

## Jiddu Krishnamurti

### Why Does the Mind Always Cling to the Known?

*From the series:*

### ***Ten Public Meetings at Brockwood Park - 1973***

---

*Sunday, September 2, 1973*

#### ***Second Public Talk at Brockwood Park***

Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday, if we may? We were concerned yesterday with the question of thought and what takes place when there is only 'what is'. If you remember that is what we were talking about yesterday morning. Thought, as we said, is the response of memory; memory is experience, knowledge; and we said also that knowledge is always the past. And all action takes, as far as we see now, from the past, from this memory, whose response is thought. And all our action is based on thought, conclusion, idea and 'what should be'. Thought itself is fragmentary, thought is never whole, thought is always from the outside, and as long as we are dealing with thought, concerned with thought and idea we cannot penetrate very deeply. That is one of our problems. We hear a statement, as you did yesterday, and you say, 'I can't go into it very deeply, I can't get at it in depth' - why? Because I think what we hear is a series of words and from that you draw an idea, and a conclusion, and act according to that conclusion or idea. So one remains always on the superficial, one never penetrates very deeply, because thought in itself is not only fragmentary, but it's always from the outside. Right?

Please, I would repeat again that we are sharing this together, you are not merely just listening to a series of words, or ideas or conclusions, or descriptions and explanations, but we are sharing together the actuality, what is implied in all this - sharing. Therefore we must not only hear and have the meaning of the words, but also there must be a verbal communication, as well as non-verbal communication. Communication means thinking together, sharing together, building together, understanding together. That is what communication means - if you look it up in a dictionary, that is what it means. So we are sharing these things together. You are not merely listening, accepting or not accepting, but when you share something together, it is yours. And what is yours comes when we are working, thinking, acting together. Please do bear this in mind all the time, that we are not indulging in ideas, in description, in analysis, in conclusions, but rather investigating, enquiring into this whole problem of a way of living in which there is no conflict, in which action is of supreme intelligence. Now that is what we were talking about yesterday - briefly. Now

we will go into it.

We said thinking is the result of memory, stored up in the brain, and the brain can only act in the field of knowledge, always within the field of the known. Right? And that is why in the known there is so much security for us. That is why we live in the past. All our traditions, all our knowledge, all our conclusions are the result of the past. So our action is based on the past. So what place has knowledge in the transformation of a human being? You are following? I see in the world as it is - corrupt, immoral, preparing for war, preparing to destroy human beings: socially, economically, physically, dividing the people religiously - and so there is in the world outside of me, there is always conflict, always battle, strife, pain; and inwardly there is this battle going on in myself and in my relationship with others. This is obvious. And I say to myself: what place has knowledge, which the mind has accumulated for centuries, in which it has evolved, grown, acted, created a structure of culture, what place has that knowledge in the transformation of my mind? You understand my question? What place has tradition, which is part of knowledge, in the transformation of the mind? And there must be transformation, there must be complete change, because otherwise one lives constantly in pain, in suffering, in misery, in confusion.

So what place has knowledge? Has it any place at all? And what is the function of knowledge? That is, the known, knowledge is the known, and thought always functions within the field of the known. It must, it has no other field. It can invent a field. It can suppose a new field, create a new field, but it is always acting from the known. Right? Are you following all this?

