Uh-huh.

K: ...whether it's a personal experience. If it is your personal experience, I don't want your personal experience, it doesn't mean a thing to me. Because you might be deceiving yourself. Obviously you are if god is your personal experience.

A: It is, it is a really amazing thing how many students these days have got it into their heads that there's some external something that they can begin to do in order to achieve this end. I had a student, you know, who came to class and he wore a little bell, a little Tibetan bell and the jolly thing of course would shake, you know, every time he moved in class, and it bothered a few other students. And I waited a few days, I thought maybe the novelty of it would wear off and one day I walked up to him and put my arm around his shoulder and said, you know, it might be that the bell is wearing you. And he didn't wear it any more after that. He was capable though of grasping that point.

K: Quite, quite.

A: He wasn't offended fortunately.

K: No, no, no.

A: But that, that's very encouraging, he did grasp it immediately. Maybe we could say he saw at that moment and the bell went. It wasn't a gradual getting off the bell.

K: That's it, that's it.

A: Not wearing the bell three days and then two days then one day.

K: Quite, quite.

A: Yes, I understand. Well...then...

K: Then what is meditation?

A: Yes, what is it as such?

K: Then if the all...so that's what I feel one has to negate all the dictum, all the sanctions, all the things human mind has invented about god, about meditation as a means to god, to reality. Negate all that. Because it's all just a human invention. I mean, all the rituals, all the ceremonies, all the paraphernalia that goes on in churches, has all been put together by human minds. Which isn't therefore worth... except a thing which human minds have put together. Their eyes deceived, I am deceived. Therefore the thing is to, meditation is to, cleanse the mind of every form of deception.

A: At that point then, it would be correct to say, even if it's only a partial statement, that it is a clinical activity?

K: What, clinical in the sense non-analytical?

A: Hmm, yes.

K: Because when you told that poor student the bell is wearing you, that's not clinical, he saw it instantly. Whereas our minds are used to clinical analytical way of going at it. So meditation is this instant perception.

A: Uh-huh.

K: That creates a sensitivity of the body.

A: Yes, it does.

K: I mean, alcohol, meat, drink, you know, all that stuff has to...

A: Uh-huh.

K: And you have to have a very clear mind. Sensitive mind. To say about the bell. The boy saw it instantly and therefore dropped it.

A: Uh-huh.

K: So meditation is, in the real deep sense of the word, non-clinical, non-analytical, but seeing things as they are in myself. What I am, self knowing and the conflict which the self creates, see the truth of that and end it. All that is part of meditation. And also having a really quiet mind, not cultivated, quiet mind.

A: Uh-huh.

K: Because it's only when the mind is quiet you can see things clearly. If my mind is chattering, I can't see the carpet so clearly.

A: Yes, you seem to suggest what we might metaphorically refer to as the tranquil lake that reflects perfectly the shore.

K: Yes, but there's no reflection here.

A: No, no, no. That's where the analogy breaks down.

K: Yes, yes.

A: I meant the lake in the surely, wholly receptive capacity.

K: Please sir, let's be careful in this receptive tool. What is there to receive? Who is receiving?

A: There is what is.

K: So the mind after establishing real order and that real order can only be established when it has investigated disorder in itself and the investigation and the understanding of that disorder brings order, not imposed order.

A: Uh-huh. That's the miracle. Yes.

K: Then that is established and the mind, in the process of that, the mind becomes very quiet, very still. Then what is there to reflect? All that very stillness has it's own momentum, it's own energy, it's own activity, which is not...which cannot be put into words. There is... Mind when it is quiet is not a dead mind.

A: No.

K: It's not a vegetating mind. It's a mind very very alert, very active, very alive, and highly intelligent and sensitive. Now what takes place there, in that state of stillness, is a momentum of a totally different dimension. That's why one has to be supremely careful not to deceive oneself. From the beginning, you follow?

A: Yes, yes, yes, yes.

K: And the whole function of the will has come to an end.

A: Yes, I think that is what in our culture we mean by having a quiet heart. Because we tend to associate heart and will.

K: No, no, no.

A: I don't mean...we also talk about heart in the terms of hearts and flowers...

K: Of course.

A: ...but the radical sense of heart is the seat of the faculties.

K: You see I'm really going into this question of meditation. Any conscious effort to meditate is most...is not meditation.

A: A conscious effort to meditate?

K: You know, practice.

A: "It's 6 o'clock and I think I'll meditate now". Yes, yes. I understand what you mean. One ought to be, always...

K: Because you're doing it, because you're watching, you're listening, you're looking, you're seeing what you're feeling. You follow? There's this momentum going on all the time. The movement.

A: I think that's why in our tradition we speak of the attitude, not as a state, but as an activity.