So we are asking: what place has idea in the transformation of man? Because we have built our religions, our culture, our whole social economic system on thought, on idea, whether the Communist, socialist, and so on - idea. The root meaning of that word 'idea' - which we looked up this morning - is 'to see'. You understand? The meaning of that word 'idea' is to see. And from the seeing we have drawn a conclusion, an abstraction: the perfect idea, the perfect form, the perfect society, the perfect god, the perfect human being - you are following all this? From the word idea, which is to see, we have drawn a conclusion, an abstraction, and from that abstraction we act, not from the seeing. I don't know if you follow all this. So we say action can never be perfect, man can never be happy, man can never be peaceful, because we have drawn an abstraction from 'what is', and tried to approximate our action to that, and therefore there is never a complete action. All our philosophies are based on that, from the ancient Greeks to the modern, from all the ancient Hindus, the Buddhists, and so on, are based on this. Seeing and drawing an abstraction from what you see and from that conclusion, act: not from seeing acting. You understand? See what we have done. There is 'what is', 'what is' both outwardly, and inwardly - actual. And the mind doesn't know what to do with 'what is', therefore it draws a conclusion, an abstraction, and from that abstraction it tries to act, therefore action is always incomplete and therefore contradictory, therefore bringing about misery, confusion. That is what we are doing all the time. That is what you are doing now. You are listening to words and to the explanation - and the explanation, the description, is not the described, and you are satisfied with the description, from that description is an abstraction, and you say then, 'What am I to do with the abstraction, how am I to put it into action?' You are following? Whereas the speaker is saying there is no abstraction, there is only 'what is', there is only the seeing, and when you see you act; not the division between seeing and acting. I wonder if you get all this? Are we together in this? You know if you once see this, really see this, then our whole movement in action is entirely different. There is no postponement of action. When you are at the edge of a precipice, which is a fact, you don't draw a conclusion, you move. Therefore action is immediate. When you are in front of a snake, a poisonous snake, there is not an abstraction, an idea, a conclusion and then movement. There is instant action. But that instant action is part of our conditioning which has told you precipices are dangerous, snakes are dangerous, therefore avoid them. Either you act from a conclusion, or from seeing 'what is' and act instantly. I don't know if you are following all this. Are you? Are we sharing this together? Please come, let's move.

So thought is a response of memory, experience, knowledge. So what place has knowledge in the

transformation of man? See it. This is your problem, you understand, sir? You have accumulated tremendous knowledge, psychologically, scientifically, you know, in every field of human behaviour, human existence. You have tremendous knowledge about meditation, Zen, Transcendental, all the latest idiocy, all the absurd things that are going on, you have accumulated a great deal. You know what war is. You have suffered tremendously with the last two wars, accumulated all that knowledge, and yet you are going on in the same pattern. You are following all this? You are sending your children to be killed, to be educated to destroy. The other day I turned on the television and young people were being interviewed and they asked, 'Would you fight for your country?' - everyone of them said they would. Not like the people before the war, they said they wouldn't fight for King or country, or for anybody. Now they would. And you know what war is, what an appalling thing it is, and yet you are sending your children, educating them to destroy each other. That is a fact. And what place has that knowledge in your life? Will it transform your way of thinking because you have experienced two wars? Oh, come on, sir. Will you change the whole system of your education, the division of nationalities, sovereign governments preparing for wars? It is a game you are all playing. You are not serious. Right?

So let's go back. What place has knowledge in the transformation of your mind, of your behaviour, of your conduct? Knowledge may be a symbol, an image, a conclusion, a field of the known. And why does the mind always cling to the known, which is knowledge, you are following all this - why? You have had experiences of war: the suffering, the torture, the fear, the appalling noise, the destruction. And has that changed the human mind? Has it changed your mind? And why hasn't it? Why does the mind, your whole being cling to the known? Is it fear? Or is it the pleasure in the known? Or the feeling of security in the known? After all when you are brought up in a culture - and all cultures are the known, obviously, because they are based on thought. Thought may imagine a perfect god, a perfect saviour, perfect human being, but it is still thought. And has it any place at all except in the field of action where the known must be applied, technology, medicine - please follow all this, it is your life, don't waste it, we have a few years to live, don't destroy it. Knowledge has its place - when you drive a car, when you speak a language, when you function in the field of technology, there knowledge must exist - science, all that is based on knowledge.

So where does knowledge begin to destroy the human mind? We see the importance of knowledge, otherwise you and I couldn't understand each other, because we both speak English, or if we both spoke French it would be all right, but we both speak English. That implies knowledge. Knowledge has its place and when that knowledge is used for self-centred activity - the 'me' and the 'you', my country and your country, my government and all the rest of it - then that knowledge becomes a destructive knowledge - obviously. Right sirs? You are following all this? Not verbally but with your heart, with the depth of your being.

So we see that idea, the meaning of that word idea is to see, and the mind sees very clearly, but immediately draws an abstraction from seeing. Why does it do it? I see that I am a Hindu - stupid to call oneself a Hindu or a Christian! Probably Christians have killed more than anybody else. So don't call yourselves Christians any more, or Hindus any more. I see that I am a Hindu, I call myself a Hindu, I see very clearly what it does - separates me from another, separates - my tradition, my upbringing, my culture; separates me from you. I see that very clearly, actually see it. And then I draw a conclusion that it is terrible to be divided, it destroys people. An abstraction from the seeing. Then I ask myself now how am I to put that abstraction in action? You follow? Then I want a method to put that conclusion in action; then there are a dozen people who will give you the method: the socialists, the Communists, the religious people, the latest gurus and all the rest of it. You are following all this?

So can the mind observe, see, and not draw a conclusion? And why does the mind draw a conclusion, an abstraction from 'what is'? Is it an evasion of action? Because if you saw and acted, that action may lead you to all kinds of trouble. Therefore an abstraction is a safe thing to do because you can postpone action. Therefore you live a very, very superficial life. You can never penetrate in depth because you have always

this conclusion. So in conclusions, in formulas, in symbols, in the known, there is safety. And the mind says, the brain says, I must be completely safe, otherwise I can't function. You are following all this? If it is not safe, secure, it cannot function effectively, therefore it seeks security in a belief, in a conclusion, in an abstraction, in a symbol and in neurotic behaviour. Because if I act neurotically there is safety in that! In a conclusion that I am a Hindu, in that there is safety. So the mind sees absolutely 'what is' - can't help it, it is all in front of you, the war, the stupid religious organisations. All that is very clear, and yet the mind accepts that, lives in that because it feels completely secure. And when it discards the old, it joins the new - the new guru, the new racket, the new circus that is going on.

So can the mind see and act? That is the real problem. So will knowledge prevent the seeing, and therefore acting instantly? You are following this? Because life is action in relationship; and what place has knowledge in action, in relationship, because we can't live alone, it is not possible, you may think in the abstraction that you live alone, you cannot live alone. You live in relationship with another, and in that relationship between human beings there is constant battle, between man, woman, husband, wife, boy - the whole field. And what place has knowledge in relationship? Because if knowledge cannot transform, bring about harmony in relationship, then why do we cling to knowledge? So in relationship, we are asking, what place has knowledge? Knowledge being the symbol, the image, the conclusion. I know you, the image which I have built about you - which is knowledge - which is based on thought, a conclusion, and that image I have built about you and you have built about me. Don't you know this? Don't you do this all the time? Oh, let's be honest for goodness sake! And that knowledge, that image, that symbol, the words, which is the known, the knowledge, isn't that a barrier between you and me? Come on sirs! So can there be a relationship in which the past never enters? Isn't that love? Oh, come on sirs! Are you working as hard as the speaker to convey something which is so simple? Because we are so conditioned by ideas, by conclusions, by abstractions, by symbols, by images, which are all the known, built by thought. Can there be a relationship in which the image is not? Have you ever tried it? No.

Now listen: you know what your relationship with another is, very clearly, you see it: the quarrels, the indignities, the flatteries, the sexual pleasures, the comfort, you know, the relationship between you and another. You see it, don't you? Why do you draw a conclusion from it? Is it because you are trained, educated to live in strife? Because you know nothing else and therefore you accept this misery, and therefore the fear of a relationship in which the known, the image doesn't exist. That is one of the causes of fear, isn't it? That is, we said idea means - the root meaning of that word is 'to see' - I see what my relationship is, I don't draw a conclusion, an abstraction. I see exactly what it is - the pleasure, the comfort, the escape from loneliness, the attraction, companionship, friendship, sense of security - and the seeing of it doesn't eliminate all that. Why? You are following all this? Because the seeing produces the fear of living a life of relationship in which there is never the image. So I have to grapple with fear - you understand all this? I have fear of loneliness, fear of not having somebody to lean on, fear of standing alone, being self-sufficient, which doesn't mean being selfishly isolated. I have fear of things I have not known. I only know this, this relationship in which there is constant battle, quarrels, misery agony, jealousy - you know this better than I do, I don't have to keep on describing it.