K: Yes.

A: When it's understood correctly. Now, I know that most people think of it as a state but, strictly speaking, that's not what the teaching is in our culture, but the attitude is an activity.

K: Yes, you see that that brings in the question whether there is a reality which is not, which cannot be grasped by the mind. What is the relationship of the mind, mind being the intellect? Apart from the heart, what is...has it any relationship to reality? Or it...when it is when the mind and the heart and whole being is

one, harmonious, then there is a relationship. But to try to find if there is a relationship with the intellect in the sense analysis and all that, that has no relationship with the whole. It's only when there is total harmony of the body, the heart and the mind, then in that state there is a relationship with truth. So let's forget truth, put aside god all this but see if one can establish a harmonious living. Then out of that comes...that is part of meditation...

A: Uh-huh.

K: ...then out of that comes the most extraordinary things.

A: A misapplication of the will then, would corrupt this capacity? Yes, yes. I quite follow. The idea of meditation as something that is truly ongoing, is something that we ought to stress a great deal more.

K: But you see sir, I would say don't meditate if you don't know the right thing.

A: Right.

K: Because there are all these gentlemen come over from the east and teach them meditation. Meditation schools, centres, all the rest of it, it is all such...

A: Hooked up another freight car. Another addition. Yes, yes.

K: That's why self knowing is so much more important than meditation. If, in the understanding of yourself, not through analysis clinically, but understand yourself, see yourself exactly as you are, therefore give total attention to what you are.

A: Uh-huh.

K: Find out. Do you follow sir?

A: Yes, that does effect a prorogation. That's what I meant by the word clinical before, not clinical as a technique but in it's effect it's clinical in the sense that a prorogation...

K: Prorogation

A: ...has occurred, and now things...

K: After all, wisdom is self knowing. There is no wisdom in a book. The understanding of oneself totally is wisdom. And without that, meditation remains absolutely childish.

A: Do you think we might go back to try at this point to relate love to what we've been saying. Earlier, I seem to remember remarking that the Rig Veda has the god of speech appearing among friends. We speak of philosophy as etymologically concerned with the love of wisdom and yet perhaps in a deeper sense it might be that one can't do it, except one loves and is among those who love.

K: No, after all, love of something is not love.

A: Well loving is going on.

K: It is not I love god, I love truth. If you say I love truth then you don't love it.

A: Uh-huh.

K: But with us, love is greatly involved in pleasure. Without pleasure, we say well what is love.

A: I have to fall in love in order to get more pleasure.

K: A dozen things.

A: Yes, yes, I understand.

K: You see that's why this whole question of love, pleasure, suffering, death, kind of, you know, shut our eyes to all that. We're damned to enquire, for death. Whether there is death.

A: No, we paint the corpse so it looks like it's alive.

K: I mean, it's an appalling idea.

A: It is grotesque, hmmm.

K: And this requires really to go into this question of death, love and living, requires, you know, a great deal of intelligence, love and affection to look.

A: I just happen to remember a very beautiful story that I think the Sufis tell about Jesus who walking with some persons, came upon the corpse of a dog, and mortification had already set in and decay and so the shock of the stench caused them to walk across the street and Jesus didn't, he stopped and looked, really looked at the dog. And when he caught up with them, they wanted to know how he could stand it. And he said he was looking at how beautiful the teeth were. That story has always meant a great deal to me because it seems to indicate that if one, one sees with that intensity.

K: That's what we were saying at the beginning.

A: Yes.

K: This quality of retention, in which there is no division. Sir, you see, it does take place when the scientist is examining something. Is examining through a microscope, is completely, you follow? There is no division as in me the professor and me the great Nobel prize winner who is looking through a microscope, he is looking.

A: Hmmm.

K: And I think that quality of looking, if it can be conveyed to a student, is to look at before he enters the class the whole world, you know, look everywhere. The trees, the birds, the ugliness of...well, look at everything. Then when you come into the room, you have looked, and you carry on with that look.

A: Yes, it reminds me of when I first took chemistry, how in the classroom I was hearing all about the molecules and atoms and so forth, and there was a very beautiful tree outside and I would wonder looking at this tree. And the thing that disturbed me very much was somehow we weren't getting the molecules and the tree together.

K: No, I would look at the tree completely.

A: Yes.

K: Give your whole attention to the tree. Then look at the molecules.

A: Right.

K: So that there is no division between the tree and the molecules. You've given your attention to the tree, and you've given your whole attention to the molecules.

A: Yes.

K: Then, do you follow sir, then there is no conflict, there is no division. It is this division, inwardly and outwardly, that creates such havoc in the world.

Second Conversation with Dr. Allan W. Anderson

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