Why do we put up with it? Is it because we are educated to it? Because there is comfort in it, security? And there isn't security in it. What security is there in battle, in conflict, in misery? And yet that is the field of the known. So we are asking: what place has knowledge in relationship, in the transformation of that relationship? Right? None at all, has it? No, don't say no - which means your relationship with another has undergone tremendous revolution, and that revolution is love. I don't know if you understand this. Not all this rot talked about love. So the mind, thought can only function within the field of the known. And thought, not knowing any other kind of relationship, except the relationship of conflict, misery, agony, suspense, suspicion, jealousy, is afraid to move out of that field. And being afraid it must seek more pleasure to counterbalance, it must have much more pleasure. And the pursuit of pleasure, the principle of pleasure is

the action which is brought about by a conclusion. You understand?

Questioner: Is memory...

Krishnamurti: Just a minute please. Let me finish and then you can ask questions afterwards.

So see what the mind has done, or thought has done. The seeing, which is obvious, which is clear. I can see very clearly the results of war, what war does. I see very clearly, the mind sees very clearly what relationship actually is now. The mind sees very clearly where there is division there must be conflict, not only inwardly but outwardly. And not being able to deal with what it sees, it draws a conclusion and from that conclusion it acts. And we have built our whole moral, religious, social structure on this. Oh, come on sirs! Now can the mind see clearly in relationship how destructive knowledge is in relationship? See. And the seeing is the acting. Not I see, draw a conclusion and from that conclusion say, 'I don't know what to do'. Whereas if you saw clearly, see clearly what your relationship is, that not drawing a conclusion is action, therefore action is complete and immediate. So not being able to act so drastically and immediately the mind escapes from it, escapes through pleasure and because it cannot act completely, there is fear. You follow? See what thought has done. And then we say, 'How am I, who am caught in a network of fears, how am I to get out of it?' - 'I am afraid of my wife, my neighbour, my job, my future, what is going to happen'. You follow? Again thought is responsible for fear. I don't know if you follow all this.

You see very clearly thought is responsible for fear - do you? Do you see it absolutely clearly? In the sense you are caught in a network of fears, aren't you - old age, death, pain, loneliness, boredom, laziness, anxiety, everything, innumerable fears. Do you say then, 'How am I to get rid of it?' Or do you see actually the fear - the fear which is brought about by thought, fear of what has been and what might happen again? So do you see the network of fear, as you see clearly a poisonous snake, or a precipice? If you see it clearly it is finished. I wonder if you see this. Then you walk out of this marquee without a single shadow of fear. But as long as you see your fear, then draw a conclusion and say, 'How am I to get rid of it? Tell me the way to do it. I know I am frightened of this, of that and the other' - then you are living in abstractions, and from that abstraction there is no end to fear.

But the mind is not only avoiding fear but pursuing pleasure. Right? Have you noticed how the mind is always looking, pursuing, searching for pleasure? Why? What is pleasure? Is it the desire that says, 'I must have fulfilment'. You are following all this? And then you say, 'How am I to stop my desires'? You follow? You have quantities of desires and when that desire is not fulfilled there is fear and the pursuit of pleasure. Right? Look at it yourself, it is very clear. So can the mind be aware of that desire, not cut it off, be aware of it, see what the whole nature and structure of desire is, and in the very seeing, the action, the acting? You see a beautiful thing - man, woman, car or whatever it is. The seeing, the sensation, the contact, the desire. Right? Move along sir! Let's move. And that desire needs fulfilment, whether sexually or in any direction. When that desire tries to fulfil itself in pleasure and when there is no fulfilment there is fear. Right? There is frustration, anger, jealousy, all the rest of it begins. Now can the mind be aware, see totally the movement of desire - see it and therefore the perception is the action?

So one begins to observe, see, be aware, of the movement of thought. See, aware, observe that knowledge is supremely necessary to function efficiently. And in relationship, and our life is from the beginning to the end a matter of relationship, and in that relationship when there is the image, the knowledge, then all our agonies begin. To see all this, not, 'Oh, I have heard you say that, now how am I to carry it out?' - that is silly. But to see it, see this fact and the very seeing of it is the action. So do you see it? Or do you still live in abstractions - Platonic or other kinds of ideas and conclusions: the perfect Master, the perfect Guru, your Guru is better than my Guru - you follow? - all that business.

And is love desire? Is love pleasure? Is love an action in the field of the known? So what place has knowledge, or what is the relationship of knowledge with love? Can knowledge transform the human mind?

Obviously not. What transforms human mind is the seeing and the action - not the seeing and the conclusion, the abstraction. Is this fairly clear? What time is it, sir?

Now we have talked an hour about this. Perhaps you want to ask questions. Yes sir?

Q: How can a prisoner in a jail, and I'm tempted to insult one of the guards, now if I insult the guard he will beat the hell out of me. So I have a greater conflict to see the life in jail, and a lesser conflict to get out of jail. So by allowing thought to paralyse my action I avoid the greater conflict.

K: But surely sir, you are not in jail now, are you? (Laughter) I am not being cynical but that is an abstraction you are dealing with, aren't you?

Q: Some people concretely are in jail now.

K: Surely. All right. Are you aware... Look, are you aware that you are in jail? Living outside, not actually within four walls. Are you aware that you are in jail? Listen to it. Jail means you are conditioned - your culture has conditioned you, your gods have, your saviours, your corrupt governments - no? The environment of which you are, that is the prison you are in. That is the prison which you have created, of which you are a part. Are you aware of this - aware totally, completely. Not the reformation of the prison - better toilet, more freedom, less freedom, you know, better, bigger yards to walk about, bigger golf courses and all the rest of it - within the prison.

Q: What you say seems to sound so clear but I ask is it practical when people are being terrorised excessively?

K: What you are saying is not practical.

Q: No, I do not say that.

K: Then what do you say sir?

Q: What I say is, is what you say practical?

K: That is the same thing. (Laughter) Is what you say practical. Wait sir. When people are being terrorised, when Russia is killing all the good writers, you know, all that - is what you are saying practical? Do you think what is happening is practical?

Q: No, what I think is practical...

K: Just a minute sir, just a minute, I am asking you. Is what you are all doing, is it very practical? With your sovereign governments, preparing for wars with your lovely armies - a great deal of fun these army people must be having inventing new gadgets to kill! And you know what is actually happening right throughout the world - is that very practical? People starving? Oh, come on sir. Obviously that is not practical, is it? And you say what we are saying is impractical, or not practical. On the contrary, this is the most practical thing because you eliminate conflict in relationship. You understand sir? You eliminate all your structure of religious, psychological, fantasies, you are functioning efficiently, completely practically within the field of knowledge, and eliminating totally every form of image in relationship. That is the most practical thing, isn't it? But you can't do it and you won't do it, and that is what makes it impractical. If you did it, it would be the most practical thing alive.

Q: Sir, I was wondering from those two gentlemen that were speaking, I was wondering if people that are concerned about the evils that are abroad, if it is just to avoid looking at the evils that are right here now.

K: The gentleman asks are you asking these questions from abroad, what is going on outside - abroad - avoiding what is going on in yourself. That is the game we all play, sir. We are educated to this kind of

activity.

So please let us be practical. Which is, to see what is impractical - your gods, your saviours, the images that you have built, they are totally impractical. What is practical is to see the false - see it - and the seeing is the ending of that which is false, that is the most practical thing to do. And that is complete action. What is impractical is the fragmentary action, acting irresponsibly, you act fully in one direction and incompletely in another direction. Contradictory, that is most impractical, that is devastating.

Q: We can see the falseness but how to apply the other.

K: How to apply, is it?

Q: I mean the first question was sir that when thought arises it is from the past, to be aware of that, and also are we aware of the action of the past?

K: Sir, just listen sir. I have explained that very carefully. Don't apply anything that you hear. You have heard a great deal from everybody, from philosophers, from the politicians, from the priests, all the rest of it. Don't apply: look, observe, see clearly what is going on under your nose.

Q: I am talking about the observation of thought.

K: Yes sir. Now when you observe thought - observe thought - how do you observe thought? Is there a thinker observing thought? Come on sir. When there is an observer observing thought, the observer is thought, one thought looking at another thought - right? - one fragment of thought looking at another fragment of thought, and saying, 'I must be aware of that thought' or, 'I must control that thought, I must suppress that thought, I must overcome that thought'. But the observer, the thinker is the thought. That is a fact. That is, if you see that, not abstract, if you see that then you will see the place of thought, the necessity of clear thinking. And what relationship has thinking in relationship? You understand? What place has knowledge in relationship?

Q: Sir, as an organism that can't see, it can only attempt to see, surely it has got a double agent.

K: An organism that is incapable of seeing itself, it can only attempt, that brings about a duality.

Q: Listening to your talk, I have no question to ask, you can tell by my voice, the solution is here, right? It doesn't solve my problem. OK, you can answer me that I can't observe. And I tell you I observe and I say to you, well all right I am not observing. It seems to me that the state of being whatever that may be, is in itself, it is the problem, and the problem is trying to separate from the problem. I mean it can only separate with the part of the organism that is the problem.

K: Sir, what is a problem? Just a minute sir. What is a problem?

Q: Surely it is not seen.

K: No, no. I am trying to understand, we are trying to understand what the word means, first, 'problem'. What does it mean? Something you have not dissolved, that is, that you haven't understood, that you haven't resolved, that you haven't - it exists. I have a problem, we have a problem, why does the problem exist? I am jealous of you. I make that into a problem, don't I? Because you are clever, you are nicer, you know, in every way you are more... etc., and I am jealous, I like to be like you and I am not like you, and I have that problem. That problem implies comparison, imitation, conformity to what I think you are, and wanting to conform to that. I make a problem of it - why?

Q: Sir you are right, but as a phenomenon, as...

K: Yes sir, go on, go on.

Q: As a phenomenon, as something that is living, as I am walking about here, talking to people - reducing this - I can't tell it to you any other way - I see what you are saying but again I am talking through my head. I am introducing this idea as a phenomenon.

K: Yes sir, that is just what we are saying. Don't do that.

Q: Precisely, but...

K: I know, I know sir.

Q: But not doing it is doing it.

K: I understand that. That is why...

Q: It's a monkey. You are telling the monkey, you are giving him two messages. This is a schizophrenic situation.

K: I know, I understand this, sir, I understand it very well. Then what do we do? You won't listen. Of course sir.

Q: I want to listen but I can't listen.

K: That's it. I want to listen but I can't listen. And you make that into a problem. Don't listen, go out, forget it. (Laughter)

Q: Again that is a thought, because if I were out, I wouldn't be here.

K: That's it! If you want to listen, listen completely with your heart, with your mind, with your nerves, everything that you have got, with that, listen. If you don't want to listen, go out, forget it, but you can't forget it because the seed is sown. And that is what happens with all of us, with most people. The seed is sown and they can't remove that seed. That seed is an idea, is a conclusion, which has no reality. Wait, wait! Therefore, live in a world of non-reality, if you want that - live it. Forget the rest. And if you want to break it, break it, get away from it by seeing actually what is.

Q: One is still concerned with want.

K: I am using the word sir - want - don't stick to words, get the meaning of the words. Look. I want to listen to you. I say if you want to listen, listen, with your heart, with your mind, not only to the words but to the non-verbal statement. That is real communication. Then you listen completely, not partially. If you listen so completely there is nothing more. That is the greatest miracle. But if you say, 'Well, I am really not interested in this, but I like what you are saying, it is a very good idea, it is so good', this, that and the other - then play with it, go out and do something else. But that has no reality, you haven't solved a thing. And when we are talking about human transformation you have to give your blood to this - you understand? - blood in the sense your whole life to it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I see. Lust is not related to thought, and lust must fulfil. Is that what you are saying, sir? Yes sir. One example is good enough. Lust must fulfil irrespective of thought. Right? Is that it? I never heard this strange statement before. Let's examine it. Lust, sex, it must express itself - why? Is lust like hunger? Hunger, when there is hunger there must be food, otherwise if food is not given the organism gets weak, can't function and so on. Is lust independent of thought?

Q: We only know it as thought.

K: I am asking you sir. I am asking you, is lust independent of thought?

Q: I think it is, I don't know.

K: Don't you know? I'm so sorry. What am I to do? Look sir, what is lust, what is sex, why do we give such tremendous importance to this thing? Why? Have you noticed? More and more sex (laughs) - magazines - you follow? It's become a... something... You are supposed to have discovered it recently! (Laughter) It has become your... Is it because you have nothing else in life? Is it because everything else in your life is uncreative, destructive, meaningless? Your gods, your society, wars, nothing has any meaning except this? Intellectually you are second-hand, you repeat what dozens have said, therefore there is no movement there, you are merely repeating, therefore there is no vital, creative, directive energy in there. And you have this left. You go to the office, which is a boredom, go to work, labour, everything is meaningless now. And to this you give a tremendous meaning, out of proportion. This has become all life. You see that and you don't do a thing about it. You don't say, 'Well, I'll find out why I imitate, why I think what others think, what my conditioning is' - you follow? - break up the structure of one's own life, living. And if you don't, your life becomes monotonous, meaningless, useless, and you have this one thing left. There at least you think you are free. And you blow this up out of all proportion. And that you call love.

Yes sir. Now if you see that, see that your mind, your brain, your mind, is so second-hand because your mind is full of what others have said. Your education, your whole... you know the whole business is that. And when you see that you begin to find out why you conform, why you imitate, what are the implications of imitation; and whether the mind can be really free of every kind imitation; and where there is the necessity of imitation: keeping to the left side of the road, and when you go abroad keep to the right side of the road. Where conformity, comparison - you don't look into yourself! Therefore one leads a superficial, meaningless life. And it is a very short life.

Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: But sir...

Q: You get the feeling, I am something because I am not alive. You see those who go to the Maharishi and you say well I am not one of those - you understand?

K: I am going to repeat it, sir. You go down the street, you are stimulated by the people you are seeing - short skirts, nakedness, and also you see further along, as you walk along, you see the people of Krishna consciousness, Maharishi Yogi or some other... (laughter) guru, and you say to yourself, 'Thank god, I'm not any of those people' (Laughter). You are neither associated with the Christians, with the Protestants, with the Catholics and so on and so on. And then you feel alone, and you are frightened of being alone. Therefore you cling to something that your mind says you will find there security, whether it is a woman or an idea, or a man, or an image. Now to see all that sir, to observe all the stimuli from outside and how the mind depends on stimuli, and whether the mind can keep awake totally without any stimuli. You understand sir? That is the real thing. We need experience to keep us alive, therefore we look to experience, to outward stimuli, but to have no stimuli from outside, which means to be a light to oneself - a light to oneself.

Q: Surely you can isolate yourself.

K: No, no. I have been through all that, sir. Isolation is not a light to yourself. Isolation means withdrawal, resistance, conforming not to that pattern but to another pattern. But to be a light to yourself means you are a light to the world - you understand sir? - not to yourself, you are a light.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What am I to do with the world and with myself. Right? You are not separate from the world, and you are

the world. That is so. Now what is your action - not only with regard to the world - and what is your action in relationship? What is the practical action? Go into it sir, go into it. That is your question, I am trying to investigate that question. You are the world, and the world is you. Are you asking the question: what am I to do with the world, which is so confused, brutal, violent, sick, mad, and what am I to do with that world? But you are that world, you are mad. Yes sir! You are insane, you are immoral. Wait sir, wait. So you say, 'How am I to help the world?' - you can't unless you become totally sane you can't do a thing, and the practicality is - be sane, not become sane. That's enough, sir.